



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Brenda Cassellius
Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Education
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55113

January 6, 2017

Dear Commissioner Cassellius:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (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). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) 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. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of State assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in June 2016. 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 child'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.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on Minnesota Department of Education's (MDE) recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated Minnesota's submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, 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 our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (MCA III). **Partially meets requirements.**
- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (MCA III). **Partially meets requirements.**

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.

- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science assessments in grade bands 3-5 and 6-8(MCA III). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science assessments in high school (MCA III). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8 and high school (MTAS). **Substantially meets requirements.**

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 MDE should be able to provide this additional information within one year.

The components that **partially meet requirements** do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and MDE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that MDE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

The specific list of items required for MDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because several of the State's components have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, MDE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. MDE 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. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on MDE's Federal fiscal year 2017 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

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

Page 3 – The Honorable Brenda Cassellius

If you have any questions, please contact Tahira Rashid and Shauna Myers of my staff at:
OSS.Minnesota@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Ann Whalen
Senior Advisor to the Secretary
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Jennifer Dugan, Director of Statewide Testing

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Minnesota’s Assessment System

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	<p>For the reading/ language arts (R/LA) general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that MDE R/LA standards that augmented common standards used in many States were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the mathematics general assessments in high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that MDE has improved benchmark coverage test forms. <p>For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that MDE has improved benchmark coverage test forms. • Evidence that MDE has improved DOK proportionality within R/LA item pools. • Evidence that the MCA III covers the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including the State’s writing, speaking and listening standards for all grades. <p>For the science general assessments in grades 5, 8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that MDE has improved the alignment of test item DOK with DOK specified in science content standards.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the mathematics general assessments in high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above. <p>For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above (improved benchmark coverage and DOK proportions) <p>For the science general assessments in grades 5, 8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the mathematics general assessments in high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above. • Evidence of independent alignment studies for grades 3-8. <p>For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above (improved benchmark coverage and DOK proportions).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>For the science general assessments in grades 5, 8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above. <p>For the R/LA and science alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has improved the alignment of MTAS test items with MDE content standards in R/LA and science.
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p>	<p>For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above regarding the DOK proportions. <p>For the science general assessments in grades 5, 8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above regarding the DOK alignment. <p>For the R/LA and science alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 3.1 above.
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p>	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that supports the internal structure of each test and sub-domain scores for each test (e.g., a confirmatory factor analysis or the correlations among the sub-domain scores of each test). <p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science AA-AAAS for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that supports the internal structure of each test and sub-domain scores for each test (e.g., a confirmatory factor analysis; or the correlations among the sub-domain scores of each test).
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p>	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science AA-AAAS for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity evidence that shows levels of validity generally considered adequate by professional judgment regarding such assessments, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Validity evidence based on relationships with other variables, such as analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between assessment results and other variables, OR ○ Correlations between assessment results and variables related to test-takers (e.g., instructional time on content based on grade-level content standards); OR ○ Correlations between proficiency on the high-school assessments and performance in post-secondary education, vocational training or employment.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the involvement of educators with experience with special populations in the development technology-enhanced items. • Evidence of the process used to select technology and technology tools used in presenting/administering test items, and of the process for determining that these technology tools were appropriate for all populations. • Evidence of the completed differential item functioning (DIF) analyses referred to in the State submission (i.e., the DIF studies’ results).
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of an interpretation for the reported conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) data for the tests.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the results of the equating procedures that were described in the MDE submission for these tests.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For the entire assessment system, MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance on how to select the appropriate accommodations and accessibility features for students with disabilities. <p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science AA-AAAS for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS) MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures to ensure that implementation of the AA-AAAS promotes student access to grade-level content standards.
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance on how to select the appropriate accommodations and accessibility features for ELs.
5.3 – Test Accommodations	<p>For the R/LA and mathematics general tests in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA-III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of empirical analysis to evaluate test accommodations provided (e.g., score summaries and reliability estimates, where practicable). • Evidence of improved the reliability of accommodated paper forms of the tests in all grades.
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	<p>For the mathematics general tests in grades 3-8 (MCA-III) and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (MTAS), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of State adoption of achievement standards for these tests.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	For the mathematics general tests in grades 3-8 (MCA-III), MDE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the process used to set standards for these tests.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	For the mathematics general tests in grades 3-8 (MCA-III), MDE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the process used to set standards for these tests (see element 6.2).
6.4 – Reporting	For all general tests (MCAS III) and AA-AAAS (MTAS) submitted in this peer review, MDE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that test reports 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.

U. S. Department of Education Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

June, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 6
1.3 – Required Assessments (Reviewed by Department staff only) 8
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (Reviewed by Department staff only)..... 9
1.5 – Participation Data (Reviewed by Department staff only) 10

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 11
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 11
2.2 – Item Development..... 15
2.3 – Test Administration 18
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (Reviewed by Department staff only)23
2.5 – Test Security 24
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 28

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 31
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 31
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 34
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure 36
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables 38

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 40
4.1 – Reliability..... 40
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 43
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 46
4.4 – Scoring 47
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 50
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 53
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 55

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 57
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 57
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 60
5.3 – Accommodations..... 62
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 64

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 65
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 65
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 67
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 69
6.4 – Reporting..... 71

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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
<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>Evaluate for all subjects</p> <p>Minnesota’s Mathematics Content Standards have been formally adopted, are challenging, and apply to all students. This is evidenced by the approved submission of Minnesota’s 2011 Peer Review documentation (see Exhibit 1.1.1) and documentation that those standards have not changed since 2011 (see Category 1). Evidence to support that the standards are challenging comes from a letter from the Chancellor of Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. In the letter, the Chancellor notes that the standards are aligned well with knowledge and skills students will need to be successful in post-secondary institutions and the workplace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement Previously Met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 1.1.1 Peer Review Approval Letter for Assessments New in 2011 o Category 1: Minnesota Mathematics Academic Content Standards have not changed since the State’s previous assessment peer review; 2011 Peer Review Submission (status of approved) o 1.1.2 Letter from institutions of higher education (IHE) <p>Minnesota’s English Language Arts Content Standards have been formally adopted (see Category 2), are challenging, and apply to all students. This is evidenced by the approved submission of Minnesota’s 2011 Peer Review documentation (see Exhibit 1.1.3) and ESEA Flexibility Waiver Renewal (see Exhibit 1.1.4). Evidence to support that the standards are challenging comes from a letter from the Chancellor of Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. In the letter, the Chancellor notes that</p>	<p>Evidence to say MN adopted standards but the standards themselves were not included. The organization of the evidence was confusing and difficult to determine where the each piece of specific evidence was located.</p> <p>MN adopted the ELA common core. They did provide evidence of the reading standards but not for writing, speaking and listening, or language,</p> <p>The adoption evidence for Extended Alternate Assessment standards was not included.</p> <p>The evidence for mathematics is complete, due in large part to the IHE letter (1.1.2). The IHE letter only applies to mathematics.</p> <p>The evidence does not fully address how the State adopted challenging academic content standards for students who would take the AA-AAAS. A version of the manual on standards based IEPs references the modified 2% assessment and it needs to be modified to address the 1% population.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>the standards are aligned well with knowledge and skills students will need to be successful in post-secondary institutions and the workplace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement Previously Met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Category 2: adopted a set of college- and career-ready academic content standards certified by a State network of IHEs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 1.1.3 ESEA Flexibility Waiver Approval Letter o 1.1.4 Minnesota Approval for ESEA Flexibility Waiver Renewal o 1.1.2 Letter from IHE <p>Minnesota formally adopted science standards in 2010 (see Evidence 1.1.5 for the standards and 1.1.6 for the adoption). Minnesota’s content standards apply to all public elementary and secondary schools and students. Legislation illustrating that rigorous academic standards apply to all students is found in the statute (see Exhibit 1.1.7). The specific subject areas for which the standards apply and explicit language about the standards applying to all students (with the exception of a few students for whom an individualized education plan team has decided that alternate standards are most appropriate) is also found in the statute (see Exhibit 1.1.8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1.5 MN Academic Standards Science (cover pages state/cite final Rule adopting these standards) • 1.1.6 Science Justification for Rulemaking • 1.1.7 MN Statute 120B.02 Educational Expectations • 1.1.8 MN Statute 120B.021 Required Academic Standards <p>AA-AAAS</p> <p>In the state statute, Minnesota requires that the standards apply to all students with the exception of a</p>	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>select few who have “extreme cognitive or physical impairments (See Page 1 of Exhibit 1.1.8).” For those students, the individualized education plan team will determine appropriate alternative standards. Special education teachers developed the standardized processes to follow. These processes were documented and disseminated by the state and created in adherence to the U.S. Department of Education regulations under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (see Exhibit 1.1.9).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1.8 MN Statute 120B.021 Required Academic Standards (page 1, Subdivision 1 (b)) • 1.1.9 Developing Standards Based IEPs 	
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence for writing, speaking and listening, or language standards from the CCSS. • Evidence for the adoption of the Extended Alternate Assessment standards, • IHE evidence for ELA and science. • A version of the manual on standards based IEPs that references the 1% and not the 2% population. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>Evaluate for all three subjects</p> <p>Minnesota’s Mathematics and English Language Arts Content Standards contain coherent and rigorous content, encourage the teaching of advanced skills, and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement. They specify the skills students need by the time they graduate from high school to be ready to succeed in college and the workforce demonstrated in Critical Element in 1.1. These standards were approved in 2012 as part of the ESEA Flexibility Process (see Exhibit 1.1.3), which was renewed in 2015 (see Exhibit 1.1.4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement Previously Met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 1.1.3 ESEA Flexibility Waiver Approval Letter o Category 2: adopted a set of college- and career-ready academic content standards certified by a State IHE o 1.1.4 Minnesota Approval for ESEA Flexibility Waiver Renewal <p>Minnesota’s Science Content Standards are coherent, rigorous, and apply to all students. Minnesota did not include Science Content Standards in the waiver process, so the complete documentation is provided in this submission. The assumptions guiding the Science Standards Committee’s Work (see Exhibit 1.2.2) and steps followed in the development process (see Exhibit 1.1.6 and Exhibit 1.2.3) provide evidence that the revised Minnesota Science Standards are coherent, rigorous, encourage teaching advanced skills, and involved broad stakeholder input. The process used to revise the standards included gathering input from science experts in Minnesota and science consultants with national expertise, building the standards based on current research and policy about science content, gathering input from</p>	<p>No information about the rigor of the ELA, science, or Extended Alternate Assessment standards.</p> <p>Need information to show the Extended Alternate Assessment standards are linked to the state’s general education standards.</p> <p>IHE letter for ELA would be good information.</p> <p>The waiver letters address the requirement to “know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce” for mathematics and ELA. It does not address the requirements of coherence and rigor, teaching of advanced skills, or development with stakeholder involvement. The IHE letter addresses these additional requirements for math only. Evidence for science is complete.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>stakeholders (e.g., business community, teachers, the public) throughout the process, partnering with the P–16 Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Working Group to align the new standards to support college readiness and advanced work, and comparing the standards to those in other states (see Exhibit 1.1.6 and Exhibit 1.2.5).</p> <p>Further evidence of the rigor and coherence of the science standards comes from input from nationally recognized science experts (see Exhibit 1.2.1) and the Benchmark Summary (see Exhibit 1.2.4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2.1 Science Standards Expert Reviewer’s Major Points • 1.2.2 Assumptions for Science Standards Revision Process • 1.1.6 Science Justification for Rulemaking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Steps in development process, page 7 o Input from experts, pages 9-10 o Based on current research and policy, page 16 o Comparison of the standards, page 18 • 1.2.3 Minnesota Academic Standards in Science FAQ (page 2, questions 3 and 4) • 1.2.4 Science Standard and Benchmark Summary • 1.2.5 Science Standards Revisions Committee and Staff List 	
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need information about the rigor of the ELA and science standards (e.g., IHE letter). • Need information to show the Extended Alternate Assessment standards are linked to the state’s general education standards (e.g., linking study). 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>Extensive description of required tests provided in index, but evidence 1.3.1 reference pages provide primary evidence for this element.</p>	<p>Evidence 1.3.1 lists all required tests in all grade bands for general assessments and AA-AAAS. See pages 25-27.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p> <p>see Exhibits 1.4.1, 1.4.2, and 1.4.3 for students placed in different educational settings</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the 2015–2016 Procedures Manual (see Exhibit 1.3.1</p> <p>Chapter 5 of the Procedures Manual describes accommodations, Chapter 6 of the Procedures Manual describes participation for English learners, and Chapter 7 of the Procedures Manual describes the process for students in special circumstances and situations.</p> <p>AA-AAS (see Exhibit 1.4.4),</p> <p>standards-based IEP guidance (Exhibit 1.4.5), and alternate assessment waiver information (see Exhibit 1.4.6)</p>	<p>Evidence for this critical element is complete.</p> <p>Evidence 1.4.1, 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 address relevant state code that address criteria for this element.</p> <p>Procedures manual chapters 5,6, 7 (1.3.1) support criteria for this element.</p> <p>1.4.4 supports appropriate AA-AAS participation.</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>1.5 – 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>Evidence 1.5.1 participation data Evidence 1.5.2 participation calculation procedures AA-AAAS</p>	<p>HS science participate rates are low and this was not explained nor was a plan for addressing this.</p> <p>Problem was around the difference between general ed population and ELLs and SD. Participation is high across groups, content areas, and grade bands with the exception of HS science (90% participation). HS science is administered at the end-of-course and evidence of each student being tested and counted for this assessment was not provided. References in the AYP Specifications were to 10th and 11th grade.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>The purpose of Minnesota’s assessments is documented in the Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments (hereafter Procedures Manual) and in the Guidelines for Test Construction. The purpose of Minnesota’s assessments is documented in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 (pages 23–28) • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test Construction (pages 10–12 and 16) <p>The results’ intended interpretations and uses are explicitly communicated to stakeholders. The Procedures Manual reports the ethical and unethical behaviors and practices for Minnesota assessments, an overview of assessment reporting, and a description of the test construction process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ethical and unethical behaviors and practices, pages 46–47 o Overview of assessment reporting, pages 209–236 o Building A Test, pages 248–250 • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (pages 28–42) • Evidence provided in Section 6 of this document also supports the appropriate interpretation and use of test results. <p>The test blueprints and test design, including challenging content and complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills, are created with</p>	<p>Lot of information for math but not so much for ELA.</p> <p>Organization of information was confusing.</p> <p>Nice test specs for the Alternate Assessments that included the general education standards as well as the extensions.</p> <p>The evidence for this element is thorough and complete. It addresses all four areas: purposes, blueprints, complexity, and CAT item pool.</p> <p>Test Design includes number of items in math and ELA but points in science. These are given by strand. The ELA assessment only assesses reading and has details about lexile levels and passage length for each grade. DoK (Web model is used) are given for each content area. In each case there is a high number of DoK 1 items—this is most notable in science and as a whole across all content areas very few DoK 3 items are required. Item specifications cover the range of content standards and benchmarks for each grade level but mainly focus on content limits but do not mention DoK levels of each benchmark.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>educator input and are posted on MDE’s website. Vendor staff, MDE staff, and committee members use these documents throughout the test development process. They provide direct evidence of the way that assessments reflect Minnesota academic content standards. Furthermore, in the Test Specifications, MDE explains the process they use to assign a cognitive complexity rating to content and the distribution of test items at each cognitive level. These aspects of the program illustrate how the assessments reflect challenging content and higher-order thinking skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.3 MCA III Test Specifications, Mathematics, Grades 3–8 and 11 (pages 8–10 for blueprint) • 2.1.4 MCA III Test Specifications, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (pages 11–14 for blueprint) • 2.1.5 MCA III Test Specifications, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (pages 6–9 for blueprint) • 2.1.6 MTAS Test Specifications, Mathematics, Grade 11 (page 7 for blueprint) • 2.1.7 MTAS Test Specifications, Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 (pages 6–7 for blueprint) • 2.1.8 MTAS Test Specifications, Science, Grades 5, 8 and HS (page 7 for blueprint) <p>To ensure the tests created adhere to the test specifications in the technical manual and the guidelines for test construction, MDE documents its processes. The item writer and committee review trainings are referenced in these documents and are provided in Exhibits 2.1.9–2.1.18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 2, pages 28–42 (especially 32, 35–38, and 42) • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test Construction (pages 13–30) • 2.1.9 MDE Math Item Writer Training 	<p>MN has explicit documents and training materials that are aligned to the test specifications and provide DoK training as well as difficulty training.</p> <p>MN should continue to run simulations and monitor their item pools for cognitive complexity distribution, difficulty distribution, and item standard/benchmark distribution among DoK and difficulty levels. Item exposure rates should continue to be closely monitored and items with high exposure rates should be evaluated for the information they provide and why they are being selected so frequently. This provides additional information about weakness in the item pool.</p> <p>Item writer trainings adhere to the item specifications and include information about DoK and also information about best item type to use. Reviewer training also has the same features and the Data Review training contains visuals as well as charts explaining the statistics and their use.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> • 2.1.10 MDE Reading Item Writer Training • 2.1.11 MDE Science Item Writer Training • 2.1.12 MCA Math New Item Review Training • 2.1.13 MCA Reading New Item Review Training • 2.1.14 MCA Science New Item Review Training • 2.1.15 MCA Math and Reading Bias Review Training • 2.1.16 MCA Science Bias Review Training • 2.1.17 MCA Math and Reading Data Review Training • 2.1.18 MCA Science Data Review Training <p>Minnesota’s Mathematics and Reading MCA use a computer-adaptive test design. The simulations for the spring 2016 tests estimate a maximum exposure rate of ~30 percent and ~50 percent for mathematics and reading, respectively (see Exhibits 2.1.19 and 2.1.21).</p> <p>MDE has a plan to further lower the exposure rates. A critical piece for lowering the exposure rates and improving the information from the adaptive tests is the detailed statistical evaluation of the mathematics and reading item pools based on the simulations for the spring 2016. These allowed results focused development on not only specific item types, cognitive complexity, and benchmarks, but also on item difficulty (see Exhibit 2.1.20 and Exhibit 2.1.22).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (page 126) • 2.1.19 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016, especially page 10 • 2.1.20 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 Pool Analysis Report.Nov2015, especially pages 16– 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>17</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.21 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016, especially pages 31–33 • 2.1.22 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 Pool Analysis Report.Nov2015, especially pages 11–13 • In a continuous quality improvement effort, MDE staff, the vendor, and Minnesota’s TAC will review annual simulations. The information gleaned from the simulations and discussions will inform MDE’s item development and item release plan. 	
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"> • A plan with how MN will address the findings from the reports submitted by their contractors (e.g. Pearson CAT Simulation and Testlet Construction Results, HUMRO alignment study reports). 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>The item and test development process noted in Chapter 2 of the Technical Manual and Chapter 1 of the MDE Guidelines for Test Construction provides a multi-step approach designed to ensure that items assess Minnesota’s academic content standards, including content alignment and higher-order thinking skills (see Exhibit 2.1.1 and 2.1.2). This is accomplished by a set of committees, including educators, item development experts, assessment experts, and Minnesota staff involved in item development, data review, and bias reviews prior to creating an operational form/bank.</p> <p>As part of HumRRO’s independent alignment studies, an analysis was conducted regarding how closely MCA and MTAS items reflect the content standards and adhere to the test specifications. Minnesota continues to strengthen alignment and create more robust item pools. This commitment to continuous improvement is evidenced by 2.1.20 and 2.1.22.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test Construction (pages 13–29) • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 • 2.2.1 MDE Vendor Guide to Advisory Panels (pages 5–6) • 2.2.2 2014–2015 Advisory Panels Attendee Details • 2.1.12 MCA Math New Item Review Training • 2.1.13 MCA Reading New Item Review Training • 2.1.14 MCA Science New Item Review Training • 2.1.15 MCA Math and Reading Bias Review 	<p>MN item development includes content, bias, and data reviews to ensure that only items that match their standards appear on their test forms.</p> <p>MN had the foresight to have alignment conducted. HumRRO conducted thorough and insightful alignment studies for both the general and alternate item pools that provided excellent information about the item pools. These studies revealed that for math and ELA the coverage of the benchmarks was not complete and the item pool needed to be updated with items assessing these benchmarks. For science, the items that were based on scenarios in many cases were not interconnected leading to an increased DoK level that was not based on the construct under assessment.</p> <p>A plan/schedule for item pool improvement would be important.</p> <p>Accessibility was questionable for grade 5 and HS MTAS (pg. vii—Table 4) science. Need evidence that the recommendations made by HumRRO to strengthen the alignment.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.16 MCA Science Bias Review Training • 2.1.17 MCA Math and Reading Data Review Training • 2.1.18 MCA Science Data Review Training • 2.2.3 Data Review Card Samples • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (pages 28–42) • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 (pages 248–250) • 2.2.4 MCA III Alignment Study, Mathematics, Grade 11 • 2.2.5 MCA III Alignment Study, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 • 2.2.6 MCA III Alignment Study, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS • 2.2.7 MTAS Alignment Study, Mathematics, Grade 11 • 2.2.8 MTAS Alignment Study, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 • 2.2.9 MTAS Alignment Study, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS • 2.1.3 MCA III Test Specifications, Mathematics, Grades 3–8 and 11 • 2.1.4 MCA III Test Specifications, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 • 2.1.5 MCA III Test Specifications, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS • 2.1.6 MTAS Test Specifications, Mathematics, Grade 11 • 2.1.7 MTAS Test Specifications, Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 • 2.1.8 MTAS Test Specifications, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS • 2.1.20 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 Pool Analysis Report. Nov2015 • 2.1.22 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 Pool Analysis Report. Nov2015 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan how MN will address the findings from the reports submitted by their contractors (e.g., HumRRO alignment studies). 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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. Current Practice; shift to new test engine, more adaptive testing, and Test Security enhancements 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota’s policies and procedures establish and clearly communicate consistent standardized procedures. This is demonstrated by the specificity in the procedures manual, trainings, and administration manuals (see Exhibits 1.3.1 and 2.3.1–2.3.8). These are updated annually and provided to districts and stakeholders in advance of the administration to allow districts and schools to sufficiently prepare. In the event there are questions regarding standardized policies and procedures during the administration, the Pearson Call Center provides support for consistent implementation (see Exhibit 2.3.8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 8, pages 149–196 <input type="checkbox"/> Preparing a school site for testing, pages 167–170 <input type="checkbox"/> What help Test Monitors can give, page 184 <input type="checkbox"/> Leaving during testing, pages 187–188 <input type="checkbox"/> What Students May Do after They Complete a Test, page 189 <input type="checkbox"/> Disruptions and misadministrations during testing, pages 185–186 and Test Administration Report, page 52 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Administration with accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> Accommodation table for students with an IEP or 504 Plan, pages 93–103 <input type="checkbox"/> Accommodation table for English learners, pages 125–130 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Minnesota’s definition of the accountability window and process to account for all students enrolled during the accountability window <input type="checkbox"/> Accountability window, pages 81 and 151–152 <input type="checkbox"/> Prior to testing, pages 201–204 	<p>MN has procedures for standardized test administration. The training in the specific procedures is updated on a yearly basis. Included in this Procedures Manual are specifications for administering their adaptive computer based assessments. They offer additional trainings for computer based administration as well as a checklist for computer requirements for testing.</p> <p>Missing was the list of approved bilingual word to word dictionaries.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> □ After testing, pages 204 • 2.3.1 Assessment Update 11/12/2015 (first article announces 2015–2016 Procedures Manual posted) • 2.3.2 2015–2016 MDE Trainings for DACs • 2.3.3 2015–2016 MCA and MTAS Assessments Manual (pages 10–14) • 2.3.4 2015–2016 Test Monitor Directions MCA Online • 2.3.5 2015–2016 MCA Student Directions • 2.3.6 2015–2016 Test Monitor Directions MCA Paper Accommodations • 2.3.7 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Developing Training • 2.3.8 Pearson Call Center Routing <p>In addition to developing the manuals and trainings necessary for standardized administrations, Minnesota has established procedures and training of these procedures to all individuals responsible for administering the test. Required trainings, by role and test, are listed in the procedures manual (see Exhibit 1.3.1, pages 56–58). The training plan provides a schedule of this year’s trainings available to districts (see Exhibit 2.3.2 and 2.3.9).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter Three: Responsible and Ethical Practices to Maintain Test Security and Test Score Integrity, especially Part V: Training, pages 56–58 o Appendix B: Minnesota Assessments Monitoring Checklist, page 260 (#3 and 4) o Chapter 8: Test Administration, Pre-Test Edit verification that all Test Monitors have been trained, page 163 • 2.3.2 2015–2016 Planned MDE Trainings for DACs • 2.3.9 2015–2016 Training Plan 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> • 2.3.3 2015–2016 MCA and MTAS Assessments Manual • 2.3.10 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Test Security • 2.3.7 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Developing Training • 2.3.11 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Active Monitoring • 2.3.12 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Assurance of Test Security and NonDisclosure • 2.3.4 2015–2016 Test Monitor Directions MCA Online • 2.3.13 2015–2016 MCA Student Tutorial • 2.3.5 2015–2016 MCA Student Directions • 2.3.6 2015–2016 Test Monitor Directions MCA Paper Accommodations • 2.3.14 Item Samplers Training <p>Due to the nature of the individually administered alternate assessment, the information provided for alternate test administrators regarding the test questions is more detailed and specific (see Exhibit 2.3.15). The MTAS Item Samplers (see Exhibits 2.3.16–2.3.19) provide examples of the materials supplied to MTAS test administrators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.3.15 2015–2016 MTAS Test Administrator Training • 2.3.16 2015–2016 MTAS Task Administration Manual (especially pages 14–16) • MTAS Item Samplers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2.3.17 MTAS Math Sampler Gr11 o 2.3.18 MTAS Reading Sampler Gr3 o 2.3.19 MTAS Reading Sampler Gr10 o 2.3.20 MTAS Science Sampler Gr5 • 2.3.21 2015–2016 MTAS Field Auditor Training <p>Minnesota has administered online tests since 2007, and, beginning in spring 2015, all general education</p>	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>assessments were administered online. Minnesota has policies and procedures that define technology and other related requirements to allow for standardized administrations. The Procedures Manual addresses some foundational information regarding online test administration (see Exhibit 1.3.1). The Procedures Manual also highlights the new procedures, requirements, and policies for 2015–2016 as a demonstration of Minnesota’s dedication to continuous improvement. Additional technology-specific trainings and checklists are provided (see Exhibits 2.3.22–2.3.27). Like many other assessment systems across the country, Minnesota experienced DDoS attacks during the spring 2015 administration. Details from that administration and technical changes for spring 2016 are provided in Exhibit 2.3.29. Minnesota’s contingency plan for technology issues during administration is documented in Exhibits 2.3.30 and 2.3.31.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o New for 2015–2016, pages 18–21 o Training, pages 56–58 o Technology Coordinator roles and responsibilities, pages 76–77 o Extension of testing window, page 151 o Technology Preparation and Site Readiness Confirmation, pages 162–163 • 2.3.22 PearsonAccess Before and During Testing PPT • 2.3.23 2015–2016 Online Testing Infrastructure Readiness Checklist for MCA • 2.3.24 2015–2016 Technology Readiness Training • 2.3.25 2015–2016 TestNav8TechStaffPPT • 2.3.26 2015–2016 TestNav 8OnlineSupport • 2.3.27 2015–2016 TestNav 8 Overview PPT • 2.3.28 2015–2016 TN8Online Tools and 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Accommodations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.3.29 Legislative Report on MCA Contractor Performance (pages 8–12 provide detailed technical changes for future online administrations) • 2.3.30 2015–2016 MN Training and Technology Support Plan • 2.3.31 2015–2016 Administration Issues Log and Testing Issues Communication Procedure 	
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 (pages 58–61 and 260–261) • 2.4.1 2015 MDE Site Monitoring Visits and Findings • 2.4.2 2016 MDE Site Monitoring Training • 2.4.3 2016 MDE Test Administration Monitoring Sites, column 4, specifies why the school was selected for a site monitoring visit • 2.4.4 2015–2016 MTAS Field Auditor Procedures Manual • 2.4.5 2016 MTAS Field Auditor Sites • 2.3.7 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Developing Training • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (page 140) • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (pages 366–372) 	<p>Exhibits submitted provide strong support for overall evidence of a comprehensive plan and system of monitoring test administration in Minnesota</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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. Current Practice 	<p>In 2014–2015 MDE convened a Test Policies and Procedures Committee (TPPC); the committee’s report found “MDE has comprehensive policies and procedures around the prevention, reporting, and resolution of testing irregularities.” (Exhibit 2.5.1, page 6). Minnesota plans to further strengthen efforts related to preventing irregularities by continuing to work with districts to implement recommendations from TPPC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5.1 TPPC Recommendations and Final Report (2015) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Prevention, pages 4–12, 25–32 o Reporting, pages 13–14, 27 o Detection, resolution, and investigation, pages 12–13, 14–16, and 27 <p>Minnesota is committed to continuing to improve test security and to ensure the integrity of its test data. The hiring process for a Test Security and Data Integrity Coordinator is in progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5.2 Test Security Position Description (2016) <p>Over the years, Minnesota has focused on preventing assessment irregularities. Multiple manuals and trainings to educate the field regarding proper test administration procedures demonstrate this. Administering an adaptive test that has maximum exposure rate controls is an additional preventative measure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Appropriate Professional Behavior, pages 40–46 o Test Security, 47–57 o Code of conduct appearing in student tests, pages 50–51 o Test Administration Considerations, pages 	<p>MN has procedures and training materials for preventing assessment irregularities. MN has training material for detecting test irregularities. MN has investigative procedures and procedures for remediation and/or censure.</p> <p>MN should continue to do forensic data analysis.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>181–186</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Test Monitor Test Materials Security Checklist, page 244 o Internal Test Security Procedures, Appendix B, pages 251–261 o Assurance of Test Security and Non-Disclosure, pages 232–233 o Chapter 4, Roles and Responsibilities for Testing, pages 63–82 • 2.3.3 2015–2016 MCA and MTAS Assessments Manual (pages 10, 12–17) • 2.3.4 2015–2016 Test Monitor Directions MCA Online (pages 1, 4) • 2.3.5 2015–2016 MCA Student Directions • 2.3.6 2015–2016 Test Monitor Directions MCA Paper Accommodations (pages 1–3) • 2.3.10 Mini02 Audio Transcript Test Security (slides 1–12) • 2.3.7 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Developing Training • 2.3.12 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Assurance of Test Security and Non-Disclosure (slides 1–7) • 2.5.3 Assessment Update 9-2-2015 (pages 1, 2, 4) • 2.5.4 Assessment Update 9-23-2015 (page 1) • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (pages 47–49) • 2.1.19 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 CAT Simulation Report for Spring, 2016 (page 10: Exposure Rates) • 2.1.21 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 CAT Simulation Report for 2016 (page 31: Exposure Rates) • 2.5.5 Ensuring Test Data Integrity (2015) (slides 1–19) • Non-Disclosure Agreements o 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Assessments 2015–2016; Assurance of Test Security and Non-disclosure, pages 232–233</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 2.5.6 2015–2016 MDE Advisory Panels NDAs o 2.5.7 2016 MDE Staff NDAs o 2.5.8 2016 Pearson Staff NDAs <p>Reporting of test irregularities by stakeholders is described in the procedures manual (see Exhibit 1.3.1) and has become easier with the recent availability of a tip line (see Exhibit 2.5.9).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reporting procedures, Chapter 3, pages 51–56 o Tasks related to test irregularities by role, Chapter 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Misadministrations, pages 185–186 o Invalid definition, page 190 o Test Administration Report, page 234 o Internal Test Security Procedures, pages 251–255 • 2.5.9 2015–2016 Screen shots of MDE Tip Line • 2.3.10 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Test Security (slides 13–15) • 2.3.7 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Developing Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.3.12 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Assurance of Test Security and NonDisclosure (slide 8) • 2.5.5 Ensuring Test Data Integrity (2015) (slide 20) <p>Minnesota policies and procedures related to detection, investigation and resolution of testing irregularities are detailed in the Procedures Manual, trainings, and presentations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 3, Responsible and Ethical Practices to Maintain Test Security and Test Score Integrity, especially pages 51–56 o Investigation, pages 253–255 • 2.3.7 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Developing Training • 2.3.12 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Assurance of Test Security and NonDisclosure (slide 13) • 2.5.5 Ensuring Test Data Integrity (2015) (slides 21–23) • 2.5.10 Minnesota TAC Agenda 2016 April • 2.5.11 Proposed Data Forensics (2016) 	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
x No additional evidence is required.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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. Current Practice 	<p>Minnesota has several procedures in place to protect the integrity of test materials and data. Examples of non-disclosure agreements are Exhibits 1.3.1, 2.5.6, 2.5.7, and 2.5.8. Data Practices Training required for all Minnesota staff is provided (see Exhibits 2.6.1 and 2.6.2). Minnesota also requires its vendors to protect test integrity and maintain confidentiality as demonstrated in the scope of work (see Exhibit 2.6.3) and all vendor staff are required to sign a non-disclosure agreement (see Exhibit 2.5.8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, pages 39–82 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ DAC and SAC roles on policies and procedures pages 65–71; 72–76 □ DAC and SAC roles on policies and procedures pages 65–71; 72–76 o Tracking Secure Test Materials Provided to Students, page 173 o Collection and Return of Secure Test Materials, page 194 o Assurance of Test Security and Non-disclosure, pages 232–233 o Sample District Test Security Procedure, pages 256–259 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Disclosure Agreements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016; Assurance of Test Security and Non-disclosure, pages 232–233 o 2.5.6 2015–2016 MDE Advisory Panels NDAs o 2.5.7 2016 MDE Staff NDAs o 2.5.8 2016 Pearson Staff NDAs • 2.5.5 Ensuring Test Data Integrity (2015) 	<p>MN has procedures and trainings for the protection of test materials and related data. They have guidelines for the acquisition and use of student level data and personally identifiable information.</p> <p>MN should continue their forensic studies.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>(slides 1–19)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.6.1 2016 MDE Data Practices Training • 2.6.2 2016 MDE IT Data Practices Training • 2.6.3 2015–2016 Scope of Work for MN Assessment System (Sections 1.7.3, 4.2.3, 7.5.5) • 2.3.10 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Test Security (slide 16) • 2.3.7 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Developing Training • 2.3.11 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Active Monitoring • 2.3.12 2015–2016 Audio Transcript Assurance of Test Security and NonDisclosure (slide 10) <p>Maintaining the security and privacy of student data is important to Minnesota. The evidence below provides documentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Use of Private Student Information, pages 226–229 o Assurance of Test Security and Non-disclosure, pages 232–233; especially next to last bullet page 232 o Chapter 3: Responsible and Ethical Practices to Maintain Test Security and Test Score Integrity, pages 39–62 • 2.5.5 Ensuring Test Data Integrity (2015) (slides 1–19) • 2.6.1 2016 MDE Data Practices Training • 2.6.2 2016 MDE IT Data Practices Training • 2.6.4 Guide to Members of the Public Requesting Information (2016) 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Minnesota is actively working to enhance efforts to protect personally identifiable information. The current statute and policies are provided. Planned changes to cell size reporting are intended to meet or exceed expectations for protecting personally identifiable information (see Exhibit 2.6.6).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.6.5 MN Statute 13.32 Student Data • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Early Reports and Embargoed Final Assessment Results, pages 216–219 o Public and Parental Access for Review of Statewide Assessments Policy, pages 226–229 o Chapter 3: Responsible and Ethical Practices to Maintain Test Security and Test Score Integrity, pages 39–62 • 2.6.6 Planned Changes to Cell Size Reporting (2016) 	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
__x_ No additional evidence is required.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota guarantees validity in scores by implementing a coherent system. Ensuring the tests measure the content they are designed to measure and ensuring that interpretations made by users can be legitimately supported are of the utmost importance. Creating alignment between Minnesota’s assessment and academic content standards is a multi-faceted approach. Beginning with the test specifications and item development and ending with test construction and administration, there are several reviews described in Exhibits 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 (Chapter 2). The independent alignment reviews (see Exhibits 2.2.4, 2.2.5, and 2.2.6) provide confirmation of adherence to the test specifications (see Exhibits 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5). Adjustments and targeted item development have occurred since the alignment reviews. For Math and Reading MCA, the alignment review utilized a procedure that took into account that future administrations would be adaptive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test Construction (pages 14, 16, 30–33) • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 9: Validity, pages 142–151 o Chapter 2: Test Development Process, pages 28–42 o Chapter 6: Scaling, pages 105–123 o Chapter 7: Equating and Linking, pages 124–132 o Chapter 5: Performance Standards, pages 75–104 o Chapter 11: Quality-Control Procedures, pages 155, 157–158 • 2.2.4 MCA III Alignment Study, 	<p>MN has used an adequate process for the development of their standards, test specifications, and for item development.</p> <p>Issues: No alignment study for math grades 3-8.</p> <p>Would like to know the number of forms available on the equating.</p> <p>Alignment studies for math and ELA indicate that not all of the standards/benchmarks are represented in the item pools. Therefore, it seems questionable that the assessments cover the depth and breadth of the state’s standards.</p> <p>Alignment studies for science indicate that items contain standard/benchmark irrelevant materials/information that increase the DoK level of the items but not for the right reasons. Also, again not all the standards are represented in the item pool and many of the items were misaligned.</p> <p>Simulation information indicates that use data may be high for more than a few items and the pools need to be supplemented based on cognitive complexity (appropriate for the standard/benchmark) and difficulty. As a CAT assessment, the pools need to have depth in both cognitive complexity and benchmark coverage across difficulty levels.</p> <p>The Alternate Extended standards alignment study for math suggests an adequate linkage to the academic content standards except in regard to communication levels although the content of the tasks is appropriate for the population,</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Mathematics, Grade 11 (Summary Table, page 17)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2.5 MCA III Alignment Study, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (Summary Table, page 27) • 2.2.6 MCA III Alignment Study, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (Summary Table, page iii) • 2.1.3 MCA III Test Specifications, Mathematics, Grades 3–8 and 11 (pages 8–10 for blueprint) • 2.1.4 MCA III Test Specifications, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (pages 11–14 for blueprint) • 2.1.5 MCA III Test Specifications, Science, Grades 5, 8 and HS (pages 6–9 for blueprint) <p>AA-AAAS Alignment of alternate assessments and alternate academic content standards with Minnesota’s academic achievement standards are included, in addition to the evidence above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2.7 MTAS Alignment Study, Mathematics, Grade 11 (Summary Table, page v) • 2.2.8 MTAS Alignment Study, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (Summary Tables, pages v–ix) • 2.2.9 MTAS Alignment Study, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (Summary Tables, pages iii–vii) • 2.1.6 MTAS Test Specifications, Mathematics, Grade 11 (page 7 for blueprint) • 2.1.7 MTAS Test Specifications, Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 (pages 6–7 for blueprint) • 2.1.8 MTAS Test Specifications, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (page 7 for blueprint) <p>With the move to adaptive testing, ensuring validity remains important. The annual simulation reports are discussed with TAC and necessary adjustments are made to the algorithm to support the validity of the assessments. The simulations provide clear evidence and confirmation that test blueprints are being met, which demonstrates that Minnesota’s assessments are measuring the full depth and breadth of our</p>	<p>The Alternate Extended standards alignment study for ELA suggests a less than adequate alignment with the academic content standards and the content is questionable in regard to appropriateness for this population.</p> <p>The Alternate Extended standards alignment study for science indicates a partial alignment at grades 5 and HS but adequate alignment at grade 8. The appropriateness of the content for the population is questionable in the same grade levels.</p> <p>Does MN have a plan and timeline for addressing the recommendations?</p> <p>The alignment studies were well done.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>standards. Maintaining strong content validity while improving the measurement precision is a focus of the conversation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.19 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 • 2.1.21 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 	
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"> • Need a plan for addressing the identified item pool issues for both general and alternate assessments and all content areas (e.g., low alignment with benchmarks, misleading DOK, etc.) • Need alignment for grades 3-8 math. • Low alignment regarding benchmarks is especially concerning given MN is providing benchmark scores in the Benchmark Report Users Guide 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</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>Minnesota has investigated and confirmed alignment between the cognitive processes on the state’s assessment and academic content standards. Beginning with item development and ending with test construction, there are several reviews described in Exhibits 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. The independent alignment reviews (see Exhibits 2.2.4–2.2.6) provide confirmation of adherence to the test specifications (see Exhibits 2.1.3–2.1.5).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Page 16 highlights the importance of cognitive processes during the item development process o Pages 30–33 Test Form Construction Process • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 9: Validity, pages 142–151 o Chapter 2: Test Development Process, pages 28–42 o Chapter 6: Scaling, pages 105–123 o Chapter 7: Equating and Linking, pages 124–132 o Chapter 5: Performance Standards, pages 75–104 o Chapter 11: Quality-Control Procedures, pages 155, 157–158 • 2.2.4 MCA III Alignment Study, Mathematics, Grade 11 (Summary Table, page 17) 	<p>Mathematics Grade 11 assessments match the minimum DoK levels indicated in the test specifications.</p> <p>ELA assessments do not match the minimum DoK 1 levels for all the grades except grade 3.</p> <p>Science assessments DoK alignment was low for grades 8 and HS.</p> <p>MN has used an adequate process for the development of their standards, test specifications, and for item development.</p> <p>Issues: No alignment study for math grades 3-8.</p> <p>Would like to know the number of forms available on the equating.</p> <p>Alignment studies for math and ELA indicate that not all of the standards/benchmarks are represented in the item pools. Therefore, it seems questionable that the assessments cover the depth and breadth of the state’s standards.</p> <p>Alignment studies for science indicate that items contain standard/benchmark irrelevant materials/information that increase the DoK level of the items but not for the right reasons. Also, again not all the standards are represented in the item pool and many of the items were misaligned.</p> <p>Simulation information indicates that use data may be high for more than a few items and the pools need to be supplemented based on cognitive complexity (appropriate for the standard/benchmark) and difficulty. As a CAT assessment, the pools need to</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> • 2.2.5 MCA III Alignment Study, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (Summary Table, page 27) • 2.2.6 MCA III Alignment Study, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (Summary Table, page iii) • 2.1.3 MCA III Test Specifications, Mathematics, Grades 3–8 and 11 (page 8 for cognitive specifications) • 2.1.4 MCA III Test Specifications, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (pages 14 for cognitive specifications) • 2.1.5 MCA III Test Specifications, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (pages 45 for cognitive specifications) <p>AA-AAAS Alignment of alternate assessments and alternate academic content standards with State’s academic achievement standards are included, in addition to the evidence above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2.7 MTAS Alignment Study, Mathematics, Grade 11 (Summary Table, page v) • 2.2.8 MTAS Alignment Study, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (Summary Tables, pages v–ix) • 2.2.9 MTAS Alignment Study, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (Summary Tables, pages iii–vii) 	<p>have depth in both cognitive complexity and benchmark coverage across difficulty levels.</p> <p>The Alternate Extended standards alignment study for math suggests an adequate linkage to the academic content standards except in regard to communication levels although the content of the tasks is appropriate for the population,</p> <p>The Alternate Extended standards alignment study for ELA suggests a less than adequate alignment with the academic content standards and the content is questionable in regard to appropriateness for this population.</p> <p>The Alternate Extended standards alignment study for science indicates a partial alignment at grades 5 and HS but adequate alignment at grade 8. The appropriateness of the content for the population is questionable in the same grade levels.</p> <p>Does MN have a plan and timeline for addressing the recommendations?</p> <p>The alignment studies were well done.</p> <p>Evidence of how certain populations might be favored or not-favored on each of the different forms and on each of the TE item formats.</p>
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that MN has addressed the deficiencies identified in the alignment reports. • Alignment studies of grades 3-8 in mathematics. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Strong validity evidence is provided below. Documentation specific to scoring and reporting of sub-domain structures is included. Also included is the relationship among test items and components that support the construct upon which the score interpretations are based. Evidence supporting internal structure is described in the Technical Manual and comes from dimensionality analyses, measurement error for groups of students, and internal consistency (see Exhibit 2.1.2). The data supporting the internal structure is found in the Yearbook Tables (see Exhibit 2.4.6).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 9: Validity, pages 142–151 <input type="checkbox"/> Dimensionality analyses, page 147 o Chapter 8: Reliability, pages 133–149 <input type="checkbox"/> Internal consistency, page 134 <input type="checkbox"/> Measurement error for groups of students, pages 138 and 149 o Chapter 6: Scaling, pages 105–123 o Chapter 4: Reports, pages 64–74 • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mathematics MCA <input type="checkbox"/> Item Total Correlation, pages 24–33 <input type="checkbox"/> Subscore marginal reliability by student group, 34–76 <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Consistency Reports, 77–80 <input type="checkbox"/> Classification Accuracy Reports, 81–84 o Reading MCA <input type="checkbox"/> Item Total Correlation, pages 111–132 <input type="checkbox"/> Subscore marginal reliability by student group, 133–161 	<p>Confirmatory factor analysis for the scoring and reporting structures for all MCA and MTAS at all levels and sub-groups with large populations (e.g., gender, ethnicity, etc.).</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Consistency Reports, 162–165 <input type="checkbox"/> Classification Accuracy Reports, 166–169 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Science MCA <input type="checkbox"/> Item Total Correlation, pages 181–187 <input type="checkbox"/> Subscore marginal reliability by student group, 188–197 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Consistency Reports, 198–199 <input type="checkbox"/> Classification Accuracy Reports, 200–201 <p>AA-AAAS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mathematics MTAS, pages 241–270 o Reading MTAS, pages 294–320 o Science MTAS, pages 336–346 	
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a statistical method for determining the scoring and reporting structures for all MCA and MTAS at all levels and sub-groups with large populations (e.g., gender, ethnicity, etc.) such as a confirmatory factor analysis. At a minimum, an alternative would be to provide and interpret the correlations among the subscale scores of the test. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence that Minnesota has taken steps to address validity based on other variables that support score interpretation is provided below. During the standard setting activities for high school Mathematics and Reading MCA, The ACT college ready benchmark mappings were taken into consideration (see Exhibits 3.4.1 and 3.4.2). In 2014, MDE analysis using student linking found that the high school MCA meets score was a very good predictor of ACT performance (see Exhibit 3.4.3, page 6). Sources outside of MDE also confirm that the MCAs relate as expected with NAEP and college remediation rates (see Exhibits 3.4.4 and 3.4.5). The 2018 Getting Prepared Report will include the graduating class of 2015, which was the first cohort to take MCAs aligned to the current Academic Standards; the 2018 report will include two years of higher education enrollment by students in the 2015 graduating cohort. Beginning with spring 2016 reporting, Minnesota will provide an on-track for career and college readiness indicator for students grade 3. See Exhibit 3.4.7 for a description of the process that will be used to report that information to schools and parents beginning in spring 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.4.1 Standard Setting Technical Report, Mathematics, Grade 11 (2014) (pages 9 and 16–17) • 3.4.2 Standard Setting Technical Report, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (2013) (page 17) • 3.4.3 Work Group Handout 12.17.14 (page 6) • 3.4.4 2013 Mapping State Proficiency Standards Onto NAEP Scales (pages 8, 10, 14, and 16) • 3.4.5 Getting Prepared 2015 (page 33) • 3.4.6 CCR Prediction G3–8 December 2015 Final 	<p>Correlational studies on the MCA and MSAT scores with results from a different test taken at the same time.</p> <p>Most of the evidence provided is not relevant to validity based on relationships with other variables. This type of evidence is typically characterized by calculating correlations or other agreement indices between the test scores and a second set of data points, typically scores from a different test. The CCR prediction report included correlations and classification accuracy reading and mathematics between the HS test and the ACT and between the Grade 8 test and the PLAN (given in 10th grade). The same agreement indices were calculated at one-year intervals between forms of the test for consecutive grades (e.g., Grade 3 reading with Grade 4 reading one year later). A stronger design would include a different criterion variable and a much shorter time period, since a great deal of growth can occur over a year and systematically reduce agreement.</p> <p>Although the NAEP study was included, it is not specific to MN.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need evidence that calculates the correlations or other agreement indices between the test scores and a second set of data points, typically scores from a different test. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>The strong evidence to support Minnesota’s commitment to equity is below. The test reliability for Minnesota’s student population is described in the Technical Manual 2014–15 (see Exhibit 2.1.2). The Yearbook Tables 2014–2015 (see Exhibit 2.4.6) provide the most current administration’s results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 8: Reliability, pages 133–141 o Chapter 5: Performance Standards, pages 75–104 • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mathematics MCA score reliability by student group, pages 34–76 o Reading MCA score reliability by student group, pages 133–161 o Science MCA score reliability by student group, pages 188–197 o Mathematics MTAS score reliability by student group, pages 241–262 o Reading MTAS score reliability by student group, pages 294–315 o Science MTAS score reliability by student group, pages 336–344 <p>The Yearbook reports the conditional standard errors of scale scores in the raw and scale score distribution tables. The overall SEM for each test can be calculated with data provided in the Yearbooks. However, given the use of IRT for all Minnesota’s assessments, the conditional SEM (see Exhibit 2.1.2 pages 137–138) is the primary reporting measure of precision associated with each scale score.</p>	<p>All of the appropriate evidence was provided.</p> <p>Some of the coefficient alphas for the math MCA assessments were extremely low (below .7) across multiple grades (see grades 7 and 8).</p> <p>Need to correct or explain these low reliabilities. The tests need to be either revised or explained.</p> <p>The definition for marginal reliability in the technical manual (2014-2015 p. 135-136) does not match the data provided in your yearbook for math grade 7 and 8—see especially the total reliability vs. sub-score reliabilities.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (pages 133–141) • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mathematics MCA, pages 3–23 o Reading MCA, pages 89–110 o Science MCA, pages 174–180 o Mathematics MTAS, pages 225–232 o Reading MTAS, pages 278–285 o Science MTAS, pages 328–331 <p>Consistency and accuracy of estimates of cut scores and achievement levels based on assessment results are provided in the classification accuracy (see Exhibits 2.1.2 and 2.4.6).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 5: Performance Standards, pages 75–104 o Chapter 7: Equating and Linking, pages 124–132 • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mathematics MCA classification accuracy, pages 81–84 o Reading MCA classification accuracy, pages 166–169 o Science MCA classification accuracy, pages 200–201 o Mathematics MTAS classification accuracy, pages 271–275 o Reading MTAS classification accuracy, pages 321–325 o Science MTAS classification accuracy, pages 347–349 <p>Minnesota administers Mathematics MCA Grades 3–8 and 11 and Reading MCA Grades 3–8 and 10 using</p>	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>computer-adaptive tests. Before the administration, Minnesota ensures test forms have adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement, which comes primarily through simulations and algorithm adjustments. Thorough descriptions of simulations, adjustments made to the algorithm, and the final results are included in the simulation reports for math and reading assessments (see Exhibits 2.1.19 and 2.1.21).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.19 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 • 2.1.21 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 <p>After the administration, statistical analyses are conducted using the procedures detailed in the Technical Manual (see Exhibit 2.1.2), and the most current administration’s results are provided in the Yearbook Tables (see Exhibit 2.4.6). These analyses complete the two-step process to support score interpretation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (pages 125–126) • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 	
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The low reliability coefficients for the mathematics MCA need to be corrected or explained. If the reliability of the test is truly that low it should be revised or replaced. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota has procedures in place to ensure fair and accessible assessments for all students. The design and development steps are detailed in several documents provided below. MDE would like to highlight its contributing membership in IMS Global (Exhibit 4.2.2). IMS maintains the Accessible Portable Item Protocol (APIP), Question and Test Interoperability (QTI) standards, and the Personal Needs Profile (PNP) specification, which allows online test delivery engines to provide built-in accommodations to students based on need. Documentation listing participants from the prior year’s committee meetings (Exhibit 2.2.2) demonstrates our efforts and commitment to developing accessible and fair assessments. Minnesota’s emphasis on equity is also supported by the Bias and Data Review training materials (see Exhibits 2.1.15, 2.1.16, 2.1.17, and 2.1.18) and the annual review of accommodations (see Exhibits 4.2.1 and 4.2.4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (Chapter 2, pages 27–41) • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Standards-Based Accountability Assessments, pages 24–27 o Chapter 5: Participation of Students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and 504 Plans, pages 83–112 o Chapter 6: Participation of English Learners, pages 113–130 o Reports, pages 220 and 222–223 o Building a Test, pages 248–250 • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test 	<p>No discussion of the development of TE items with input from special populations. How were these reviewed and developed?</p> <p>How were the tools chosen and how was it determined that these tools were appropriate for all populations?</p> <p>It would be helpful to have DIF studies to determine if the tests were fair to all populations.</p> <p>Need to disaggregate reliability by subgroup status (e.g., students with disabilities and students without disabilities, etc.).</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Bias and Sensitivity and Universal Design, pages 17–20 • 2.2.1 MDE Vendor Guide to Advisory Panels (pages 5–7, 9–11, 22–26, 29–30) • 2.2.2 2014–2015 Advisory Panels Attendee Details • 2.1.15 MCA Math and Reading Bias Review Training • 2.1.16 MCA Science Bias Review Training • 4.2.1 Statewide Testing Advisory Groups • 4.2.2 IMS Global 2014 Annual Report (Minnesota’s membership is recorded on page 16) • 4.2.3 2015–2016 MN Manual of Accommodations • 4.2.4 Accommodations Advisory Review Panel (AARP) meeting minutes_6.17.2014 <p>The analysis for all student groups is detailed in several documents (see Exhibits 2.1.2 and 2.4.6), including paper form accommodations. Training and analyses that MDE conducts prior to operational administrations, demonstrated by the data review cards (see Exhibit 2.2.3) and the training for data review committees (see Exhibits 2.1.17 and 2.1.18), illustrate that fairness and accessibility are part of all analyses in the testing process. In addition, the accessibility features in the online test delivery system (see Exhibits 2.3.27 and 2.3.28) demonstrate Minnesota’s commitment to design assessments that are accessible to all. The features available to all students include text to speech, contrast, and magnifier, and additional features available to EL students include accommodated text to speech.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (Chapter 8, pages 133–141) • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mathematics MCA, pages 34–76 o Reading MCA, pages 133–161 o Science MCA, pages 188–197 o Mathematics MTAS, pages 241–262 o Reading MTAS, pages 294–315 o Science MTAS, pages 336–344 • 2.2.3 Data Review Card Samples • 2.1.17 MCA Math and Reading Data Review Training, Slides 14 and 17 • 2.1.18 MCA Science Data Review Training, Slides 14 and 17 • 2.3.27 TestNav 8 Overview PPT • 2.3.28 TN8Online Tools and Accommodations 	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the development process used for the TE items with input from special populations. • Description of the process used to select tools and how was it determined that these tools were appropriate for all populations. • DIF studies to determine if the tests were fair to all populations or at a minimum the reliabilities by subgroup, mean scores by subgroup, and explanations for differences. • Need to disaggregate reliability by subgroup status (e.g., students with disabilities and students without disabilities, etc.). 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota provides adequately precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum. Implementing Math and Reading MCA adaptive tests underscores these efforts. For example, it is estimated that the measurement precision of Reading MCA adaptive forms in spring 2016 is equal to or better than previously administered linear tests, despite having 8–9 fewer items (approximately equal to a reduction of one passage set). The 2014–2015 Technical Manual (see Exhibit 2.1.2) and Yearbook Tables (see Exhibit 2.4.6) detail the analysis conducted for the spring 2015 administration. The Math and Reading simulation reports (see Exhibits 2.1.19 and 2.1.21) provide information on the simulated performance across the continuum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Page 33 o Chapter 7, page 126 o Chapter 8, pages 133–141 • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 • 2.1.19 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 • 2.1.21 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 	<p>Data is provided (conditional SEMs) but said data does not adequately confirm that the assessments provide precise estimates of student performance across the full performance continuum. It would be helpful to have some discussion about the SEMs because some of these are large (over 5, 6 and some are double figures).</p> <p>Correcting the reliability issues will possibly resolve these large conditional SEMs (see grade 7 and grade 8 math MCA assessments).</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>__x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation of the statistics included in the Yearbook (beyond the definitions in the technical manual). 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</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>Minnesota’s standardized scoring procedures and protocols are primarily documented in the Technical Manual and Yearbook (see Exhibits 2.1.2 and 2.4.6). The quality control process for scoring all test questions, including technology enhanced, is described in the Spring 2016 MCA Scoring Specifications (see Exhibit 4.4.1) and the Production Validation Process (see Exhibit 4.4.3). Additional procedures for scoring the alternate assessment are provided in the MTAS Field Auditor Manual (see Exhibit 2.4.4). To verify all scoring is correct, Minnesota staff review the aggregate student responses from field test analysis and during adjudication (see Exhibit 4.4.3), and Pearson staff conduct an independent key check for all questions prior to the administration (see Exhibits 4.4.5 and 4.4.6).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reports, Chapter 4, pages 64–74 o Scaling, Chapter 6, pages 105–123 o Equating and Linking, Chapter 7, pages 124–132 o Reliability, Chapter 8, pages 133–141 • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Scale Score—Percentile Rank Tables Mathematics MCA-III 2015 (pages 4–23) o State Means and Standard Deviations for 	<p>MN has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Math MCA-III 2015 (pages 35–76)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Scale Score—Percentile Rank Tables <p>Reading MCA-III 2015 (pages 90–110)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o State Means and Standard Deviations for Reading MCA-III 2015 (pages 134–161) o Raw to Scale Score Tables Science MCA-III 2015 (pages 175–180) o State Means and Standard Deviations for Science MCA-III 2015 (pages 189–197) o Raw to Scale Score Tables Mathematics, Reading, and Science MTAS 2015 (pages 226–232; 279–285; 329–331) • 4.4.1 Spring 2015 MCA Scoring and Equating Specifications • 4.4.2 Pearson MN Publishing and Scoring Diagram • 4.4.3 2016 Production Validation Process • 4.4.4 MCA RMS Spring 16 Adjudication Schedule • 4.4.5 MCA RM Spring 16 Materials Development Schedule o Grade 3 Math Key Check, lines 65/3173–73/3181 o Grade 3 Reading Key Check, lines 129/3237–137/3245 o Grade 4 Math Key Check, lines 193/3301–201/3309 o Grade 4 Reading Key Check, lines 263/3371–265/3373 o Grade 5 Math Key Check, lines 321/3429–329/3437 o Grade 5 Reading Key Check, lines 385/3493–393/3501 o Grade 6 Math Key Check, lines 449/3557–457/3565 o Grade 6 Reading Key Check, lines 513/3621–521/3629 o Grade 7 Math Key Check, lines 577/3685–585/3693 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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 Grade 7 Reading Key Check, lines 641/3749–649/3757 o Grade 8 Math Key Check, lines 705/3813–712/3820 o Grade 8 Reading Key Check, lines 768/3876–776/3884 o Grade 10 Reading Key Check, lines 896/4004–904/4012 o Grade 11 Math Key Check, lines 832/3940–840/3948 • 4.4.6 MCA Spring 16 Materials Development Schedule o Grade 5 Key Check, lines 45/834–53/842 o Grade 8 Key Check, lines 92/881–100/889 o HS Key Check, lines 139/928–147/936 • 2.4.4 MTAS Field Auditor Procedures Manual 	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota administers adaptive forms for Math and Reading MCA annually. The Science MCA and Math, Reading, and Science MTAS have multiple forms across years. There are also forms across years for paper accommodations. The equating procedures followed to verify that all forms represent academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations are detailed in the documents below. The Alignment Studies (see Exhibits 2.2.4–2.2.9), Test Specifications (see Exhibits 2.1.3–2.1.8), Technical Manual (see Exhibit 2.1.2), Yearbook Tables (see Exhibit 2.4.6), and test construction guidelines (see Exhibit 2.1.1) illustrate test construction processes to support that all forms adequately represent the content standards. Furthermore, the scaling, equating, and linking chapters and data from these sources illustrate analysis methods to provide evidence of comparability of forms within and across school years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Test Development, Chapter 2, page 42 o Scaling, Chapter 6, pages 105–123 o Equating and Linking, Chapter 7, pages 124–132 o Reliability, Chapter 8, pages 133–141 o Reports, Chapter 4, pages 64–74 • 4.5.1 Technical Manual for Minnesota Title I and Title III Assessments 2013–2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Scaling, Chapter 6, pages 119–137 o Equating and Linking, Chapter 7, pages 138–146 o Reliability, Chapter 8, pages 147–155 o Reports, Chapter 4, pages 72–81 	<p>It would be good to have alternate form comparability studies to make sure the forms not only adequately represent the content standards but also yield consistent score interpretations.</p> <p>Although the state mentioned across grade comparability studies were conducted the data from these studies were not provided in their documentation.</p> <p>The procedure for pre and post equating is described but the results of the equating is not discussed.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Scale Score—Percentile Rank Tables Mathematics MCA-III 2015 (pages 4–23) o State Means and Standard Deviations for Math MCA-III 2015 (pages 35–76) o Scale Score—Percentile Rank Tables Reading MCA-III 2015 (pages 90–110) o State Means and Standard Deviations for Reading MCA-III 2015 (pages 134–161) o Raw to Scale Score Tables Science MCA-III 2015 (pages 175–180) o State Means and Standard Deviations for Science MCA-III 2015 (pages 189–197) • 4.5.2 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota Title I and Title III Assessments 2013–2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Scale Score—Percentile Rank Tables Mathematics MCA-III 2015 (pages 4–24) o State Means and Standard Deviations for Math MCA-III 2015 (pages 33–75) o Scale Score—Percentile Rank Tables Reading MCA-III 2015 (pages 88–109) o State Means and Standard Deviations for Reading MCA-III 2015 (pages 132–160) o Raw to Scale Score Tables Science MCA-III 2015 (pages 171–177) o State Means and Standard Deviations for Science MCA-III 2015 (pages 185–194) • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.19 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 • 2.1.21 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 • 4.5.3 2016 MCA III Science Test Construction Specifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.5.4 2016 Test Construction Graphs for Science Grade 5 • 4.5.5 2016 Test Construction Graphs for 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Science Grade 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.5.6 2016 Test Construction Graphs for Science High School • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test Construction • 2.2.4 MCA III Alignment Study, Mathematics, Grade 11 • 2.2.5 MCA III Alignment Study, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 • 2.2.6 MCA III Alignment Study, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS • 2.2.7 MTAS Alignment Study, Mathematics, Grade 11 • 2.2.8 MTAS Alignment Study, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 • 2.2.9 MTAS Alignment Study, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS • 2.1.3 MCA III Test Specifications, Mathematics, Grades 3–8 and 11 • 2.1.4 MCA III Test Specifications, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 • 2.1.5 MCA III Test Specifications, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS • 2.1.6 MTAS Test Specifications, Mathematics, Grade 11 • 2.1.7 MTAS Test Specifications, Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 • 2.1.8 MTAS Test Specifications, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS 	
Section 4.5 Summary Statement		
___x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on the follow up dealing with mode effect between paper and on-line forms. • Report on the results of the equating is not discussed. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Evidence that the state constructed multiple versions of its assessments in a way that supports comparability in score interpretations is found in the test construction guidelines (see Exhibit 2.1.1) and simulation reports for the computer adaptive assessments (see Exhibits 2.1.19 and 2.1.21). Evidence of the comparability of the meaning and interpretations of results is found in the Technical Manual (see Exhibit 2.1.2), Procedures Manual (see Exhibit 1.3.1), and mode comparability studies (see Exhibits 4.6.1 and 4.6.2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test Construction • 2.1.19 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 • 2.1.21 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 CAT Simulation Report for Spring 2016 • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 8, Reliability, pages 133–141 • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 (Chapter 10) • 4.6.1 MCA III Math Grade 11 Mode Comparability (2014) • 4.6.2 MCA III Reading Mode Comparability (2013) • 4.6.3 WAN & HENLY 2012 Item Formats • 4.6.4 Minnesota Tablet Usability Study Report (2013) • 4.6.5 Device Comparability of Tablets and Computers • 4.6.6 Question Types - Tablet Research 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.6 Summary Statement		
__x_ No additional evidence is required or (see 4.5).		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota regularly monitors the assessment system and participates in efforts for continuous improvements as needed for all assessments. The quality control procedures that Minnesota follows are documented (see Exhibit 2.3.31). Several committees meet regularly and follow a standard process to monitor, maintain, and improve the assessment system (see Exhibit 4.2.1). As part of the technical analyses to feed into continuous monitoring, Minnesota has always conducted pool analyses prior to finalizing the next year’s item development plan. This year Minnesota enhanced the math and reading pool analysis approach by closely examining results of the adaptive simulations (see Exhibits 2.1.22 and 2.1.20). Part of the technical analysis and ongoing maintenance process is eliciting user feedback to implement improvements. During the technical difficulties experienced in 2015, Minnesota held conference calls with stakeholders. That feedback in addition to themes observed during Minnesota’s review of the call center informed the improvements (see Exhibits 2.3.29). As part of Minnesota’s process of continuous improvement, Minnesota revises materials and training based on user feedback. Future revisions will be based on focus group feedback to inform materials development for 2017 (see Exhibit 4.7.1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.3.31 Administration Issues Log and Testing Issues Communication Procedure • 4.2.1 Statewide Testing Advisory Groups • 2.1.20 MCA III Math Grades 3–8 and 11 Pool Analysis Report.Nov2015 • 2.1.22 MCA III Reading Grades 3–8 and 10 Pool Analysis Report.Nov2015 	<p>The state has requested appropriate analyses and studies to monitor the entire assessment system. However, there is no evidence that the state has made changes to improve these assessments based on these studies and analyses.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> • 2.3.29 Legislative Report on MCA Contractor Performance (pages 8–12 provide detailed technical changes for future online administrations) • 4.7.1 DAC Focus Group Presentation_3.21.16 	
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
__x_ No additional evidence is required.		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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
<p>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; 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS</p> <p>The procedures Minnesota follows to include all students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system are described in the Procedures Manual (see Exhibit 1.3.1, Chapter 5). The procedures explicitly describe guidance for making assessment decisions based on a student’s Individual Educational Plan (IEP). The differences between Minnesota’s assessments are explained in the Procedures Manual (see Exhibit 1.3.1, Chapter 2). The 2015 Participation for Peer Review (see Exhibit 1.5.1) offers actual data to support Minnesota’s dedication to including students with disabilities in state assessments. Assessment decisions, including accommodations, are to be based on IEPs. To help the IEP team create the most appropriate and high-quality IEP, Minnesota created an online training course (see Exhibit 1.4.5). Eligibility requirements for the alternate academic achievement standards, which includes any from the disability categories listed in the IDEA, are also provided (see Exhibit 1.3.1, Chapter 5). Guidelines for determining whether students should be assessed on the general assessment (with or without accommodations) or an alternate assessment are provided (see Exhibit 1.3.1, pages 83–112). Minnesota’s Manual of Accommodations offers guidelines for selecting, administering, and evaluating the use of accommodations for students with disabilities (see Exhibit 4.2.3). Eligibility requirements for the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) are described along with a graphical decision-making process (see Exhibit 1.4.4). Minnesota created guidelines for how districts can apply for waivers for students taking the MTAS (see Exhibit 1.4.6).</p>	<p>MN provides information about the differences between assessments (M.CA and MTAS) and provides state policies on student’s education resulting from taking these assessments.</p> <p>MN provides guidelines on how to assess students with disabilities based on their IEP and how to determine accommodations.</p> <p>Provides information on accessibility tools available for students taking each assessment.</p> <p>MN provides for the informing of parents about the test, results, and how the results should be used.</p> <p>Did not find information about promoting access to the grade level content standards based instructional curriculum for all students with disabilities.</p> <p>What seems to be missing is directions on how to select the appropriate accommodations/accessibility for each student.</p> <p>Did not address informing parents of the possible consequences of taking the AA.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • 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>Minnesota provides information on accessibility tools and features available through the assessments in various documents (see Exhibits 2.3.13, 2.3.28, and 1.3.1, Chapter 5). MDE works to ensure 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. Parents are also informed of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from District or State policy (See Exhibit 5.1.1). The Statewide Testing Division produces the parent fact sheet below. Additionally, divisions across the agency work with school staff to understand, and then communicate with parents, the assessments and accommodations available.</p> <p>Minnesota law has procedures in place to ensure that implementing alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum (See Exhibits 1.1.7, 1.4.2, 1.4.1, and 1.1.8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 5: Participation of Students with IEPs and 504 Plans (pages 87–106)—assessment options for students with disabilities o Chapter 5: Participation of Students with IEPs and 504 Plans (pages 106–110)—Alternate Assessment Eligibility Information o Chapter 2: Minnesota Assessments (pages 24–28)—overview of assessments • 1.5.1 2015 Participation for Peer Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Rows 26, 27, and 28 • 1.4.5 Standards-Based IEP Syllabus • 4.2.3 2015–2016 MN Manual of Accommodations • 1.4.4 Eligibility Requirements for MTAS 	

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —</p> <p>Minnesota has procedures in place to ensure inclusion of all English learners (see Exhibit 1.3.1). Procedures for determining whether an English learner should have testing accommodations that are in the Technical Manual (see Exhibit 2.1.2). The State’s Manual of Accommodations describes accessibility tools and the available accommodations for English learners (see Exhibit 4.2.3). Guidance for selecting appropriate accommodations for English learners is provided (see Exhibits 2.3.28 and 1.3.1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All public school students are to participate in assessment system, page 24 o English Learners Who Are New to U.S. Schools (New to Country) test code, pages 116–117 o Determining Appropriate Supports and Accommodations for English Learners, pages 120–130 o Supports and features available to all students, pages 84–87 • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Accommodations, pages 49–63 o Chapter 5: Performance Standards, pages 75–104 o Chapter 6: Scaling, pages 105–123 • 4.2.3 2015–2016 MN Manual of Accommodations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.3.28 TN8Online Tools and Accommodations 	<p>MN does not provide clear information about the approved assessment accommodations, accessibility tools, and features specific to the EL populations.</p> <p>MN does provide guidance on the selection of appropriate assessment accommodations for their Language Proficiency Assessment but not for their general education (MCA) assessment specific for EL students based on the language proficiency of the student. As the language proficiency of the EL will change over time, the testing accommodations used will also change over time.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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">• Directions on how to select the appropriate accommodations/accessibility for each student.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>Minnesota makes appropriate accommodations available for students with disabilities under IDEA and/or covered by Section 504 (see Exhibits 1.4.4, 1.3.1, 4.2.3, and 1.4.6). Minnesota works diligently to provide appropriate accommodations for English learners, and provides adaptive tests with embedded accommodations (e.g., text-to-speech and enlarged text) in addition to the paper accommodations. The Yearbook Tables (see Exhibit 2.4.6) demonstrate the available accommodations being used by a reasonable portion of the population. The documentation that shows accommodations are appropriate for each student’s needs, do not alter construct being assessed, and allow for meaningful interpretations of results and comparability of scores, is provided (see Exhibits 2.1.1, 1.3.1 Chapter 6, 4.2.3, and 2.3.28). Minnesota implements processes to individually review and allow for exceptional requests (see Exhibits 4.2.1 and 4.2.4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.4.4 Eligibility Requirements for MTAS • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 5: Participation of Students with IEPs and 504 Plans, pages 83–112 o Chapter 6: Selecting accommodations for MCA for ELs, pages 120–130 • 4.2.3 2015–2016 MN Manual of Accommodations • 1.4.6 Alternate Assessment Waivers Background • 2.1.1 MDE Guidelines for Test Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Item Development; General Considerations, pages 16–29 	<p>MN has accommodations available for all EL and SPED students.</p> <p>It is not clear if the accommodations were effective. Disaggregate reliability data to find out if students receiving accommodations and students without accommodations perform differently on the assessment.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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 Chapter 12, Guidelines for Text to Speech, pages 251–281 • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 o MCA Accommodation Codes, page 204 o MCA Mathematics Frequency-Distribution Reports for Students in Special Education, pages 205–208 o MCA Reading Frequency-Distribution Reports for Students in Special Education, pages 213–216 o MCA Science Frequency-Distribution Reports for Students in Special Education, pages 221–222 o MCA Mathematics Frequency-Distribution Reports for English Learners, pages 209–212 o MCA Reading Frequency-Distribution Reports for English Learners, pages 217–220 o MCA Science Frequency-Distribution Reports for Students in Special Education, pages 223–224 • 4.2.3 2015–2016 MN Manual of Accommodations • 2.3.28 TN8Online Tools and Accommodations • 4.2.1 Statewide Testing Advisory Groups • 4.2.4 Accommodations Advisory Review Panel (AARP) meeting minutes_6.17.2014 	
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disaggregate reliability data to find out if students receiving accommodations and students without accommodations perform differently on the assessment. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p>Minnesota monitors test administrations to ensure appropriate assessments are provided for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners (See Exhibits 2.4.4, 1.3.1, and 2.4.6). Site monitoring findings are included (see Exhibit 2.4.1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.4.4 MTAS Field Auditor Procedures Manual • 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Chapter 3: General Principals of Professionally Responsible Practice, pages 40–43 o Chapter 3: Monitoring and Audits, pages 58–61 o Chapter 4: Roles and Responsibilities for Testing, pages 63–82 o Chapter 5: Participation of Students with IEPs and 504 Plans, pages 83–112 o Chapter 6: Participation of English Learners, pages 113–130 o Appendix B: Minnesota Assessments Monitoring Checklist, page 260 (#7) • 2.4.6 Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 (pages 366–372) 	<p>MN monitors test administrations.</p> <p>MCA should have a test monitor field manual.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota formally adopted academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards at required grades (see Exhibits 3.4.1, 3.4.2, and 6.1.1–6.1.12). Minnesota applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students based on the enrolled grade (see Exhibit 1.4.1). Standards include four levels of achievement, descriptions of competencies associated with each achievement level, and scores that differentiate among the achievement levels (see Exhibits 6.1.11, 6.1.12, and 2.1.2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.4.1 Standard Setting Technical Report, Mathematics, Grade 11 (2014) • 3.4.2 Standard Setting Technical Report, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (2013) • 6.1.1 Standard Setting Technical Report, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (2012) • 6.1.2 Commissioner Approval of Cuts Math, Grade 11 (2014) • 6.1.3 Commissioner Approval of Cuts Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (2013) • 6.1.4 Commissioner Approval of Cuts Science, MCA Grades 8 and HS, and MTAS 5, 8, and HS (2012) • 6.1.5 Commissioner Approval of Cuts Science, MCA Grade 5 (2012) • 6.1.6 ALD Review Report, Mathematics, Grade 11 • 6.1.7 ALD Review Report, MCA III Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (2013) • 6.1.8 ALD Review Report, MTAS Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (2013) • 6.1.9 ALD Review Report, MCA III Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (2012) 	<p>MN has adopted academic achievement standards. MN has appropriate achievement levels (4 levels total with 2 for high performers). MN conducted standard settings to set the performance levels.</p> <p>Need documents for MCA and MTAS Math 3-8.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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"> • 6.1.10 ALD Review Report, MTAS Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (2012) • 6.1.11 MCA Achievement Level Descriptors • 6.1.12 MTAS Achievement Level Descriptors • 1.4.1 MN Statute 120B.30 Statewide Testing and Reporting System • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reports, Chapter 4, pages 64–74, especially Table 4.1 	
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents for MCA and MTAS math grades 3-8. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota used a technically sound method and process for setting achievement standards. That process involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable (see Exhibits 6.1.11, 6.1.12, 3.4.1, 6.1.2, 3.4.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.1, 6.1.4, and 6.1.5). Minnesota’s TAC reviews and assists in the development of standard setting processes. Additionally, MDE’s process included individual TAC members observing the standard setting process; the observers confirmed the established processes were implemented faithfully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.1.11 MCA Achievement Level Descriptors • 6.1.12 MTAS Achievement Level Descriptors • 3.4.1 Standard Setting Technical Report, Mathematics, Grade 11 (2014) (pages 5–8; C-1–C-227) • 6.1.2 Commissioner Approval of Cuts Math, Grade 11 (2014) • 3.4.2 Standard Setting Technical Report, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (2013) (pages 6–9; C-1–C-305) • 6.1.3 Commissioner Approval of Cuts Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (2013) • 6.1.1 Standard Setting Technical Report, Science, Grades 5, 8, and HS (2012) (pages 4–6; B-1–B-16) • 6.1.4 Commissioner Approval of Cuts Science MCA, Grades 8 and HS, and MTAS 5, 8, and HS (2014) • 6.1.5 Commissioner Approval of Cuts Science MCA, Grade 5 (2012) 	<p>MN used the bookmark method for setting their achievement standards for the MCAS and MTAS.</p> <p>Evidence for math 3-8 was not present.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Setting report for math 3-8 and commissioner approval of cuts for these grades (MCA and MTAS). 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota begins development of the achievement level descriptors. There are multiple reviews of the achievement level descriptors as they are being developed to ensure alignment. Minnesota’s achievement standards are written to Minnesota’s academic content standards (see Exhibit 6.1.11 and 2.1.2). Minnesota’s academic content standards articulate the skills needed to be successful after high school (see Exhibit 1.1.2). Additional steps were taken during the high school math and reading MCA standard setting activities to ensure the meets (proficient) achievement level/cut was aligned with indicators of post-secondary readiness available to the state (see Exhibits 3.4.1 and 3.4.2). Alternate academic achievement standards aligned to alternate content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible (see Exhibit 6.1.12).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.1.11 MCA Achievement Level Descriptors • 2.1.2 Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Test Development, Chapter 2, pages 27–41 o Performance Standards, Chapter 5, pages 104 • 1.1.2 Letter from IHE • 3.4.1 Standard Setting Technical Report, Mathematics, Grade 11 (2014) (pages 9, 16–17, and P2–P10) • 3.4.2 Standard Setting Technical Report, Reading, Grades 3–8 and 10 (2013) (pages 17 and N1–N40). • 6.1.12 MTAS Achievement Level Descriptors 	<p>MN used an industry standard process for setting their general education and alternate achievement standards.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Setting report for mathematics 3-8 (MCA and MTAS). • IHE letters for reading and science. 		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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 	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p>Minnesota reports its assessment results in ways that support defensible interpretations and uses of results for students, parents, and educators (see Exhibits 6.4.1 and 6.4.2). Student achievement at each proficiency level and percentage not tested for all students and reported subgroups is provided (see Exhibits 6.4.1, and 6.4.3). Itemized score analyses with interpretive guides are provided to the public and schools (see Exhibits 6.4.1, and 6.4.3). Additional analysis and systems are provided to district staff (see Exhibits 6.4.4–6.4.11). Individual interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic student reports are provided in Minnesota.</p> <p>In 2015 MDE redesigned student reports (see Exhibit 6.4.2). The redesign efforts spanned several months and included parent feedback from across the state (See Exhibit 6.4.12). The new report design provides valid and reliable student achievement information; grade-level academic achievement standards including performance-level descriptors; and interpretation and recommendations for specific academic needs. The process and timeline for delivering individual student reports is detailed in the Procedures Manual (See Exhibit 1.3.1) and more detailed communication closer to reporting (See Exhibit 6.4.13).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.4.1 Interpretive Guide for Minnesota Assessment Reports 2014–2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ pages 14, 17 ○ pages 19–33 • 6.4.2 Student Report Mock-ups • 6.4.3 Screen Shot from MDE Data Center by proficiency 	<p>Not sure if results are available in alternate formats.</p> <p>Benchmark level scores should be removed from reports and should not be reported until evidence of the reliability scores at this level, and the validity of ensuing inferences, is available. Given the small number of items and low level of alignment at the benchmark level (as indicated in the HumRRo Reports), it is unlikely that such evidence will support reporting or interpretation at this level.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>that parents can understand;</p> <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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.4.4 MDE Report Card Spreadsheets Sample 6.4.5 2014–2015 Assessment Secure Reports User Guide 6.4.6 2014–2015 District and School Student Results (DSR and SSR) File Information 6.4.7 2015 Mathematics Benchmark Reports User Guide 6.4.8 2015 Reading Benchmark Reports User Guide 6.4.9 2015 Science Benchmark Reports User Guide 6.4.10 Pearson On-Demand Reports Quick Guide (2015) 6.4.11 Pearson Longitudinal Reports User Guides (2015) 6.4.12 2016 Individual Student Report (ISR) Redesign Process 1.3.1 Procedures Manual for Minnesota Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important Dates, page 7 Process, page 221 6.4.13 2015 Test Results Key Dates and Deliverables 6.4.14 Assessment Update 5-20-2015 (page 6, providing 2015 Key Dates and Deliverables for Test Results) 	
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input type="checkbox"/>_x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove benchmark scores from reports. Indicate other forms of reports that are available (e.g., Spanish version, braille version). 		