



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Carey M. Wright
State Superintendent of Education
Mississippi Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205-0771

April 17, 2018

Dear Superintendent Wright:

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 Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in August 2017.

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:

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language assessment for grades 3-8 (MAAP): **Partially meets requirements**
- General assessments in high school mathematics (MAAP EOC algebra I) and R/LA (MAAP EOC English I): **Partially meets requirements**

The components that **partially meet requirements** of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and/or MDE will need to provide substantial

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.

additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that MDE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

The specific list of items required for MDE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because several of the State's components have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, MDE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. MDE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on MDE's federal fiscal year 2018 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-17 school year. The MDE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-18 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the 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 MAAP assessments partially 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 members have 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 MAAP assessments has partially met the new requirements of ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. Additional evidence needed to comply with the new requirements of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA may be found in the enclosed list of items referenced above (under critical element 4.2).

Page 3 – The Honorable Carey M. Wright

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 Mildred Horner-Pierce of my staff at:
OSS.Mississippi@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Position of
Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Walt Drane, Executive Director of Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP end-of-course (EOC) high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of alignment with the academic content standards, as described in critical element 3.1.
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that demonstrates that district or school staff receive specific training or instruction on security of student-level assessment data and protection of student privacy and confidentiality.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</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, the full range of academic content standards (e.g., reading, writing and language), balance of content, and cognitive complexity. Examples of this evidence may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of an independent alignment study that provides an overall set of recommendations and findings that are clearly actionable. ○ Evidence of an alignment study that includes expert panels of sufficient size and representativeness. ○ Evidence of an alignment study that includes expert panelist judgment of alignment to the entire body of standards.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that assessments measure the intended cognitive processes.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For the MAAP 3-8, MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity evidence that shows the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with criterion and other variables for all student groups, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reports of analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between academic assessment results and external measures that assess similar constructs, such as NAEP, TIMSS, assessments of the same content area administered by some or all districts in the State, and college-readiness assessments. ○ Reports of analyses that demonstrate convergent and

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>divergent relationships between State academic assessment results and measures other than test scores, such as performance criteria, including college- and career-readiness (e.g., college-enrollment rates; success in related entry-level, college credit-bearing courses; post-secondary employment in jobs that pay living wages).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reports of analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between academic assessment results and other variables, such as academic characteristic of test takers (e.g., average weekly hours spent on homework, number of advanced courses taken). ○ Reports of analyses that show stronger positive relationships with measures of the same construct than with measures of different constructs. ○ Reports of analyses that show assessment scores at tested grades are positively correlated with teacher judgments of student readiness upon entry in the next grade level.
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p>	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of the reliability for each subscore (strand).
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility (additional requirement under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(xiii))</p>	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that the assessments are developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL). This may include documentation of steps the State has taken in the design and development of its assessments, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation describing approaches used in the design and development of the State’s assessments (e.g., principles of universal design, language simplification, accessibility tools and features embedded in test items or available as an accompaniment to the items), OR; ○ Documentation of the approaches used for developing items; OR ○ Documentation of procedures used for maximizing accessibility of items during the development process, such as guidelines for accessibility and accessibility tools and features included in item specifications; OR ○ Description or examples of instructions provided to item writers and reviewers that address writing accessible items, available accessibility tools and features, and reviewing items for accessibility; OR ○ Documentation of procedures for developing and reviewing items in alternative formats or substitute items and for ensuring these items conform with item specifications;

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.4 – Scoring	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the English II assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the hand scoring rubrics, criteria, and overall processes are generating valid and reliable scores for the reading/language arts writing component (e.g., improved rates of hand scoring agreement).
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a plan and timeline for analyzing whether assessments delivered by different types of devices yield results that are comparable in meaning and interpretation.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the State’s plan for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of its assessment systems. This evidence may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Short-term and long-term strategic plans for analysis and maintenance. ○ Documentation of regular internal and external technical review of components of the State’s assessment system, such as State Board of Education minutes, minutes from TAC meetings, and documentation of roles and responsibilities of TAC members. ○ Outline of a deliberate cycle for reviewing and updating the State’s academic content standards and assessments (e.g., provides for logical transitions such that the assessments are aligned to the standards on which instruction is based in the relevant school year).
5.3 – Accommodations	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence to show that accommodations are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct, allow meaningful interpretation of results and comparisons.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the written procedures and guidance to districts for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration. • Evidence of the summary of results of the monitoring of accommodations during test administration.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the MAAP 3-8, MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State’s content standards were used as a main reference in writing the draft performance level descriptors used in establishing academic achievement standards; • Evidence that the performance level descriptors reflect the full range of the State’s academic content standards for each grade.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the MAAP for grades 3-8 and the MAAP EOC high school assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence that the interpretation of performance levels is consistent across educator reports, parent reports, interpretive guides, and student reports.• Evidence that 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 academic achievement.○ Report the student’s academic 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 provided in an understandable and uniform format.

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

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .	4
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	6
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	7
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	8
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	10
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	11
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	11
2.2 – Item Development.....	12
2.3 – Test Administration	13
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	14
2.5 – Test Security	15
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	16
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	17
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	17
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	20
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	21
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	22
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	23
4.1 – Reliability.....	23
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	24
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	25
4.4 – Scoring	26
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	27
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	28
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	29
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	30
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	30
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	32
5.3 – Accommodations.....	33
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	34
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	35
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	35
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	36
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	37
6.4 – Reporting.....	38

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 MISSISSIPPI

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 MISSISSIPPI

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>1.1.a - State Board of Education Minutes_Jan 2016, p. 6. 1.1.b - Approved Mississippi College and Career Readiness Standards - Final 1.1.c - Title 37 Education § 37-1-3, p.2 (Board authority to adopt curriculum) 1.1.d - MSCCRS-Full-2016 (Full ELA/M standards)</p>	<p>1.1.a - Academic content standards adopted at Board of Education meeting, 1/21/2016 1.1.b - Document appears to be log of revisions made to selected ELA/M standards. Original standards adopted in May 2015, revisions proposed in December 2015, feedback from APA Forum, and final revisions to standards for adoption.</p> <p>Document 1.1.d states on the cover page that these standards are effective with the 2016-2017 school year, yet the submission is for 2015-2016 assessments. The document shows edits to the standards reflective of the standards review described above. A separate document, 2014-MS-CCR-Math, was current for 2015-2016, and contains a header on each page that reads: “NOTE: The standards contained in this APA-released document are identical to the 2014 Mississippi College- and Career-Readiness Standards.” No edits to any standards are shown.</p> <p>It is assumed that the entire submission is intended to reflect the adoption of new academic standards and item development based on these new standards, along with the evidence of the administration, scoring, and reporting of tests that were not based on the new standards. This is acceptable only to the extent that the revised standards do not differ significantly from the standards upon which the 2015-2016 tests were based. One possible analysis that could be done is to empanel a small independent group to compare the performance level descriptors used at standard setting with the revised, current standards. Any changes that are found should be</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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		analyzed to determine if the cut scores still hold, or if they should be revised.
Section 1.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the revised standards that were submitted align with test design, blueprint, test item specifications, and standard setting used for the 2015-2016 assessments that were submitted for review. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

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>1.2.a MS CCR Standards Review Evidence</p> <p>1.2.b Standards Review by WestEd Evidence (Summary of the standards review process by 3rd-party facilitator)</p> <p>1.2.c Reviewer Resume</p>	<p>1.2.a - Stakeholder PPT overview of standards review and revision process/outcomes</p> <p>1.2.c - Sample of resumes for some reviewers</p> <p>The revised standards are based on nationally-recognized standards, and revisions do not appear to substantively change the quality of the standards.</p> <p>Additional evidence needed that stakeholder engagement was broad. Evidence 1.2.b. only says a “representative group”. Evidence 1.2.c seems to only include a sample of reviewer resumes, and there is no documentation of the total number or qualifications of the reviewers whose input was considered in making the changes. This, however, is only relevant if the revised standards were the ones upon which the assessment was based. (See request for additional information in 1.1)</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of broad stakeholder engagement in review of the standards. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>REVIEW-ED STAFF</p> <p>Evidence 1.3 MS Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) included Grades 3-8 for ELA and Math (administered 2015-2016) Web: http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/OSA/MAAP</p>	<p>REVIEW-ED STAFF</p> <p>MAAP and MAP-A Assessments for ELA, Math, and Science were first issued during 2015-2016. Evidence did not support high school assessments issued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presumptive that ACT was administered in high school juniors (grade 9) during 2015-2016 • Evidence 1.3 MS Academic Assessment Program (MAAP) included Grades 3-8 for ELA and Math (administered 2015-2016) • Science assessment (Mississippi Science Test, Second Edition (MST2) - administered in Grades 5 and 8 – measures student achievement in science based upon the 2010 Mississippi Science Framework. • MS Alternate Assessments (MAP – A): Aligned in 2015–2016 to the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Essential Elements however, DLM were discontinued; Grades 3 – 8 in ELA and Math; Grades 5 and 8 in Science (Mississippi Extended Science Frameworks (MESF) <p>Statement provided by MDE: The ACT will be administered to all students classified as Juniors starting at the 2014-2015 school year.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High school assessments for ELA, Math, and Science needed – information missing in evidence provided • High school Alternative Assessment; DLM provided up to Grade 8 • Clarification needed for use of ACT in high school assessments; It wasn’t clear if this was the high school assessment for ELA and Math. 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>REVIEW-ED STAFF</p> <p>1.4.a -Title 37-16-3 (2).pdf : 2010 Mississippi Code TITLE 37 – EDUCATION Chapter 16 - Statewide Tesing Program. 37-16-3 - General powers and duties of department of education.</p> <p>1.4.b - Title 37-16-9 (3)(4).pdf): (2010 Mississippi Code TITLE 37 - EDUCATION Chapter 16 - Statewide Testing Program. 37-16-9 - Modification of testing instruments and procedures for students with identified handicaps or disabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.4.c - Student-Assessment-Handbook.pdf • 1.4.d - MAP_3-8_TCM_ - Test Coordinator Manual (Grades 3 – 8 for ELA and Math) 	<p>REVIEW-ED STAFF</p> <p>1.4b: Modifications for Statewide testing and instrument: (3) Children with disabilities shall be included in general statewide and district-wide assessments programs, with appropriate accommodations, where necessary. As appropriate, the State Department of Education and the local educational agency shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Develop policies and procedures for the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments for those children who cannot participate in statewide and district-wide assessment programs; and (b) Develop and, beginning not later than July 1, 2000, conduct those alternate assessments. <p>1.4.c (Student Handbook included EL in statement: Eligible Students All eligible students must be tested. (SB Policies 3600, 3800, 7220, and 7601) {MS Code 37-16-3(2)} Eligible students refers to the total number of students in membership who are required to take the specified test as outlined in the Mississippi Statewide Assessment System, including students with disabilities and students who are English Language Learners. This includes assessing students through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the standard test administration, <input type="checkbox"/> the standard test administration with

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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
		accommodations, and <input type="checkbox"/> the state-designated alternate assessment such as the Mississippi Assessment of Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information needed to address students with disabilities that are placed in private schools 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>REVIEW-ED STAFF</p> <p>1.5.a - State_ELA_2015_16.pdf – Participation Rates for all students and disaggregated by student group and assessment type (ELA)</p> <p>1.5.a - State_ELA_2015_16.pdf - Participation Rates for all students and disaggregated by student group and assessment type (Math)</p> <p>1.5.c - State_Science_2015_16.pdf - Participation Rates for all students and disaggregated by student group and assessment type (Science)</p>	<p>REVIEW-ED STAFF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation Rates in ELA, Math, and Science files does not disaggregate grade levels. Percentages of Participation are listed only.
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided high school participation data for end-of-course assessments; Include grade levels of participation rates for ELA, Math, and Science assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

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>2.1.a-Algebra 1 Interpretive Guide 9.17.15 Final 2.1.b-ELA, Grades 3-8 Interpretive Guide 9.17.15 Final 2.1.c-ENG II Interpretive Guide 9.17.15 Final 2.1.d-Mathematics, Grades 3-8 Interpretive Guide 9.17.15 Final</p> <p>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final, pp. 3-4; 6-33</p>	<p>pp. 3-4 of the Technical Report provide purposes, intended interpretations, and uses of results</p> <p>pp. 6-33 of the Technical Report provides sufficient information on the processes used in designing the test to measure the full range of standards and at various levels of complexity, with some areas for improved communication regarding complexity noted below.</p> <p>Cognitive complexity distributions for each grade and subject are included in the Technical Report (p. 11), but should also be made explicit in the interpretive guides and blueprints. Evidence is needed that it is also included in item writer training.</p> <p>The submission index states that sample questions are provided in the interpretive guides, none could be found. These are important for item writers to have. If the revisions to the standards require revisions to the item samples in the standards document, that should be considered as well. No changes to any of the sample items were apparent.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that item writers are trained in cognitive complexity • Evidence that sample items in the revised standards document reflect these revisions. 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

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>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final, pp. 6-33; Appendix F (Item Writer Survey Results); Appendix G (Item Reviewer Checklist)</p>	<p>Documentation is generally sufficient to demonstrate that reasonable and technically-sound procedures are used to develop items for future use, with one exception noted below.</p> <p>The item writer training and item reviewer checklist do not explicitly ask about content alignment, or intended and actual cognitive complexity of the items.</p> <p>The item development process described in the technical report is for future tests, however, on p. 24, the report states, “The test forms were then constructed using items in Questar’s item bank.” There is no further evidence regarding the origin of these items used on the operational 2015-2016 tests, including the nature of the population of students upon which these items’ statistics are based. There is some discussion in section 3.4.3.1 regarding MDE’s review of the forms, but more information is needed about that review process, including MDE criteria for accepting or rejecting items selected by Questar.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that describes the origin of the content and item statistics used to construct the operational 2015-2016 test forms. • Evidence that describes MDE’s review and approval process of items proposed by Questar for inclusion on the operational 2015-2016 test forms. • Evidence that item writers are trained in content alignment and intended cognitive complexity of the items. • Evidence that item reviewers are judging content alignment and cognitive complexity of the 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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>2.3.a-2015-2016 Test Administrator Manual-EoC 2.3.b-District Test Coordinator Training-Materials-All 2.3.c-District Test Coordinator Training-Participants-All 2.3.d-MAP_3-8_TCM_Updated_April_2016 2.3.e-MAP_3-8_TAM_Updated_April_2016 2.3.f-Prohibition of Electronic Communication Devices 2.3.g-Student-Assessment-Handbook-v1 2.3.h-Test Administrator Manual Checklist 2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final, Appendices I-L, pp. 257-364</p>	<p>The technical report Appendices I through L provide a broad overview of the training offered, dates, and target audience. Evidence indicates that training on the key elements of test administration was offered in person as well as via recording, and it was offered in a timely manner. Materials address standardization of test administration, accommodations, system requirements, and contingency plans for technology challenges (interruptions).</p> <p>No additional evidence needed.</p>
<p>Section 2.3 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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>REVIEW-ED STAFF 2.4a – OPLAN FAST – Final 2.4b – Assistance Visit Schedule 2.4c – FAST Team Planning</p>	<p>REVIEW-ED STAFF MDE, in coordination with Questar Assessments, Inc, has developed Forward Assessment Support Teams (FAST) to provide proactive support to districts, rapidly responding to, and resolving test irregularities, and maximizing economies of effort necessary for the administration of MAP and SATP2 administrations.</p> <p>The Office of Student Assessment has established a three-year rotation to provide assistance visits to each school district for the purpose of reviewing testing policies and procedures.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>2.5.a - Accreditation Standards-Appendix F 2.5.b - District Test Security Plan Guidance-2016 2.5.c - OSA_Investigations_Guidelines 2.5.d - MDE Investigation Business Rules (revised) 2.5.e -Tools Techniques Procedures (TTPs)</p>	<p>2.5.a_– The entire 68-page document is a State Board of Education document on test security requirements, including procedures for investigating possible breaches.</p> <p>2.5.b – The state requires an annual security plan for each district. Each school in a district is also required to have its own test security plan plus a copy of the District Test Security Plan on file at the school.</p> <p>2.5.d – This document provides additional detail on investigations, and may be a companion to the OSA Investigations Guidelines document (Evidence 2.5.c)</p> <p>2.5.e – Forms for reporting irregularities, audit checklists, certificate of shredding, principal’s oath.</p> <p>Adequate support is provided to demonstrate that policies and procedures are in place to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results to the extent possible.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>2.6.a - MDE - IT Security Policy 2017-03-21 2.6.b- Confidentiality Agreement 2.5.a through 2.5.e – Test materials security</p>	<p>2.6.a – The Mississippi submission template only references Section VII as evidence, but sections IV through XXVIII all relate to data security and integrity.</p> <p>2.5.a through 2.5.e all address integrity and confidentiality of test materials</p> <p>The Mississippi submission template states the minimum n-size and min/max percentages for reporting, but no supporting documentation for this policy was provided.</p> <p>None of the evidence submitted demonstrates that district or school staff receive specific training or instruction on security of student-level assessment data and protection of student privacy and confidentiality.</p>
<p>Section 2.6 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 suppression rules are formally documented in processes and procedures. • Evidence that demonstrates that district or school staff receive specific training or instruction on security of student-level assessment data and protection of student privacy and confidentiality. 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

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>3.1.a Internal Alignment Report-June 2017</p> <p>2.1.a-Algebra 1 Interpretive Guide 9.17.15 Final 2.1.b-ELA, Grades 3-8 Interpretive Guide 9.17.15 Final 2.1.c-ENG II Interpretive Guide 9.17.15 Final 2.1.d-Mathematics, Grades 3-8 Interpretive Guide 9.17.15 Final</p> <p>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final</p>	<p>Title of Exhibit 3.1.a, “Internal Alignment Report” is confusing. This title suggests that the alignment was done solely by (or with significant input from) MDE staff. However, it appears that the panel was facilitated by another entity, without any substantive involvement by MDE staff. If so, the report should be designated as an independent study.</p> <p>That an alignment study was performed is important, however the methodology used to perform the study was inadequate. Detail is provided below on the most critical areas found to be inadequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scope of Study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The study seems to be focused on a comparison of the alignment between the test forms and the test blueprints. Alignment must be examined between the test forms and the full breadth of the content standards in the grade and subject that is being assessed by each test. ▪ Given the above, there is no discussion of the ELA tests’ alignment with the speaking and listening standards, nor is there evidence of the alignment of the ELA writing prompts with the state’s writing standards in their respective grades and subjects. • Report’s Findings and Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The only recommendations offered seem to be those of specific panelists, and neither the findings nor the recommendations clearly indicate the issues in many instances, nor in many cases, what specific actions should be taken. A number of recommendations seem

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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>to be targeted at improving the blueprint documents themselves. The organization conducting the study should synthesize the findings and recommendations into a coherent and actionable narrative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Findings and recommendations may be based on panels of inadequate size and representativeness. For example, there were no findings nor recommendations for G6 ELA from what appears to be a single panelist (p.8 of PDF). <p>Examples of unclear recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Cross check standards with questions for alignment” (p. 7, G3 ELA) ▪ “Closer look at the blueprint, especially the writing component” (p. 8, G7 ELA) <p>There was no overall plan by MDE to address the actionable findings and recommendations. Only one specific instance could be found, which was on p. 10, where a note was added that stated the review led to the removal of one 5th grade mathematics standard from the test (and presumably from the blueprint).</p> <p>Finally, the MDE submission index cites Chapter 11 of the technical report as the primary source of validity, but it is just a summary of the evidence to be found elsewhere. Information in Chapter 2 and 3, along with evidence from Critical Element 2.1 is cited.</p>
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of an alignment study that provides an overall set of recommendations and findings that are clearly actionable. • Evidence of an alignment study that includes panels of sufficient size and representativeness. 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of an alignment study that includes panelist judgment of alignment to the entire body of standards, including, but not limited to, panelist judgement of alignment of ELA tests with the state’s speaking, listening, and writing standards. 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

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>3.1.a Internal Alignment Report-June 2017</p> <p>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final</p>	<p>3.1.a – While DOK is addressed, it is not clear the items are measuring the intended cognitive processes. The references to cognitive demand or cognitive complexity do not provide evidence of the intended cognitive processes.</p> <p>On p. 115-116 of the technical report, there is discussion of future studies to examine the extent to which the cognitive skills and processes employed by students match those identified in the construct domains. Such studies would be useful in order to provide this additional evidence.</p> <p>To evaluate the cognitive processes, cognitive labs could be conducted, and/or additional statistical analyses of intact operational forms.</p>
<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"> • Evidence that assessments measure the intended cognitive processes 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

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>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final, Sections 11.4, 11.5</p>	<p>The technical report includes results of Principal Component Analyses, analyses of correlation between reporting categories/strands, and DIF analyses. The first two are detailed in 11.4, and the latter in 11.5.</p> <p>Evidence seems to indicate the tests are unidimensional, there is satisfactory correlation between reporting categories, and DIF is acceptable.</p> <p>It was noted that Grade 4 ELA PCA values, correlation between categories, and reliabilities all differed somewhat from those values for other grades and subjects. MDE should investigate these differences and take appropriate action, if warranted.</p> <p>Correlations in Table 11.3 beginning on p. 119 of the technical report should be corrected for attenuation. This would not likely change the findings, however.</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No further evidence is needed</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 MISSISSIPPI

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>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final, Section 11.5</p>	<p>No evidence on relationships with other variables was provided. Narrative was provided on p. 122 of the technical report regarding studies that could be performed, but no specific plans or timelines are given.</p> <p>DIF was covered in Section 11.5 of the technical report, but would be more appropriately placed in section 11.4 of the Technical Report.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables. 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final, Chapter 10, p.104; Appendix V, p. 493; Tables 10.5 and 10.6</p>	<p>Test reliabilities, overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the assessments, and consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification are all adequate.</p> <p>The cut scores on the scale that was selected are relatively close together, which could result in variations of up to two performance levels when measurement error is taken into account.</p> <p>The reliabilities should be reported for strands.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 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 that reliabilities for each strand are provided. 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

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>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final, p.24 & p. 32 (Bias and Sensitivity); pp. 27-28 (Universal Design); Section 11.5 (DIF); p. 48-50 (accessibility, accommodations, and alternate accommodated forms such as Braille and large print)</p> <p>2.3.d-MAP_3-8_TCM_Updated_April_2016, p.6</p>	<p>2.3.d is offered as an example of accessibility features for the online test.</p> <p>The technical report section on DIF (11.5.1) also provides evidence for this critical element.</p> <p>Bias and sensitivity reviews (3.3.2.2) also provide evidence of support.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 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 MISSISSIPPI

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>Exhibit 6.2 -MAP Standard Setting Report-2016</p> <p>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final, Tables 7.7 and 7.8, p. 78 (PL Distribution); Appendix R, pp. 440-447 (Scale Score Distributions); Table 10.2 and 10.3, p. 109 (CSEM at passing and proficient cuts only)</p>	<p>It is unclear whether the standard setting report provides any relevant evidence in this area.</p> <p>Appendix U of the technical report includes conditional standard errors of measurement for each scale score. While the error at the extreme ends of the distribution is higher, there are no students scoring in those regions.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final – Ch. 5, pp.52-55 (Raw scores); pp. 56-66 (handscoring); Ch 9, Calibration, Scaling, and Equating, pp.96-103</p>	<p>Overall, documentation is sufficient, with the one exception noted below.</p> <p>On p. 66 of the technical report, the table indicates a significant number of non-adjacent scores for all components, especially in the lower grades. Even for the 2-point components, the rate of non-adjacency is unusually high. Narrative on page 65 states that condition code responses are not scored, so it is difficult to understand how non-adjacent scores on a 2-point dimension can occur.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the handscoring rubrics, criteria, and overall processes are generating valid and reliable scores for the ELA Writing Component. 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

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>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final – Ch 9, Calibration, Scaling, and Equating, pp.96-103</p>	<p>Evidence provided indicates that processes are in place that will allow equating back to the 2015-2016 administration as the baseline year.</p> <p>Two forms of each test in Algebra 1 and English II were administered, one in fall 2015 and one in spring 2016, and evidence is sufficient that the scores on the forms are comparable on the respective content area tests.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 		<p>Submission template text for this critical element states that multiple versions are not administered.</p> <p>No evidence was submitted regarding device comparability (e.g., laptops, desktops, tablets) for computer-based tests. Peer review guidance offers suggestions for evidence that can be submitted to satisfy the criteria for this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 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 that assessments delivered by different types of devices yield results that are comparable in meaning and interpretation. 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Final</p> <p>3.1.a Internal Alignment Report-June 2017</p>	<p>Chapters 3-7 and 9-11 all contain evidence that the state has a system that can be used to monitor, maintain, and improve the quality of its assessment system. However, Section 11.11 on p. 130 describes only general plans to conduct future correlation studies with external measures, exploratory factor analyses, and an evaluation of an expanded IRT model. These plans should also include studies to monitor scale drift. There is no formal plan or timeline to indicate ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>As indicated in the comments for Critical Element 2.1, it is not clear as to the plans to address findings and recommendations from the alignment study.</p> <p>It is not clear what role that the TAC plays in technical analysis, and how they may help in ongoing maintenance of the assessment system. The TAC met four times during the period covered by this peer review, yet there is little evidence of its role.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 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 the short term as well as strategic plans for maintaining and/or improving the state’s assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

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>Exhibit 5.1.a Students-with-disabilities-regulations-2012</p> <p>Exhibit 5.1.b -Technical Report_Volume II-Excerpt, pp. 1-2</p> <p>Exhibit 5.1.c-MAP_3-8_TCM_Updated_April_2016-Excerpt</p>	<p>5.1.a – Although the submission index cites specific pages, the entire document contains information defining SWDs, outlining the process for determining eligibility for the statewide content assessments or the alternate assessment, and provides guidance for IEP teams.</p> <p>Exhibit 5.1.b – Provides information on accessibility features available to all students, as well as those available to students with disabilities. A table is provided that shows the number of students by grade and subject who used the various accessibility features, or special accommodated forms such as Braille and large print.</p> <p>Exhibit 5.1.c – Excerpt from test administration manual showing the procedures for providing accessibility features and special accommodated forms.</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 MISSISSIPPI

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. 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

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>Exhibit 5.2.a-Guidelines for English Learners-2011</p> <p>Exhibit 5.3.a Mississippi Testing Accommodations Manual-2013</p>	<p>Exhibit 5.2.a - p. 48 states that ELs must be included in the assessment. Appendix E, pp. 93-96 discuss accommodations in general terms, but does not offer specific guidance on accommodations for ELs.</p> <p>Exhibit 5.3.a. provides information on all accommodations, including those for ELs, such as English-to-heritage or heritage-to-English translation tools (p.6). It is not clear if there are other accommodations. Some mention of accommodations for ELs is made briefly on p. 3 and p. 9 as well.</p> <p>Reference is made on p. 50 to an <i>English Language Learner Testing Accommodation Manual</i> , and a link is provided, but the link is inoperative. Having specific guidance such as this would be helpful, rather than relying on information in separate documents.</p>
<p>Section 5.2 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 MISSISSIPPI

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>Exhibit 5.3.a Mississippi Testing Accommodations Manual-2013, pp. 4-6</p> <p>Exhibit 5.3.b -Accommodation-request-form-2016</p> <p>Exhibit 5.3.c - MS Code 37-16-9 Modification of testing instruments.</p> <p>Exhibit 5.1.b -Technical Report_Volume II-Excerpt, pp. 1-2</p>	<p>5.3.a – List of accommodations</p> <p>5.3.b – Form for request/approval of accommodations beyond the listed allowable accommodations</p> <p>5.3.c – State statute requiring accommodations for SWDs</p> <p>5.1.b - A table is provided that shows the number of students by grade and subject who used the various accessibility features, or special accommodated forms such as Braille and large print.</p> <p>No evidence was given to show that accommodations are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct, and allow meaningful interpretation of results and comparisons. Peer review guidance suggests reports of studies, data analyses, or other evidence to support that the scores are comparable to those on non-accommodated test forms.</p>
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence to show that accommodations are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct, allow meaningful interpretation of results and comparisons (this can be from existing research or professional judgement when research is not available). 		

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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>2.4.a - OPLAN FAST-Final, p. 14</p>	<p>2.4.a - Site visit checklist question #14 regards the appropriate use of accommodation by SWDs and ELs.</p> <p>No evidence for guidance to districts on monitoring accommodations, and no summary of monitoring efforts described in evidence 2.4.a.</p>
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the written procedures and guidance to districts for monitoring the use of accommodations during test administration. • Evidence of the summary of results of the monitoring of accommodations during test administration. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR MISSISSIPPI

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>6.1.a-SBE Minutes-July 2016</p> <p>6.1.b-SBE Backup Material</p> <p>1.4.a -Title 37-16-3</p> <p>1.4.b -Title 37-16-9</p>	<p>6.1.a – SBE meeting minutes showing approval of cut scores in July, 2016.</p> <p>6.1.b – Details on the standard setting process and outcomes, which shows that students are placed into one of five achievement levels. Performance level descriptors are provided for each grade and subject.</p> <p>1.4.a – statute requiring all students to participate</p> <p>1.4.b – statute requiring all SWDs to participate either in the statewide assessment or the alternate assessment</p>
<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 MISSISSIPPI

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>Exhibit 6.2 -MAP Standard Setting Report-2016</p>	<p>Full report of the Standard setting process, including methodology, panelist qualifications, performance level descriptors, impact data, policy review, and state board approval.</p> <p>Documentation indicates the appropriate use of industry-standard processes.</p>
<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 MISSISSIPPI

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>Exhibit 6.3.a -SBE Presentation Achievement Standards-Excerpt Exhibit 6.3.b -MAP Standard Setting Report-2016-Excerpt Exhibit 6.2 -MAP Standard Setting Report-2016</p>	<p>6.3.a – Presentation showing how proficiency rates on the new MAP are similar to performance on PARCC assessments the previous year.</p> <p>6.3.b – Discussion of the vertical articulation process, as well as a policy-level review of the proposed cut scores.</p> <p>6.2 – Evidence throughout the complete standard setting report includes more detail on the process, including the performance-level descriptors.</p> <p>The process by which the original, draft PLDs were developed and adopted does not seem to be included in any of the evidence. Not found was evidence that the state’s content standards were used as a main reference in writing the draft performance level descriptors, nor was there evidence that the performance level descriptors reflect the full range of the state’s academic content standards for each grade.</p> <p>The standard setting report does include a statement the PLDs may be revised based on feedback from the standard setting panelists.</p>

Section 6.3 Summary Statement

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that the state’s content standards were used as a main reference in writing the draft performance level descriptors
- Evidence that the performance level descriptors reflect the full range of the state’s academic content standards for each grade.

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 MISSISSIPPI

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., 	<p>6.4.a -2015-2016 MAP Technical Report-Reporting 6.4.b - Sample Reports 6.4.c - MAP 2016 Assessment Results-081716 6.4.d - Driving Instruction with MAP-V6-2016 6.4.e - Interpretative Guide -2016</p>	<p>6.4.a and b. provide information the reports and reporting timeline.</p> <p>6.4.c. – presentation of assessment results to State Board of Education</p> <p>6.4.d and e. provide background on the assessments, performance standards, reports, and appropriate interpretations of scores.</p> <p>Exhibit 6.2 – In Appendix G of the standard setting report, the policy definitions provided are assumed to be the ones upon which panelists’ judgment was based. These policy definitions are consistent with those provided in the Interpretive Guide, a document which is targeted to educators. However, the sample reports include policy definitions for families that are significantly different than those in the standard setting report and interpretive guide. Most notably, the parent report states that PL 3 denotes that performance in this level “Represents minimal understanding of a subject’s skills and knowledge at grade level.” In the standard setting report and interpretive guide, students at PL 3 “demonstrate general mastery of the knowledge and skills required for success in the grade or course in the content area. These students are able to perform approaching or at the level of difficulty, complexity, or fluency specified by the grade-level content standards.” These are significantly different interpretations.</p> <p>On 6.4.e, p. 1, the sample report may have a typo on the scale, where 837 on the horizontal axis may have intended to be 1037. There are other such instances of possible errors.</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 MISSISSIPPI

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		<p>On 6.4.e, p. 2 the bar graph and table of raw scores are redundant, and that space could be better used to provide more detail on the individual categories. Parents are directed to the MDE main elementary and secondary webpage to learn more about the scores, but it is not clear where on the webpage that this information can be found. A total raw score is provided, but there is no caveat for parents on the appropriate interpretation of these scores, as there is in the interpretive guide for educators. Providing a total raw score may lead parents to draw inappropriate inferences or conclusions from their child’s report.</p> <p>On the sample report, there is no guidance regarding the appropriate interpretation of the mean scale scores by school, district, and state. These scores should not be presented in terms of performance levels, since these designations only apply at the student level.</p> <p>CSEM is provided on the student report, but there is no indication as to what CSEM stands for or how to interpret it. That information is included in the interpretive guide, but again, the introduction states that the audience for that document is educators and districts.</p> <p>Overall, the interpretive guides and student reports should be carefully and thoroughly reviewed for consistency, accuracy, and completeness.</p>
<p>Section 6.4 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 the interpretation of performance levels is consistent across standard setting reports, interpretive guides, and student reports. Evidence that standard error noted on the student report is explained for parents, guardians, and other users of this report. 		

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.