



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

March 5, 2018

Dear Commissioner Cassellius:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in August 2017 and which was a follow up to a review that occurred in 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 children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

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

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.

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (MCA III). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**
- Reading/ language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (MCA III). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**
- Science assessments in grade bands 3-5 and 6-8 (MCA III). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**
- Science assessments in high school (MCA III). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**
- Science AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8 and high school (MTAS). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**

The assessments that **substantially meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB**, mean that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that MDE may be able to provide this additional information within one year. The specific list of items required for MDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State’s Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, the Department is continuing to place 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 provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The MDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), will apply to State assessments. Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the MCA III and MTAS assessments substantially meet most of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff carefully reviewed MDE evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the MDE administration of the MTAS assessments need to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3 along with the other evidence needed from the August 2017 peer review.

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary
of the Office of 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 as a result of 2017 review
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the reading/language arts (R/LA) and science general assessments (MCA III):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that MDE has improved DOK proportionality within R/LA test events and science forms for all tested grades.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the R/LA and science general:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above (improved benchmark coverage and DOK proportions).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the MCA III general tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that DOK consistency is improved in grades 5-8 mathematics items. • In grades 3-8 R/LA and grades 5 and 8 science, evidence that the State has addressed the results of the analysis indicating weak alignment in DOK. • See evidence specified in element 2.1 above (improved benchmark coverage and DOK proportions). <p>For the R/LA and science alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent evidence that supports the alignment of the new test forms with the test blueprint and content standards.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 3.1 above (regarding 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):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence specified in element 3.1 above (independent evidence that supports the alignment).
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the interpretative guidelines used to evaluate that supports the internal structure of each test and sub-domain scores for each test. <p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science AA-AAAS for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the interpretative guidelines used to evaluate that supports the internal structure of each test and sub-

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed as a result of 2017 review
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>domain scores for each test.</p> <p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science AA-AAAS for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that examines the moderate correlations of MTAS reading scores with LCI reading and the moderate correlations of MTAS mathematics with LCI mathematics; particularly compared to the strong correlation between MTAS reading and MTAS mathematics ($r = .78$).
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the completed differential item functioning (DIF) analyses referred to in the State submission (i.e., the DIF studies' results), including the criteria used to flag items, the percentage of flagged items, and the steps taken to address flagged items.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the interpretive criteria used to support the claim that the reported conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM) for the tests demonstrates adequately precise measurement.
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the results of the equating procedures used to establish that MCA III test forms yield consistent scores.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For the entire assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of guidance on how to select the appropriate accommodations and accessibility features for children with disabilities. <p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science AA-AAAS for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS):</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):</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):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of empirical analysis to evaluate test accommodations provided (e.g., mean score summaries and reliability estimates by sub-groups and by accommodated/non-accommodated status, where practicable).

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed as a result of 2017 review
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)</p>	<p>For the R/LA, mathematics and science AA-AAAS for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the MTAS alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p>	<p>For all general tests (MCAS III) and AA-AAAS (MTAS) submitted in this peer review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that test reports are available in in a native language that parents can understand, to the extent practicable.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes of Minnesota Resubmission



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Contents—items below reflect critical elements that require additional submission of evidence from 2016 peer review)

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards.....	3
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	4
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.2 – Item Development	7
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY	10
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	10
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	13
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	16
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	18
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	20
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	22
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms.....	23
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	24
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities.....	24
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	26
5.3 – Accommodations	28
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING	30
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	30
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	32
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards.....	34
6.4 – Reporting	36

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>The development of Minnesota’s English Language Arts Content Standards involved broad stakeholder input. The process used to revise the standards included gathering input from ELA experts in Minnesota and ELA consultants with national expertise, building the standards based on current research and policy about ELA content, gathering input from stakeholders (e.g., business community, teachers, the public, postsecondary) throughout the process, and comparing the standards to those in other states (see Exhibit 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1_ELA SONAR Signed and Final <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Minnesota’s History with Standards-based Initiatives and English Language Arts Legislation, pages 7-8 ○ Role of the Common Core State Standards in the ELA Revision Process, page 13 ○ The English Language Arts Standards Revision Process, pages 13-14 ○ Obtaining Feedback on the Draft ELA Standards, pages 14-15 <p>ELA Standards Committee Roster, Appendix A, pages 40-41</p>	<p>Appendix A-List of committee members was presented but no sign-in sheets/dated agendas.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <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. 		
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>To demonstrate improved benchmark coverage for MCA-III Mathematics Grade 11, the pool analysis report (see Exhibit 2) recommends Minnesota develop the content detailed in the item development plan (see Exhibit 3). Consistent with the recommendation on page 36 of Exhibit 2, Minnesota has ordered several items for benchmark 9.4.2.2. The item pool analysis report also contains graphs comparing the pool to the test blueprint proportions by strand and by standard. Additionally, the table on page 87 of Exhibit 4 shows that all adaptive Grade 11 MCA tests had 100% benchmark coverage from the Test Specifications (see Exhibit 4). These documents demonstrate thorough coverage for the grade 11 math assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2_Spring 2017 MCA-III Math Grades 3-8 and 11 Pool Analysis Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grade 11 recommendation, page 36 • 3_MCA Math G11 Item Development Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Benchmark 9.4.2.2, Line 72 • 4_ Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Math Blueprint Summary Report, page 87 <p>To demonstrate improved benchmark coverage and DOK proportionality for MCA-III Reading Grades 3-8 and 10, Minnesota continues to monitor and improve our coverage of benchmarks as well as DOK proportionality. This is evidenced by the graphs in the</p>	<p>Peers have concerns about DOK proportionality in reading and science. What was it like before and why are the new distributions better? Peers request for each grade and content area provide the percentage of test events or forms meeting DOK targets as defined in your test specifications. We need two points of comparison for each subject to evaluate overall improvement, for example:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Percent of Test Events Meeting DOK Targets</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Math</th> <th>2014-2015</th> <th>2015-2016</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade 5</td> <td>92%</td> <td>96%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 6</td> <td>80%</td> <td>87%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>State has not presented evidence that it is assessing the full range of its ELA content standards, specifically to include writing, speaking, and listening.</p>	Math	2014-2015	2015-2016	Grade 5	92%	96%	Grade 6	80%	87%
Math	2014-2015	2015-2016									
Grade 5	92%	96%									
Grade 6	80%	87%									

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>2017 Reading Testlet Construction Results document (Exhibit 5). In addition, the Future Directions for Development document addresses specific item and passage development plans to further improve the MCA Reading pool by adding text sets (Exhibit 6), and the item development order (Exhibit 7) implements the recommendations. Additionally, the table on page 158 of the Yearbook shows that all adaptive Reading MCA tests had 100% benchmark coverage from the Test Specifications (see Exhibit 4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5_2017 Reading Testlet Construction Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Predicted Percent Frequency Distributions for DOK, Appendix E, pages 58-68 ○ Predicted Percent Frequency Distributions for Skill Domain, Appendix F, pages 69-79 ○ Predicted Percent Frequency Distributions for Content Standard, Appendix G, pages 80-105 • 6_MCA-III Reading Grades 3-8 and 10 Future Directions for Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Future Directions for the Development of Text Sets, pages 11-13 • 7_MCA-III Reading Grade 10 Item Development Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Text sets are exclusively informational or mixed (one literary and one informational passage) ○ Demonstrates diligence and attention to DOK 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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"> • 4_ Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reading Blueprint Summary Report, page 158 <p>Evidence of improved DOK alignment for MCA-III Science Grades 5, 8 and high school is provided in the science pool analysis report (see Exhibit 8). This document demonstrates efforts to continuously improve the Science MCA item pool and ensure that test blueprints will be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8_Spring 2017 MCA-III Science Pool Analysis Report <p>Pages 8-9 discuss the numbers of scenarios containing DOK 1, 2 and 3 in the operational item pool</p>	
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <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. 		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that MDE has improved DOK proportionality within R/LA test events and science forms for all tested grades. • 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. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>To demonstrate improved benchmark coverage for MCA-III Mathematics Grade 11, the pool analysis report (see Exhibit 2) recommends Minnesota develop the content detailed in the item development plan (see Exhibit 3). Consistent with the recommendation on page 36 of Exhibit 2, Minnesota has ordered several items for benchmark 9.4.2.2. The item pool analysis report also contains graphs comparing the pool to the test blueprint proportions by strand and by standard. Additionally, the table on page 87 of Exhibit 4 shows that all adaptive Grade 11 MCA tests had 100% benchmark coverage from the Test Specifications (see Exhibit 4). These documents demonstrate thorough coverage for the grade 11 math assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2_Spring 2017 MCA-III Math Grades 3-8 and 11 Pool Analysis Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grade 11 recommendation, page 36 • 3_MCA Math G11 Item Development Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Benchmark 9.4.2.2, Line 72 • 4_ Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015-2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Math Blueprint Summary Report, page 87 <p>To demonstrate improved benchmark coverage and DOK proportionality for MCA-III Reading Grades 3-8 and 10, Minnesota continues to monitor and improve our coverage of benchmarks as well as DOK proportionality. This is evidenced by the graphs in the 2017 Reading Testlet Construction Results document</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>(Exhibit 5). In addition, the Future Directions for Development document addresses specific item and passage development plans to further improve the MCA Reading pool by adding text sets (Exhibit 6), and the item development order (Exhibit 7) implements the recommendations. Additionally, the table on page 158 of the Yearbook shows that all adaptive Reading MCA tests had 100% benchmark coverage from the Test Specifications (see Exhibit 4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5_2017 Reading Testlet Construction Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Predicted Percent Frequency Distributions for DOK, Appendix E, pages 58-68 ○ Predicted Percent Frequency Distributions for Skill Domain, Appendix F, pages 69-79 ○ Predicted Percent Frequency Distributions for Content Standard, Appendix G, pages 80-105 • 6_MCA-III Reading Grades 3-8 and 10 Future Directions for Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Future Directions for the Development of Text Sets, pages 11-13 • 7_MCA-III Reading Grade 10 Item Development Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Text sets are exclusively informational or mixed (one literary and one informational passage) ○ Demonstrates diligence and attention to DOK • 4_ Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p align="center">and Title III Assessments 2015-2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reading Blueprint Summary Report, page 158 <p>Evidence of improved DOK alignment for MCA-III Science Grades 5, 8 and high school is provided in the science pool analysis report (see Exhibit 8). This document demonstrates efforts to continuously improve the Science MCA item pool and ensure that test blueprints will be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8_Spring 2017 MCA-III Science Pool Analysis Report <p>Pages 8-9 discuss the numbers of scenarios containing DOK 1, 2 and 3 in the operational item pool</p>	
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <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. OK <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)See 2.1 for DOK recommendation <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 (same as 2.1) 		
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III)-See 2.1 for DOK request • For the science general assessments in grades 5, 8 and high school (MCA III)-See 2.1for DOK request 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>For MCA Mathematics and Reading, reference evidence and text for Critical Elements 2.1 and 2.2 on pages 1-3.</p> <p>Minnesota’s Mathematics MCA Grades 3-8 have undergone an independent alignment study. In addition to the report provided as Exhibit 9, this is further evidenced by the approved submission of Minnesota’s 2011 Peer Review documentation (see Exhibit 10) and documentation that those standards have not changed since 2011 (see Category 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement Previously Met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 9_MCA-III Mathematics Grades 3-8 Alignment Report ○ 10_2012 Peer Review Approval Letter for Assessments New in 2011 ○ 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) <p>AA-AAAS MDE contracts for alignment studies in the first year of a new operational assessment. Science MTAS alignment studies were performed in 2012. Reading MTAS alignment studies were performed in 2013. Since that time, MDE has created two static forms in each subject from additional development. The static forms have been analyzed internally for alignment of MTAS items to the extended benchmarks, alignment of the extended benchmarks to the general standards</p>	<p>Peers reviewed Evidence 9 which identifies that Depth Of Knowledge for grades 5-8 show partial and weak DOK consistency (see summary DOK on page 46).</p> <p>The state should develop a plan to address alignment concerns. Peers want alignment improved at grades 5-8.</p> <p>AA-AAAS- The evidence identifies that MDE internally analyzed the alignment of two new forms. Peers find the new forms should have undergone an independent alignment study, as per the Non-regulatory guidance, (page 34).</p> <p>Page 7- Peers do not recommend the use of <i>The Communication Matrix</i> replace “the MTAS for a small group of students eligible for alternate assessments”.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>and benchmarks, and DOK alignment (see Exhibit 11).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11_Analysis of Science and Reading MTAS Alignment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cognitive Complexity Charts, page 6 <p>To further demonstrate alignment for MTAS Reading Grades 3-8 and high school, see Exhibits 12-17. These documents serve to establish that all assessments administered satisfy the Test Specifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12_MTAS Science Test Specifications • 13_2016 MTAS Science Test Map • 14_2017 MTAS Science Test Map • 15_MTAS Reading Grades 3–8, 10 Test Specifications • 16_2016 MTAS Reading Test Map • 17_2017 MTAS Reading Test Map <p>Minnesota’s academic standards for Science will be revised in 2018-2019, and the redesign of its AA-AAAS for all subjects will begin at that time. Operational administrations of the redesigned AA-AAAS will begin in SY 2021-2022 or 2022-2023.</p>	<p>Such a measure is unlikely to have content validity evidence connected to state standards.</p> <p>Cognitive complexity range for science does not include the full range of DOK.</p> <p>The documents (Evidence 12-17) do not support the claim that the test forms satisfy the test specifications. Peers could not determine if the forms met test specifications for both science and reading.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <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). <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>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-8,M Peers want depth of knowledge consistency (DOK) improved at grades 5-8 • 3-8, R and S A plan for addressing the DOK in the weakly aligned grades and an independent review of those grade levels after improvements are made (CE 2.1). • HS R-Address alignment issues identified (CE 2.1). • ALT 3-8, HS R/S An independent alignment study of the new test forms. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>For MCA Mathematics and Reading, reference evidence and text for Critical Elements 2.1 and 2.2 on pages 1-3.</p> <p>Minnesota’s Mathematics MCA Grades 3-8 have undergone an independent alignment study. In addition to the report provided as Exhibit 9, this is further evidenced by the approved submission of Minnesota’s 2011 Peer Review documentation (see Exhibit 10) and documentation that those standards have not changed since 2011 (see Category 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement Previously Met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 9_MCA-III Mathematics Grades 3-8 Alignment Report ○ 10_2012 Peer Review Approval Letter for Assessments New in 2011 ○ 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) <p>AA-AAAS MDE contracts for alignment studies in the first year of a new operational assessment. Science MTAS alignment studies were performed in 2012. Reading MTAS alignment studies were performed in 2013. Since that time, MDE has created two static forms in each subject from additional development. The static forms have been analyzed internally for alignment of MTAS items to the extended benchmarks, alignment of the extended benchmarks to the general standards and benchmarks, and DOK alignment (see Exhibit</p>	<p>3-8, M DOK was weakly aligned for 5th grade and 8th grade (# 9, p. 4).</p> <p>ALT 3-8, HS R/S Evidence that the State has improved the alignment of MTAS test items with MDE content standards in R/LA and science is addressed via the analysis of alignment (# 11). This alignment review was conducted internally rather than independently.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>11).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11_Analysis of Science and Reading MTAS Alignment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cognitive Complexity Charts, page 6 <p>To further demonstrate alignment for MTAS Reading Grades 3-8 and high school, see Exhibits 12-17. These documents serve to establish that all assessments administered satisfy the Test Specifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12_MTAS Science Test Specifications • 13_2016 MTAS Science Test Map • 14_2017 MTAS Science Test Map • 15_MTAS Reading Grades 3–8, 10 Test Specifications • 16_2016 MTAS Reading Test Map • 17_2017 MTAS Reading Test Map <p>Minnesota’s academic standards for Science will be revised in 2018-2019, and the redesign of its AA-AAAS for all subjects will begin at that time. Operational administrations of the redesigned AA-AAAS will begin in SY 2021-2022 or 2022-2023.</p>	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</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>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-8 R/LA general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (See CE 3.1) regarding the DOK proportion • ALT 3-8, HS R/S An independent alignment study (see CE 3.1). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>Minnesota emphasizes quality content development as a critical and first step in validity. During the item development process, item alignment is a focus to ensure consistency with standards. As evidence of that commitment to validity, the procedures to calculate the internal structure of each test and sub-domain scores for MCA and MTAS is explained in the Technical Manual (see Exhibit 18), and the results for the 2015-2016 administration are included in the Yearbook Tables (see Exhibit 4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18_Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 8: Validity, pages 140-149 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Test Validity and Content, page 141-142 ▪ This chapter from 2015-2016 represents an extensively improved version based on initial Peer Review feedback in January 2017. • 4_Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mathematics MCA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Internal Consistency Reports, pages 77-79 ▪ Dimensionality Reports, page 85 ○ Reading MCA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Internal Consistency Reports, pages 148-150 	<p>Peers would like to know what the interpretive guidelines for interpreting unidimensionality indices presented by the evidence for both MCA & MTAS.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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"> ▪ Dimensionality Reports, page 156 ○ Science MCA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Internal Consistency Reports, page 184 ▪ Dimensionality Reports, page 188 <p>AA-AAAS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4_Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mathematics MTAS, pages 269-275, 282 ○ Reading MTAS, pages 335-338, 345 <p>Science MTAS, pages 364, 369</p>	
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that MCA & MTAS supports the internal structure of each test and sub-domain scores for each test Peers would like to know what the interpretive guidelines for interpreting unidimensionality indices presented by the evidence. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>Evidence that Minnesota has taken steps to address validity based on other variables that support score interpretation is provided below. To demonstrate that Minnesota’s alternate assessment for grades 3-8 and high school results are consistent with external judgments, Minnesota calculated correlations with alternate assessment results and the characteristics of the test takers, using the Learner Characteristic Inventory (LCI) (see Exhibits 18 and 4). Minnesota believes this to be a sound approach given the variability of the alternate assessment population and after researching the methodology used by other states and research organizations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18_Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 8: Validity, pages 140-149 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This chapter from 2015-2016 represents an extensively improved version based on initial Peer Review feedback in January 2017. ▪ Evidence Based on Relations to Other Variables, page 146-148 ▪ Based on Peer Review feedback in January 2017, this analysis is new for 2015-2016 administration. This analysis will be conducted annually. • 4_Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and 	<p>Correlations among the subscales are in the acceptable range (r's = .72 to .78). There is no pattern of validity evidence based on relations with scores from the Learner Characteristics Inventory. It is problematic that the correlations between constructs within the MTAS (r's = .72 to .78) were higher than were the correlations within constructs between the MTAS and the LCI (r's = .49 to .54).</p> <p>The pattern of correlations among LCI and MTAS variables, reported in Exhibit 4, page 383, is not as expected for a convergent / discriminant validity analysis. The LCI mathematics variable, for example, has a lower correlation with MTAS mathematics, than it does with MTAS reading or MTAS science. At minimum, State should provide an explanation for why Exhibit 4, page 383, does not fully support validity claims for MTAS.</p> <p>The matrix demonstrates on page 383 does not support claims of convergent and discriminate validity for the MTAS. The state should provide some kind of explanation or a plan and timeline for further attending to the issue.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Title III Assessments 2015–2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Correlations Among LCI Variables, page 383 ○ Correlation of Mathematics and Reading LCI Variables with MTAS Scale Scores, page 383 <p>Based on Peer Review feedback in January 2017, this analysis is new for 2015-2016 administration. This analysis will be conducted annually.</p>	
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the R/LA, mathematics and science AA-AAAS for grades 3-8, and high school (MTAS), MDE must provide: Not Okay</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. 		
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALT 3-8, HS, R/M/S Validity evidence that shows levels of validity generally considered adequate by professional judgment: Explanation for MTAS reading sharing too low of a correlation with LCI reading ($r = .45$) and MTAS mathematics sharing too low of a correlation with LCI mathematics ($r = .54$), particularly compared to the correlation between MTAS reading and MTAS mathematics ($r = .78$). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>4.2 – 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>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. Evidence of involvement of educators with experience with special populations in the development of technology-enhanced items is demonstrated by Exhibits 19 and 20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19_MDE Vendor Guide to Advisory Panels (pages 7-9) • 20_MN Peer Review Accessibility <p>Minnesota also completes statistical analysis after field testing to further ensure fairness and accessibility. Our DIF analyses procedures are described in Exhibit 18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18_Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 2: Test Development, pages 31-50 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mantel-Haenszel Procedure, page 44-47 <p>Based on Peer Review feedback in January, the procedures and details for DIF analyses have been improved.</p>	<p>The DIF analysis is described in the technical manual (# 18). Results of the DIF analysis are still missing.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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. partial • 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. Where are any usability studies? partial • Evidence of the completed differential item functioning (DIF) analyses referred to in the State submission (i.e., the DIF studies' results).NO 		
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-8, HS, R/M/S Evidence of the results from the completed differential item functioning (DIF) analyses referred to in the State submission (i.e., the DIF studies' results). Results of DIF study could include percentage of items that were flagged for DIF and steps to address those items. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>Evidence of an interpretation for the reported conditional standard error of measurement data for the MCA-III Mathematics, Reading and Science is found in Exhibits 18 and 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18_Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 9: Reliability, Pages 150-160 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Standard Error of Measurement, pages 156-157 ▪ This chapter from 2015-2016 represents an extensively improved version based on initial Peer Review feedback in January 2017. • 4_Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mathematics, Frequency Distribution Reports, pages 5-24 ○ Reading, Frequency Distribution Reports, 89-109 ○ Science, Frequency Distribution Reports, 160-165 	<p>The State has explained what CSEM is and how it is calculated. The State has also provided CSEMs for all tests.</p> <p>The State should make (and possibly support) some statement as to the adequacy of the precision of those reported CSEMs? For example, how do these compare CSEMs compare to previous years. Are the CSEMS. The precision across the performance continuum comparable to the previous administrations.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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. NO 		
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peers request interpretative guidelines, and the source, supporting the claim that the reported CSEMs demonstrate adequate precision across the scales. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>The details of Minnesota’s equating procedures for the MCA-III Mathematics, Reading and Science are documented in Exhibit 18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18_Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 7: Equating and Linking, pages 131-139 <p>This chapter from 2015-2016 represents an extensively improved version based on initial Peer Review feedback in January 2017.</p>	<p>Equating procedures were described however the actual results are missing.</p> <p>The evidence does not include flagging criteria (for example, for flagging items with large parameter drift) nor an interpretation of the extent to which the new forms yield consistent scores.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</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 of the results of the equating procedures that were described in the MDE submission for these tests. 		
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-8, HS, R/M/S Peers request evidence of the results of the procedures. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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 	<p>Evidence of Minnesota’s guidance on how to select the appropriate accommodations and accessibility features for students with disabilities and English Learners is provided in Exhibits 21 and 22.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21_Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessments 2016–2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 5: Participation of Students with IEPs and 504 Plans, pages 79–98 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary and Explanation of Accommodations for the MCA, pages 88-98 ○ Chapter 6: Participation of English Learners, pages 99-112 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Determining Appropriate Supports and Accommodations for English Learners, pages 102-112 • 22_Minnesota Manual of Accessibility Features for Students with Disabilities (Steps 1-3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Minnesota has drafted a document with Steps 4 and 5. We plan to have that available for stakeholder review during the 2017-2018 school year. <p>Evidence that Minnesota ensures all students, including those taking the alternate assessment, receive instruction in grade level content standards is provided in Exhibit</p>	<p>Could not identify, among Evidence documents presented, the State’s specific guidance on how to select accommodation tools – that is, on which tools to select based on which IEP designations for codes. Do 504 plans contain a description of the accommodation(s) needed?</p> <p>The information on ELLs groups linguistic and disability supports together with no way to support the selection. The section includes English Proficiency assessment descriptions. This evidence should support academic content for required general assessment separate from the English Language Proficiency assessments.</p> <p>The critical element asks for evidence of how appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities are selected. IEP teams need guidance on which options are available on which assessments and how you determine which are appropriate for individual students.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>disabilities;</p> <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>11.</p> <p>11_Analysis of Science and Reading MTAS Alignment</p>	<p>ALT 3-8 HS R/S-Peers: The documentation of this evidence shows the breadth of the standards are missing. This provides illustration to support the request in CE 2.1 about why an alignment study is critical for these two contents</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <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. 		
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of guidance on how to select the appropriate accommodations and accessibility features for students with disabilities. ALT 3-8 Math Evidence of procedures to ensure that implementation of the AA-AAAS promotes student access to grade-level content standards: Alternate mathematics alignment study. BIG ASK ALT 3-8, HS Reading-Need to address Breadth of the standards (see CE 2.1) ALT S 3-8, HS Science-Need to address Breadth of the standards (see CE 2.1) 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>Evidence of Minnesota’s guidance on how to select the appropriate accommodations and accessibility features for students with disabilities and English Learners is provided in Exhibits 21 and 22.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21_Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessments 2016–2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 5: Participation of Students with IEPs and 504 Plans, pages 79–98 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary and Explanation of Accommodations for the MCA, pages 88-98 ○ Chapter 6: Participation of English Learners, pages 99-112 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Determining Appropriate Supports and Accommodations for English Learners, pages 102-112 • 22_Minnesota Manual of Accessibility Features for Students with Disabilities (Steps 1-3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Minnesota has drafted a document with Steps 4 and 5. We plan to have that available for stakeholder review during the 2017-2018 school year. <p>Evidence that Minnesota ensures all students, including those taking the alternate assessment, receive instruction in grade level content standards is provided in Exhibit 11.</p>	<p>Peers request evidence of guidance for how to select supports based on individual needs.</p> <p>Recommend further guidance be provided on the linguistic versus disability supports or accommodations. Recommend separate section of guidance be available for ELL or ELLs w Disabilities, keep focus on the required assessments (general, alternate, ELP assessment).</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	11_Analysis of Science and Reading MTAS Alignment	
Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the R/LA, mathematics and science general assessments in grades 3-8 and high school (MCA III), MDE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance on how to select the appropriate accommodations and accessibility features for ELs. 		
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of guidance on how to select the appropriate accommodations and accessibility features for ELs. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>Evidence of empirical analysis to evaluate test accommodations provided is shown in Exhibits 18 and 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18_Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 9: Reliability, pages 150-160 • 4_Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mathematics, Frequency Distribution Reports (score summaries), pages 5-24 ○ Reading, Frequency Distribution Reports (score summaries), pages 89-109 ○ Science, Frequency Distribution Reports (score summaries), pages 160-165 <p>Evidence of improved reliability of accommodated paper forms of MCA is shown in Exhibits 18 and 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18_Technical Manual for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 9: Reliability, pages 150-160 • 4_Yearbook Tables for Minnesota’s Title I and Title III Assessments 2015–2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mathematics, pages 37-39, 43-45, 49-51, 55-57, 61-63, 67-69, and 73-75 <p>Reading, pages 121-122, 125-126, 129-130, 133-134, 137-138, 141-142, and 145-146</p>	<p>3-8, HS, R/M/S & ALT 3-8, HS, R/M/S</p> <p>The evidence does not review that the State “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;”. The best form of such evidence would be mean scores and reliability and validity coefficients disaggregated by disability status and accommodation use.</p> <p>PEERS: Do you have any studies of performance Scores and reliability coefficients by subgroups?</p> <p>ASK-Means & Alpha coefficients disaggregated by whether students had accommodations or not.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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).NO • Evidence of improved reliability of accommodated paper forms of the tests in all grades.-OK 		
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-8, HS, R/M/S & ALT 3-8, HS, R/M/S Evidence of mean scores and reliability indices disaggregated by accommodation use. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>Minnesota formally adopted academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards for Mathematics Grades 3-8 (see Exhibits 23-25). Minnesota applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students based on the enrolled grade. Standards include four levels of achievement, descriptions of competencies associated with each achievement level, and scores that differentiate among the achievement levels (see Exhibits 23-25). While the reports are provided as Exhibits 23-25, this is further evidenced by the approved submission of Minnesota’s 2011 Peer Review documentation (see Exhibit 10) and documentation that those standards have not changed since 2011 (see Category 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement Previously Met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 23_Standard Setting Technical Report Math Grades 3-8 ○ 24_MCA Achievement Level Descriptors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mathematics, pages 8-22 ○ 25_MTAS Achievement Level Descriptors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mathematics, pages 8-13 ○ 10_Peer Review Approval Letter for Assessments New in 2011 ○ 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) 	<p>3-8, HS M & ALT 3-8, HS M</p> <p>Evidence of State adoption of achievement standards for these tests was included in the peer review approval letter (# 10).</p> <p>ED’s clarification of the peer review notes and the evidence submitted by the State suffice to demonstrate this critical element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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. • <i>Note to Peer Reviewers from ED: MDE submitted information documenting that for Math 3-8; academic standards were adopted I 2011; and approved through peer review. MDE stipulated that the math tests submitted in 2016 are tests of the same standards, but of different design (CAT). MDE further stipulated that CAT tests are reported on same scale, therefore no additional achievement standard setting was conducted for the 2016 submission. The standards setting report is available for review on the max.gov evidence page</i> 		
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>Minnesota formally adopted academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards for Mathematics Grades 3-8 (see Exhibits 23-25). Minnesota applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students based on the enrolled grade. Standards include four levels of achievement, descriptions of competencies associated with each achievement level, and scores that differentiate among the achievement levels (see Exhibits 23-25). While the reports are provided as Exhibits 23-25, this is further evidenced by the approved submission of Minnesota’s 2011 Peer Review documentation (see Exhibit 10) and documentation that those standards have not changed since 2011 (see Category 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement Previously Met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 23_Standard Setting Technical Report Math Grades 3-8 ○ 24_MCA Achievement Level Descriptors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mathematics, pages 8-22 ○ 25_MTAS Achievement Level Descriptors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mathematics, pages 8-13 ○ 10_Peer Review Approval Letter for Assessments New in 2011 ○ 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) 	<p>3-8, HS M</p> <p>Evidence of the process used to set standards for these tests was included in the standard setting technical report (# 23).</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the mathematics general tests in grades 3-8 (MCA-III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the process used to set standards for these tests. • <i>Note to Peer Reviewers from ED: MDE submitted information documenting that for Math 3-8; academic standards were adopted I 2011; and approved through peer review. MDE stipulated that the math tests submitted in 2016 are tests of the same standards, but of different design (CAT). MDE further stipulated that CAT tests are reported on same scale, therefore no additional achievement standard setting was conducted for the 2016 submission. The standards setting report is available for review on the max.gov evidence page</i> 		
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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>Minnesota formally adopted academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards for Mathematics Grades 3-8 (see Exhibits 23-25). Minnesota applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students based on the enrolled grade. Standards include four levels of achievement, descriptions of competencies associated with each achievement level, and scores that differentiate among the achievement levels (see Exhibits 23-25). While the reports are provided as Exhibits 23-25, this is further evidenced by the approved submission of Minnesota’s 2011 Peer Review documentation (see Exhibit 10) and documentation that those standards have not changed since 2011 (see Category 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement Previously Met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 23_Standard Setting Technical Report Math Grades 3-8 ○ 24_MCA Achievement Level Descriptors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mathematics, pages 8-22 ○ 25_MTAS Achievement Level Descriptors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mathematics, pages 8-13 ○ 10_Peer Review Approval Letter for Assessments New in 2011 ○ 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) 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the mathematics general tests in grades 3-8 (MCA-III), MDE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the process used to set standards for these tests (see element 6.2). • <i>Note to Peer Reviewers from ED: MDE submitted information documenting that for Math 3-8; academic standards were adopted I 2011; and approved through peer review. MDE stipulated that the math tests submitted in 2016 are tests of the same standards, but of different design (CAT). MDE further stipulated that CAT tests are reported on same scale, therefore no additional achievement standard setting was conducted for the 2016 submission. The standards setting report is available for review on the max.gov evidence page</i> 		
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

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 	<p>Beginning in 2017, Minnesota has added a statement to Individual Student Reports that test reports are available in alternate formats upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language parents can understand. Current year mock-ups are provided as Exhibit 26.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26_Student Report Mock-ups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Math and Reading MCA grades 3, 4, 6, and 7, bottom of page 4 ○ Math, Reading and Science MCA grade 5, bottom of page 8 ○ Math, Reading and Science MCA grade 8, bottom of page 12 ○ Science MCA High School, bottom of page 14 ○ Reading MCA grade 10, bottom of page 16 ○ Math MCA grade 11, bottom of page 18 ○ Reading MTAS grade 10, bottom of page 20 ○ Math MTAS grade 11, bottom of page 22 ○ Science MTAS High School, bottom of page 24 ○ Math and Reading MTAS grades 3,4, 6, and 7, bottom of page 28 <p>Math, Reading and Science MTAS grades 5 and 8, bottom of page 32</p>	<p>3-8, HS R/M/S & ALT 3-8, HS R/M/S</p> <p>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 was indicated in student report mock ups (# 26).</p> <p>The statement added to the reports in Evidence 26 concerns other formats, not languages other than English.</p> <p>Peers recommend offer upon request translator services for non-English Learner groups (perhaps the five most prevalent languages).</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MINNESOTA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; <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. 		
Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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. 		
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request evidence that test reports are available upon request, in a native language translation or interpretive service available upon request. 		

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