



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Candice McQueen  
Commissioner of Education  
Tennessee Department of Education  
710 James Robertson Parkway  
Nashville, TN 37243

October 10, 2018

Dear Commissioner McQueen:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated TDOE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, the following:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments for grades 3-8 (TNReady): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Reading/language arts, mathematics, and science general assessments in high school (end of course TNReady): **Partially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

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

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202  
<http://www.ed.gov/>

*The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.*

Because the 2018 peer review resulted in a designation of partially met requirements, I am placing a condition on TDOE's Title I grant award. This condition will remain in place until such time as TDOE presents evidence that the reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments meet all of the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. The condition also stipulates that the Department may take further action if the condition was not resolved in a timely manner.

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. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 4.2 and 5.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on DESE's federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

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

In addition, the full peer review notes from the review are enclosed. These recommendations to the Department formed the basis of our determination. Please note that the peers' recommendations may differ from the Department's feedback; we encourage you to read the full peer notes for additional suggestions and recommendations for improving your assessment system beyond what is noted in the Department's feedback.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The TDOE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. In the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, began to apply to State assessments. Department staff carefully reviewed the evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the TDOE administration of the TNReady assessments needs to meet one additional requirement regarding supports and the enhancement of the accessibility of these assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning. This requirement is listed under critical element 4.2.

Page 3 – Honorable Candice McQueen

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 Nkemjika Ofodile-Carruthers of my staff at: [OSS.Tennessee@ed.gov](mailto:OSS.Tennessee@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank Brogan  
Assistant Secretary for  
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Heather Peltier, Director of Assessments

**Critical Elements Reviewed and Evaluated as “Not Meeting Requirements-Additional Evidence Needed”**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the test blueprints describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that address the depth and breadth of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results.</li> <li>• Evidence of 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).</li> </ul>
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills (e.g., the analytic criteria used in the evaluation of test item data, or “business rules” used in evaluating these data).</li> </ul>
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its personally identifiable student information.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment (e.g., an independent evaluation of the alignment) of the tests 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 depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures 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.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and</p>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<b>accessibility</b>	<p>high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that TDOE 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 (e.g., the analytic criteria used in the evaluation of test item data, or “business rules” used in evaluating these data for fairness).</li> <li>• Evidence that the State supports and enhances the accessibility of the assessments through appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, by incorporating principles of universal design for learning (section 1111(b)(2)(B)(xiii) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act).</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students (e.g., theta distributions, particularly at the upper end of the distribution).</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics (grades 3-8):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of score comparability across computer-based versus paper/pencil versions.</li> </ul> <p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan to follow up on the issues identified in the end-of-course (EOC) comparability studies; and a plan for any issues identified through the 3-8 comparability analyses.</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<p>For all assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that 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).</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 - Accommodations</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence 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.</li> </ul>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades.</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
Students	
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For the TNReady reading/language arts and mathematics grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of the percentages of students not tested in the EOC assessments.</li> <li>• Evidence that the Grades 3-8 and EOC State, district and school assessment results may be disaggregated by gender and migrant status.</li> <li>• Evidence of the State’s process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State makes student reports available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille, large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> </ul>

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

## March 2018 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 Tennessee

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3**  
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .... 4  
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards ..... 7  
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 12  
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 13  
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 14

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 15**  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 16  
2.2 – Item Development..... 22  
2.3 – Test Administration ..... 26  
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)29  
2.5 – Test Security ..... 31  
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 35

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 36**  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 37  
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 40  
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 41  
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 46

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 47**  
4.1 – Reliability..... 48  
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 51  
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 56  
4.4 – Scoring ..... 59  
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 64  
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 66  
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 67

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 67**  
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 68  
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 71  
5.3 – Accommodations..... 73  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 75

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 75**  
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 76  
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 77  
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 80  
6.4 – Reporting..... 82

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 Tennessee

**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
------------------	--	--

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence of adoption of the Tennessee academic content standards:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.1</b> TN SBE 4-15-16_Minutes (pages 4-5 and page 9)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.2</b> 238179_Setting_the_Standards_Report_Book__FINAL_7-25-17</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.3</b> Public Chapter 423 , page 1, explicitly states that the academic standards shall be fully implemented in Tennessee public schools.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.4</b> TNCode</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.5</b> Press release on standards adoption</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.6</b> Standards Article</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.7</b> Standards Review Policy 7_24_15</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.8</b> TCA_Standards</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b> <b>Exhibit 1.1.1:</b> (Page 9) provides a record of State Board adoption of standards for English language arts and mathematics. Standards are included for grades K-8, the required high school courses of Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II (or Integrated Math I,II,II), as well as the options for the required fourth year math course and the ELA standards for grades K-12.</p> <p>(Procedure and Challenge): Since first reading of the standards, the State Board staff has reviewed additional feedback from the public, higher education faculty for the SAILS mathematics program, and industry representatives.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.2</b> summarizes the process followed by the state to adopt challenging academic content standards for English language arts and mathematics. The report also makes it clear that science standards are under review and are expected to be implemented in 2018-19.</p> <p>The outlined stakeholder input and review process seems extensive and appropriate, but it would be helpful to review the relevant demographics and credentials of various committee members, including: race/ethnicity, sex, years of experience, degree status, and related credentials. Exhibit 1.1.4 speaks to this area, but not with required specificity.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.3:</b> Public Chapter 423 states that these academic standards shall be fully implemented in Tennessee public schools. WHEREAS, these new Tennessee academic standards shall be adopted and fully implemented in Tennessee public schools in the 2017-2018 school year, at which time the previously adopted set of standards shall be rescinded (Page 1).</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>The Tennessee State Board of Education has the authority to adopt academic content standards (Exhibit 1.1.4).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.5 and 1.1.6</b> speak to TN’s public announcement of standards adoption, which is not required in the peer review documentation.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.7</b> is the State Board of Education (SBE) policy that states that academic standards shall be reviewed at least every 6 years, pursuant to additional SBE requirements (Phase in science 2018-19 see 2.2 Training PPT).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.8</b> is a picture of the state code that requires educational programs related to the standards within LEA purview [reflective of content in Exhibit 1.1.3, section 1(e)]</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b>            TN formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State. Documentation of the outreach might have been strengthened by the addition of a plan that targets those with minimal access to television and/or the internet.</p> <p>No evidence is submitted for science, which will require additional review.</p> <p>Were standard review panels representative of various stakeholder groups and did they include appropriate content expertise? (addressed in 1.2)</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee

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"> <li>Evidence that TN formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State. This expectation follows any time that science assessment is addressed from this point forward.</li> </ul>	
Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the Tennessee academic standards contain coherent and rigorous content and encourage the teaching of advanced skills:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.16</b> stds_english_language_arts  <b>Exhibit 1.2.17</b> stds_math  <b>Exhibit 1.1.2</b> 238179_Setting_the_Standards_Report_Book__FINAL_7-25-17  <b>Exhibit 1.2.7</b> SRP Process Diagram  <b>Exhibit 1.2.4</b> SREB_TN External Review  <b>Exhibit 1.2.1</b> Copy of Higher Ed Faculty_content teams_Standards reviewers who completed review  <b>Exhibit 1.2.3</b> Higher Ed Feedback Report_V4  <b>Exhibit 1.2.5</b> SRC_Bios_Updated  <b>Exhibit 1.2.6</b> Recommendations for revision_SRC_FINAL  <b>Exhibit 1.2.10</b> Position Statement_SRC_1.20.16_FINAL  <b>Exhibit 1.2.8</b> Tennessee Academic Standards Review - ELA - submitted  <b>Exhibit 1.2.9</b> Tennessee Academic Standards Review - Math- submitted</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the Tennessee academic standards were developed with broad stakeholder involvement:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.1.2</b> 238179_Setting_the_Standards_Report_Book__FINAL_7-25-17  <b>Exhibit 1.2.7</b> SRP Process Diagram  <b>Exhibit 1.2.4</b> SREB_TN External Review  <b>Exhibit 1.2.1</b> Copy of Higher Ed Faculty_content teams_Standards reviewers who completed review  <b>Exhibit 1.2.5</b> SRC_Bios_Updated  <b>Exhibit 1.2.2</b> Copy of Math and ELA Educator Team Contact List_9.17.15  <b>Exhibit 1.2.8</b> Tennessee Academic Standards Review - ELA - submitted</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibit 1.2.1-2.3:</b> present the 10 members of IHE, appointed by their respective presidents to complete this work, who were involved in the review of content standards in ELA (4 members) and mathematics (6 members).</p> <p>1.2, Page 1: 9 out of 10 reviewers said that the rigor of the standards is just right. This includes 100% of ELA reviewers.</p> <p>1.3, Page 4: They were impressed with the rigor, coherence, continuity, and clarity of the new math standards and felt they were incredibly comprehensive and grade-appropriate.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.4:</b> presents outline of results an external evaluation of TN ELA and mathematics standards conducted by four expert reviewers from Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). Standards are deemed generally rigorous and coherent. Researchers emphasize preparing teachers to be able to instruct at levels sufficiently rigorous to match the standards.</p> <p>Page 5: Reviewers both described the drafted standards as “content specific, rigorous, measurable, and grade-level appropriate.”</p> <p>Both reviewers noted that the TN standards are aligned with other state standards that have been validated for college and career readiness (Page 7).</p> <p>Higher Ed faculty teams do not delineate the qualifications of the members.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.5- 2.6:</b> conveys the qualifications of the Standards Recommendation Committee (SRC). Also elaborates how they were involved in reviewing</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Exhibit 1.2.9</b> Tennessee Academic Standards Review - Math- submitted</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.11</b> 4-Subject Level ELA</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.12</b> 4-Subject Level Math</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.13</b> 5-GradeLevelReports (003) (math standards feedback summary)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.14</b> 5-GradeLevelReports (ELA standards feedback summary)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.15</b> Public Feedback-WebsiteRoundtables (information about public feedback collection)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.18</b> standards writer_reviewer committees math ELA (composition of standards review committees)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.19</b> agenda kick_off meeting for standards writers ELA math</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.20</b> Kick-off Presentation 5_3_15 math and ELA (outlines process and timeline for standards review)</p>	<p>recommendations from public and educator advisory panels. They developed 8 recommendations to improve the ELA standards and 11 recommendations to improve the mathematics standards. These recommendations appear to have influenced standards development, as reflected in the IHE commentary (Exhibits 1.2.2-2.3).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.7:</b> conveys a clear, transparent diagram of the standards review process and membership.</p> <p><b>Exhibits 1.2.8-2.9:</b> provides evidence that the State Collaborative on Reform in Education (SCORE) reviewed drafts of the ELA and math standards as part of the review process, including major findings regarding ELA: alignment with college demands and cross-content literacy, as well as clear guidance regarding grade-level text complexity; and five recommendations in mathematics addressing gaps or inconsistencies with prior standards and coding.</p> <p>2.8, Page 16: With two significant exceptions, Tennessee’s draft TES substantially meet Achieve’s criteria. To be well prepared for postsecondary success, high school graduates must be able to apply literacy skills across academic disciplines as well as within career and technical courses. Tennessee’s standards, however, do not attend to developing literacy in the content areas and as a result reduce the likelihood that Tennessee high school graduates will be well prepared. Tennessee should also provide educators clear guidance on what is regarded as the appropriate grade-level complexity of texts. Not clear how the recommendations were addressed.</p> <p>2.9, Page 1: Achieve uses a set of six criteria: rigor, coherence, focus, specificity, clarity/accessibility, and measurability. For the purposes of this analysis, the</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>TMS were compared with the current Tennessee State Standards (TSS) for Mathematics and analyzed with respect to these criteria.</p> <p>2.9, Page 29: The draft TMS are generally rigorous, coherent, and focused. This finding is especially true for grades K–8, with only a few exceptions, which are detailed in this report and in the accompanying alignment chart.</p> <p>13 types of stakeholders reviewed the ELA and math standards (to keep, review, or remove). Do not know how representativeness of the reviewers, but impressive numbers. Then presented by grade-level.</p> <p>Website and regional roundtables to obtain more feedback—good.</p> <p>Writer and review team compositions and meeting agendas seem appropriate.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.10:</b> provides the SRC’s recommendations to the SBE related to preparing for standards implementation.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.11-2.14:</b> provides tables and summaries of the ELA and math standards that were kept, recommended for review/revision, or recommended for removal and lists of examples of the “top ten” in each category. Acceptance rates range generally between 70-80%.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.15:</b> PPT overview of initial stakeholder website review of standards feedback, and elaboration of group constitution by role (teacher, parent, IHE, etc.).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.16</b> (Page 1): Standards should measure</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>excellence, not just benchmark skills; therefore, the committee of Tennessee teachers, administrators, and higher education faculty developed a set of learning outcomes that embraces an overall expectation of 21st century literacy skills necessary to succeed in post-secondary and workforce arenas.</p> <p>Ultimate goal—students who are post-secondary and workforce-ready.</p> <p>Foundational Literacy standards are the strands that lead to literacy competence: Language, Reading, Speaking and Listening, and Writing (page 2).</p> <p>(Page 16): The standards have been written based on a progression beginning with the skills in the Foundational Literacy standards—print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, word and sentence composition, and fluency. The progression continues to build toward a more sophisticated manipulation of language in the upper grades. This progression of building and reinforcing foundational skills will be critical for the success of Tennessee students as they advance towards mastering post-secondary and workforce expectations.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.17</b> (Page 1): The Tennessee State Math Standards were reviewed and developed by Tennessee teachers for Tennessee schools. The rigorous process used to arrive at the standards in this document began with a public review of the then-current standards. After receiving 130,000+ reviews and 20,000+ comments, a committee composed of Tennessee educators spanning elementary through higher education reviewed each standard. The committee scrutinized and debated each standard using public feedback and the collective expertise of the group.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>The standards for each grade are not written to be nor are they to be considered as an island in and of themselves. There is a flow, or progression, from one grade to the next, all the way through to the high school standards. There are four main progressions that are composed of mathematical domains/conceptual categories (Page 3).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 1.2.18-23:</b> present the Governor’s announcement of the standards development process and supplemental information related to the purpose of the review, the final list of standards advisory committee members, a kick-off meeting agenda, and PPT.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b>            TN submitted sufficient evidence to support the claim that their academic content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics 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>No such evidence was submitted in science. It will be in the classroom during the 2018 – 2019 school year.</p>
<b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [see comments in 1.1]</li> </ul>		

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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p align="center"><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></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"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) has been the state’s testing program since 1988, and it includes TNReady assessments in math, English language arts, social studies, and science, as well as alternative assessments, like MSAA and TCAP-Alt, for students with special needs in reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12) and in science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</p>	<p>Evidence meets requirement.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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;</li> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>TDOE included a table to show that the state requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system.</p> <p>On the website, English learners (ELs) are assessed each year with an assessment called ACCESS 2.0. <i>(Note: Tennessee has partnered with a non-profit organization called WIDA since 2014-15 in order to measure the English proficiency levels of EL students. ACCESS 2.0 is a WIDA-developed assessment.)</i></p> <p>Additionally on the site, TDOE offers alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards in compliance with the U.S. Department of Education federal regulations and guidance. A student must have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) and the primary disability must be recognized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).</p>	<p>The submitted evidence was not enough to validate this element, and it was necessary to look at language on the website to ensure that SWD and EL populations had clear policies. TDOE should ensure that all required evidence can be accessed from that submitted in OMB MAX.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></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>TDOE included a table to show that the state requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system.</p> <p>The state highlighted the participation data as evidence and showed that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system</p>	<p>No additional evidence required</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></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 Tennessee

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></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"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibit provides statements of the purposes of the assessments:  <b>Exhibit 2.1.55</b> Purpose of Testing documentation</p> <p>The following exhibits provide statements of the intended interpretations of assessment results:  <b>Exhibit 6.4.25</b> XXXXX_TN1704_EOC_GTI_v03-02_b</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.40</b> XXXXX_TN1705_3-8_GTI_v03_02_a</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.41</b>  18261_TN1703_EOC_GTI_OPT_FINAL</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.42</b> XXXXX_TN1704_EOC_GTI_v03_02_b</p> <p>The following exhibits describe the structure of each assessment in terms of the number of items and representation of standards:  <b>Exhibit 2.1.1</b> Grade 3_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.2</b> Grade 4_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.3</b> Grade 5_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.4</b> Grade 6_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.5</b> Grade 7_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.6</b> Grade 8_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.7</b> Alg I_Internal Blueprints_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.8</b> Algebra II_Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.9</b> Geometry_Internal Blueprints_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.10</b> Integrated Math I_Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.11</b> Integrated Math II_Internal</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibit 2.2.8</b> (Section 2.2 Item Development Rationale) and <b>6.4.42</b> not located.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.55:</b> The TCAP tests are designed to assess true student understanding and not just basic memorization and test-taking skills. TCAP measures student understanding of our state standards.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.25:</b> Guide to Test Interpretation 2017–18 TCAP End of Course Assessments defines various score reports with target audiences and addresses intended interpretations.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.40</b> (Page 4): Guide to Test Interpretation 2017–18 TCAP Grades 3-8 Assessments The results presented in the reports are helpful in making important decisions regarding instructional needs for classes and individual students.</p> <p>Interpretations Guides for 2016-2017 were also provided.</p> <p>Purposes and intended interpretations and uses of results are sufficient.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.1 – Exhibit 2.1.12:</b> Major: Work of the Grade X Number of Items for 2017-2018 and 2016-2017. Major work statements seem too broad.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.13</b> ELA Internal Blueprints 2016-2017 delineates standards assessed X reporting categories.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.27 -- Exhibit 2.1.30:</b> Clusters with an asterisk indicate major content of the grade. Structure of the math tests. External blueprints are similar to the internal blueprints.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.12</b> Integrated Math III_Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.13</b> ELA Internal Blueprints 2016-2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.27</b> Grades 3-5_2016 math external blueprints  <b>Exhibit 2.1.28</b>            Grades 6-8_2016 math external blueprints  <b>Exhibit 2.1.29</b> Integrated High School_2016 math_external blueprints  <b>Exhibit 2.1.30</b> Traditional High School_2016 math_external blueprints  <b>Exhibit 2.1.31</b> ELA            Blueprints_Grade_3to5_External_Public Facing_2016-17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.32</b> ELA            Blueprints_Grade_6to8_External_Public Facing_2016-17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.33</b> ELA            Blueprints_Grade_HighSchool_External_Public Facing_2016-17</p> <p>The following exhibits describe the structure of each assessment in terms of the item types and response formats:  <b>Exhibit 2.1.14</b> G3-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications draft_REV_8.31.2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.15</b> G4-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications_draft_REV_8.31.2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.16</b> ELA G5 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.17</b> ELA-G6_Item-Specifications_10-20-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.18</b> ELA G7 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.19</b> ELA G8 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.20</b> TNR Grades 9-10 ELA Test Item</p>	<p><b>Exhibit 2.1.31 -- Exhibit 2.1.33 ELA:</b> Part 1 is Writing; Part 11 is Reading includes Literature, Informational, Vocabulary and Conventions with nested standards.</p> <p>ELA domains: I. Foundational Literacy; II. Reading; III. Listening; IV. Writing.</p> <p>Under each of these domains, the item specifications discuss the ELA content standards pertaining to the domain. For each standard, the following sections are provided: Alignment Notes, which provides do's and don'ts for items written to each standard as well as the range of content that should be assessed in the items for the standard; Text Type, which indicates whether the text type for the standard is informational or literary and may indicate if specific kinds of texts are required; Task Demand, which describes various kinds of items that could be written for the standard; and Sample Items and Stems section, which contains various examples of items or item stems for the standard.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.14 – Exhibit 2.1.21:</b> ELA item specifications: purpose is to write and/or evaluate items that are aligned to the TN ELA standards and effectively assess grade X ELA content.</p> <p>Items that are well aligned to the reading standards will require a DOK level of 2 or 3 or an overall cognitive demand level of 2, 3, or 4 in a standards-specific taxonomy (page 15, 4<sup>th</sup> grade). See 3.2</p> <p>Does the item align to the proposed standard(s) (e.g., Does the item reflect the cognitive rigor of the grade level standard(s)?) Item Review Checklist (page 56, 4<sup>th</sup> grade).            Appendices address cognitive demand and DOK</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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Specs rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.21</b> TNR Grade 11 ELA Test_Item-Specifications 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.34</b> Alg. 1 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.35</b> Alg. II Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.36</b> Geometry Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.37</b> Grade 3 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.38</b> Grade 4 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.39</b> Grade 5 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.40</b> Grade 6 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.41</b> Grade 7 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.42</b> Grade 8 Item Specs 2016_17</p> <p>The following exhibits describe the structure of each assessment in terms of the item difficulties:  <b>Exhibit 2.1.22</b> TN Psychometric Stats Requirement_QAI-p-values</p> <p>The following exhibits describe the structure of each assessment in terms of the applicable time limits:  <b>Exhibit 2.1.23</b> EOC_ELA_Fact_Sheet  <b>Exhibit 2.1.24</b> EOC_Math_Fact_Sheet  <b>Exhibit 2.1.25</b> Grades_2-8_ELA_Fact_Sheet  <b>Exhibit 2.1.26</b> Grades_2-8_Math_Fact_Sheet  <b>Exhibit 2.3.4</b>  19302_TN1704_TAP_ALG_GEO_FINAL v320170411T173711_001, pages 4 &amp; 22  <b>Exhibit 2.3.5</b> 19620_TN1705_TAPS_6-8_ELA_FINALr1v220170411T225901_001, pages 4 &amp; 22</p> <p>The following exhibits describe the alignment of the assessments to the full range of the Tennessee Academic Standards and balance of content:  <b>Exhibit 2.1.14</b> G3-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications draft_REV_8.31.2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.15</b> G4-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications_draft_REV_8.31.2017</p>	<p>(Webb)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.34 -- Exhibit 2.1.42:</b> Math item specifications: include revised standards, specifications per standard and use of calculator. Possible practices are coded but not explained.</p> <p>Math item specifications do not reference challenging content, or knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.22:</b> The contractor suggests a general (somewhat normal) distribution of p-values (Item Difficulty). Seems like the distribution should reflect the difficulty inherent in the content standards.</p> <p>Assessment structures are similar across subjects and grade levels (performance levels).</p> <p>See prior comments/notes.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.2.7:</b> Mathematics Item Development with respect to Item Types; assumptions and distributions of item types, but located no reference to ETS or WestEd.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.57</b> TAC Notes (page 2): Regarding the ranges in the test blueprints, the TAC is okay with the ranges and is also okay with rotating content. The TAC did note that ranges that are too large could lead to differences across tests across years.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.12:</b> Compare blueprints from 2016-17 with 2017-18; there are differences in major work of the grade.</p> <p>TDOE explained that they have chunked assessment into smaller subparts. TDOE received feedback that the subparts should fit between bell</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p> <b>Exhibit 2.1.16</b> ELA G5 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.17</b> ELA-G6_Item-Specifications_10-20-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.18</b> ELA G7 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.19</b> ELA G8 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.20</b> TNR Grades 9-10 ELA Test Item Specs rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.21</b> TNR Grade 11 ELA Test_Item-Specifications 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.2.8</b> Section 2.2 Item Development Rationale                 </p> <p>The following exhibits describe the alignment of the assessment design to the specific knowledge and skills in the Tennessee academic content standards:</p> <p> <b>Exhibit 2.1.14</b> G3-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications draft_REV_8.31.2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.15</b> G4-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications_draft_REV_8.31.2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.16</b> ELA G5 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.17</b> ELA-G6_Item-Specifications_10-20-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.18</b> ELA G7 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.19</b> ELA G8 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.20</b> TNR Grades 9-10 ELA Test Item Specs rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.21</b> TNR Grade 11 ELA Test_Item-Specifications 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.34</b> Alg. 1 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.35</b> Alg. II Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.36</b> Geometry Item Specs 2016_17                 </p>	<p>schedules. Students will now spend 30% less time taking state tests. Tennessee is at the minimum to test standards and is not able to reduce testing time (page 2). Adequate testing time could be an issue. Also, not likely that bell schedules are the same across the state.</p> <p>See prior comments/notes.</p> <p>State does not administer computer-adaptive assessments.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b>                      Blueprints do not include DOK. Suggest that complete blueprints include DOK level or an overall cognitive demand level. See 3.2. This concern is connected to overall Peer concerns regarding the issue of whether the assessments reflect the full performance continuum. Including specific, and higher, DOK requirements in the test blueprints might help address this concern. This begs the question of item refreshment, as well, which is unclear in the submission.</p> <p>The Peers strongly recommend that TN include revised blueprints that include DOK as it replenishes items (and with the assumption that this is part of their approach to continuous improvement).</p> <p>Point biserial values of .10 for operational items and .25 for anchor items may not be sufficiently prescriptive. The Peers recommend that this threshold be selected in relation to the standard error (meaning that it is statistically significant).</p> <p>The new assessment requires 30% less time to complete; however, there are potential consequences for this decision that the state should consider, such</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p> <b>Exhibit 2.1.37</b> Grade 3 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.38</b> Grade 4 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.39</b> Grade 5 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.40</b> Grade 6 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.41</b> Grade 7 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.42</b> Grade 8 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.2.7</b> Mathematics Item Development - Item Type Proposal for TDOE review_WestEd and ETS feedback_TDOE Feedback  <b>Exhibit 2.2.8</b> Section 2.2 Item Development Rationale, pages 8-13                 </p> <p>The following exhibits describe the approaches Tennessee uses to include challenging content and complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills:</p> <p> <b>Exhibit 2.1.57</b> TAC Notes_10 27 16_10 28 16_QAI_11 09 16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.14</b> G3-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications draft_REV_8.31.2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.15</b> G4-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications_draft_REV_8.31.2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.16</b> ELA G5 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.17</b> ELA-G6_Item-Specifications_10-20-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.18</b> ELA G7 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.19</b> ELA G8 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.20</b> TNR Grades 9-10 ELA Test Item Specs rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.21</b> TNR Grade 11 ELA Test_Item-Specifications 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.34</b> Alg. 1 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.35</b> Alg. II Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.36</b> Geometry Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.37</b> Grade 3 Item Specs 2016_17                 </p>	<p>as reliability. There were also concerns regarding the time allotments for the elementary level, particularly in writing, where the time appears to be too long for students to maintain attention (75 minutes; see 2.3.2, Page 8).</p> <p>TN did not submit alternate assessments (this will be done in December 2018).</p> <p>No evidence was submitted for science.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p> <b>Exhibit 2.1.38</b> Grade 4 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.39</b> Grade 5 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.40</b> Grade 6 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.41</b> Grade 7 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.42</b> Grade 8 Item Specs 2016_17                 </p> <p>                     The following exhibits describe the usability of the technology-based presentation of the assessments:  <b>Exhibit 2.1.56</b> Combined Tennessee Style Guide  <b>Exhibit 2.1.52</b> Nextera UX Scrolling + Zooming  <b>Exhibit 2.1.53</b> Proposed TDS Updates 6232016  <b>Exhibit 2.1.54</b> Student Research Day Results Overview                 </p>	

**Section 2.1 Summary Statement**

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- TN did not submit test design and development evidence for its alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS). They plan to submit this evidence in December 2018. Documentation regarding the AA-AAS will not be referenced further, though it remains a source of needed evidence.

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>The following exhibits provide a description of the process that the State uses to ensure that the item types are tailored for assessing the academic content standards:  <b>Exhibit 2.2.7</b> Mathematics Item Development - Item Type Proposal for TDOE review_WestEd and ETS feedback_TDOE Feedback  <b>Exhibit 2.2.8</b> Section 2.2 Item Development Rationale, pages 8-13  <b>Exhibit 2.2.9</b> Section 2.2 ELA Item Types - TNReady March 2015 Regional Meeting  <b>Exhibit 2.2.10</b> Section 2.2 ELA Passage Selection - TNReady March 2015 Regional Meeting  <b>Exhibit 2.2.11</b> Section 2.2 Math Item Types - TNReady March 2015 Regional</p> <p>The following exhibits detail the content standards to be tested:  <b>Exhibit 2.1.14</b> G3-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications draft_REV_8.31.2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.15</b> G4-ELA_Test-Item-Specifications_draft_REV_8.31.2017  <b>Exhibit 2.1.16</b> ELA G5 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.17</b> ELA-G6_Item-Specifications_10-20-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.18</b> ELA G7 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.19</b> ELA G8 Item Specifications rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.20</b> TNR Grades 9-10 ELA Test Item Specs rev 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.21</b> TNR Grade 11 ELA Test_Item-Specifications 10-19-16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.43</b> Alg. 1 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.44</b> Alg. II Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.45</b> Geometry Item Specs 2016_17</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibit 2.2.7:</b> Mathematics Item Development with respect to Item Types; assumptions and distributions of item types seem reasonable, but located no reference to ETS or WestEd.</p> <p>Item specifications and internal/external blueprints were discussed under 2.1.</p> <p>Using item types that allow the measurement of higher order thinking skills is purported.</p> <p>Every item that is submitted to be a field test item is reviewed by the TDOE content team as well as the</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p> <b>Exhibit 2.1.46</b> Grade 3 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.47</b> Grade 4 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.48</b> Grade 5 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.49</b> Grade 6 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.50</b> Grade 7 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.1.51</b> Grade 8 Item Specs 2016_17  <b>Exhibit 2.2.12</b> TNReady March District Meetings_Book 3-3-15 FINAL                 </p> <p>The following exhibits provide documentation of instructions provided to item writers and reviewers:  <b>Exhibit 2.5.4</b> Opening PPT Item Review Sept. 2017  <b>Exhibit 2.2.1</b> TN Math Item Review - Combined Math Presentation  <b>Exhibit 2.2.25</b> Bias_Sensitivity Passage Training  <b>Exhibit 2.2.26</b> IWW Opening Presentation March 2017  <b>Exhibit 2.2.27</b> IWW_ELA_March2017 3-3-17  <b>Exhibit 2.2.28</b> TN Item Writer Basics_VM edits  <b>Exhibit 2.2.29</b> TN Math Item Review 5-8  <b>Exhibit 2.2.30</b> TN Math Item Review Grades 2-4                 </p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence that items are developed by individuals with content expertise, experience as educators, and experience with special populations:  <b>Exhibit 2.2.6</b> Peer Review_Committee Applicant Demographics  <b>Exhibit 2.2.13</b> Christiansen Susan Resume - Specialist ELA  <b>Exhibit 2.2.14</b> Foss, Sharon resume - Specialist - Math (contractor)                 </p>	<p>Questar team.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.2.12</b> March District Assessment Meeting; includes several types of useful information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test design</li> <li>• Scoring and reporting information</li> <li>• Accessibility and accommodations</li> <li>• Administration policies and testing time</li> <li>• Technology readiness</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.5.4 -- Exhibit 2.2.30:</b> Documentation of instructions provided to item writers and reviewers</p> <p>Opening PPT Item Review: item/test security; science 2018-19; review for content, bias, accessibility (more detailed in other evidence).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.2.1</b> Objective (page 23): Ensure that the Difficulty and Depth of Knowledge of each item is accurate and consistent.</p> <p>Alignment (page 24): Does the item follow the item specifications and the scope and clarifications? And We need to consider both the breadth and depth of the standard when reviewing assessment items.</p> <p>DOK, clarity and accuracy explained. Items must reflect the cognitive rigor of the grade-level standards (page 28). See 3.2; 4.3.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.1:</b> The vast majority of DOKs for grades 3 – 8 ELA are 2s with a few 3s.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.2:</b> The vast majority of DOKs for grades 3 – 8 Math are 1s and 2s with four 3s at grade 8.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.2.25</b> Bias and Sensitivity Passage Training: (not well explained).</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p> <b>Exhibit 2.2.15</b> Herron, Pamela resume - Alt Assessment Specialist  <b>Exhibit 2.2.16</b> Hickman, Judy resume - Sr Specialist - Math  <b>Exhibit 2.2.17</b> Resume_Barnes_Curtis  <b>Exhibit 2.2.18</b> Resume_Chen_Natalie  <b>Exhibit 2.2.19</b> Resume_Durden_Sandra  <b>Exhibit 2.2.20</b> Resume_Hinderer_Kurt  <b>Exhibit 2.2.21</b> Resume_Kump_Laura  <b>Exhibit 2.2.22</b> Resume_Kuntz_Teresa  <b>Exhibit 2.2.23</b> Resume_Smiley_Julie  <b>Exhibit 2.2.24</b> Resume_Sofia_Jean  <b>Exhibit 2.2.31</b> Peer Review_Committee Applicant Demographics                 </p> <p>The following exhibits provide documentation of procedures for item review and for evaluating the quality of items in order to select items for operational use:</p> <p> <b>Exhibit 2.2.2</b> EFT Review Checklist Math  <b>Exhibit 2.2.3</b> Content 2 checklist math  <b>Exhibit 2.2.4</b> Content 3 Checklist math  <b>Exhibit 2.2.5</b> INTAKE Checklist for initial item review_math  <b>Exhibit 2.2.36</b> TN Item Review Checklist_ELA  <b>Exhibit 2.2.37</b> TNReady Passage Review Criteria Checklist_ELA                 </p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of procedures to evaluate the quality of items and select items for operational use:</p> <p> <b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport (pages 21-29)  <b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport (chapter 12)                 </p> <p>The following exhibit provides evidence that</p>	<p> <b>Exhibit 2.2.26 -- Exhibit 2.2.2.8:</b> Explained PLDs, EBSR Items (Evidence-Based Selected Response), deconstructing a standard, and principles of Universal Design. Item writer training appears adequate (and a bit more descriptive in terms of bias/sensitivity criteria than 2.2.25, though not sufficiently detailed).                 </p> <p> <b>Exhibit 2.2.6 and Exhibit 2.2.31 (repeated):</b> Peer Review Committee Applicant Demographics: presents demographics of participants.                 </p> <p> <b>Exhibit 2.2.13 -- Exhibit 2.2.24:</b> credentials of item developers seem appropriate.                 </p> <p> <b>Exhibit 2.2.2 -- Exhibit 2.2.5 and Exhibit 2.2.36, Exhibit 2.2.37:</b> procedures for item review and for evaluating the quality of items in order to select items for operational use.                 </p> <p>The distribution of items follows the external blueprint specifications/percentages for major work of the grade (as appropriate), reporting categories, and calculator use. Part of the Checklist for Embedded Field Test Forms (page 1).</p> <p>Align, rigor, balanced, accurate, and complete are among the action words used in the item review checklists.</p> <p> <b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport (Draft) and <b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport: evidence of procedures to evaluate the quality of items and select items for operational use. Classical and IRT statistical methods used to review items were described and seem typical and appropriate.                 </p> <p>DIF results for TNReady End of Course 2016-2017</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	accessibility features do not produce an inadvertent effect on the construct assessed: <b>Exhibit 2.1.54</b> Student Research Day Results Overview	were presented (pages 136-139), but no actual ACH item results were located.  <b>Peer Notes:</b> What was the basis for matching item types to specific content standards? (research literature) in 2.2.7?  In 2.2.25, the state should have provided reviewers with concrete examples of protected groups when making bias considerations, not merely generic labels like “cultures.” This is only about passage evaluation for ELA. How were all ELA items reviewed? Math?  How well do the demographics of the item reviewers in 2.2.6 match the actual State demographics?  Item level DIF results use in item evaluation and selection for TNReady Grades 3-8 should be provided; in addition, more clarity regarding how items exhibiting DIF were handled is needed.

**Section 2.2 Summary Statement**

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Documentation that items are not performing differentially across student groups in Grades 3-8 assessments in ELA or math was not submitted and is required (e.g., DIF analyses). In addition, the methods employed for these analyses and the decision rules used by TN with regard to the results are required.

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the state of Tennessee has established and communicated clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, through test administration manuals and test administrator scripts for all state assessments:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.1</b> 19300_TN1704_TAM_v01_09_optimized v220170411T165359_001</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.2</b> 19615_TN1705_TAM_v01_12_optimized v220170411T165531_001</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.4</b> 19302_TN1704_TAP_ALG_GEO_FINAL v320170411T173711_001</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.5</b> 19620_TN1705_TAPS_6-8_ELA_FINALr1v220170411T225901_001</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of instructions for the use of accommodations allowed by the state on assessments:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.17</b> Accessibility_Accommodation Guidance_2016_17</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.18</b> Accommodation Chart_16_17</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.19</b> Assessment_Accommodation_Memo_16_17</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.20</b> Determining_Appropriate_Accommodations</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.2.12</b> TNReady March District Meetings_Book 3-3-15 FINAL, pages 104-124</p> <p>Key documents regarding test administration are made available electronically and are provided to district and school test coordinators through a variety of communication modes, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Secure (sign-in required) website, Ed Tools:</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.6</b> EdToolsTAMTAPS</p>	<p><b>Peer Review:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.1:</b> Test Administration Manual TNReady Paper Assessments End of Course. Seems complete.</p> <p>(Page 20): Districts will establish a district-wide testing schedule to fit the needs of their staffing and facilities. Flexibility in test scheduling has some positives, but could lead to item exposure (e.g., writing prompt) across districts.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.2:</b> Test Administration Manual TNReady Assessments Grades 3 - 8. Includes standardized procedures for the administration of assessments, including administration with accommodations; security sections complete; policy statements regarding issues (e.g. Homebound) and various clear checklists.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.3:</b> Test Administration Manual TNReady Online Assessments End of Course. Appropriate checklists provided for system test coordinators, building test coordinators and test administrators (before, during testing and after). Uses of assessment accessibility and accommodations (students with disabilities and LEP) were also provided.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.4:</b> Test Administrator/Proctor Scripts Algebra/Geometry TNReady Assessments. Lots on test security. Not sure which EOC tests the State uses for accountability.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.5:</b> Test Administrator/Proctor Scripts English Language Arts TNReady Assessments Grades 6 through 8.</p> <p>Structure of Test Administration Manuals is basically the same and appears complete.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>- Public (no sign-in required) website, LiveBinder: <b>Exhibit 2.3.7</b> LiveBinderTAMTAPS</p> <p>- E-mailed communications to district testing coordinators: <b>Exhibit 2.3.16</b> Communications</p> <p>Section V of <b>Exhibit 2.3.1</b> 19300_TN1704_TAM_v01_09_optimized v220170411T165359_001, <b>Exhibit 2.3.2</b> 19615_TN1705_TAM_v01_12_optimized v220170411T165531_001, and <b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017 provide evidence of the State’s process for documenting modifications or disruptions of standardized test administration.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.8</b> SampleRI provides a sample of the interface used to document incidents, while <b>Exhibit 2.3.9</b> 2016-2017 Reports of Irregularity Summary provides a summary of documented incidents during the 2016-17 test administration.</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of statewide training meetings: <b>Exhibit 2.3.10</b> Fall Regional Book 2016 FINAL tabs corrected_Optimized20161012T223735_001 <b>Exhibit 2.3.11</b> Regional Assessment meetings Spring 2017 CAD_final20170303T163435_001 <b>Exhibit 2.3.13</b> Scheduled TNReady Trainings</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of the state’s procedures to ensure that all district-level individuals involved in test administration receive training for each test administration: <b>Exhibit 2.3.14</b> FINAL Fall Regional Meetings Registration Form</p>	<p><b>Exhibit 2.3.17 -- Exhibit 2.3.20:</b> instructions provided by the State to district testing coordinators, regarding the appropriate use of allowed accommodations for state assessments. Includes a guide for selecting and evaluating accommodations. Seem appropriate.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.2.12</b> March District Assessment Meeting; includes several types of useful information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test design</li> <li>• Scoring and reporting information</li> <li>• Accessibility and accommodations</li> <li>• Administration policies and testing time</li> <li>• Technology readiness</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.16:</b> For the 2016-17 school year, the department’s office of assessment logistics utilized both the weekly <i>Commissioner’s Update for Directors</i> and the EdTools message board to communicate assessment-related updates to districts and schools. The Test Administration Manuals (TAMs) and Test Administrator/Proctor Scripts (TAPS) were posted under the resources tab in EdTools, and paper copies were sent to schools.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.10 -- Exhibit 2.3.13:</b> Four dates and locations in Fall 2016 and four dates/locations in Spring 2017. Primary Test Coordinators and District Administrators were target audience. Attendance ranged from 89 to 229. Much of the presented information was consistent with prior presented evidence.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.14 and Exhibit 2.3.15:</b> Registration Forms (completed) used to make sure all district test</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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>Exhibit 2.3.15</b> Spring Regional Meetings Registration Form 2017</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence that Tennessee has clearly defined the technology and other related requirements necessary for schools to administer the assessments, and has communicated these requirements to schools and districts</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.17</b> Setup Installation Guide 2016 TN Final_optimized</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.18</b> Regional Technology Overview</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.19</b> Nextera_Prep</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.20</b> Re_Verification Steps for Online EOC</p> <p>The following exhibit provides evidence of a test administration manual that includes specific instructions for administering technology-based assessments:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017, pages 21-30 and 43-49</p> <p>The following exhibit provides evidence of contingency plans for managing possible challenges during test administration:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.12</b> TN EOC AWOP LASR Plan_FINAL</p>	<p>individuals involved in test administration receive training.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.17 is Exhibit 2.3.21:</b> This document is designed for technology coordinators responsible for the installation, administration, and configuration of the Nextera Assessment System. Successfully deploying the client software requires a solid understanding of the environment, requirements and specific testing needs (Page 4).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.18 is Exhibit 2.3.22:</b> Online platform training for testing and technology coordinators (Nextera) Fall 2016.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.19 is Exhibit 2.3.23</b> Nextera Prep: Checklist #9, page 2: All test administrators have been fully trained on test security and the prohibition of the possession and use of electronic devices during testing, beyond the one specifically provisioned for the purpose of taking the test.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.3:</b> references <i>Nextera® User Guide</i> for additional information and EdTools.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.12 (pages 2, 3):</b> Questar and TDOE will activate tactical operations centers (TOC). This will allow easy and rapid communications, issue identification, resolution and unified command and control across both organizations. The Tactical Operation Centers will be activated on the first day of the test window.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b> In 2.3.16, the distribution of testing information online (good—any record/data regarding utilization,</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>such as website hits?)</p> <p>School test coordinators should have a quick access list of common technology issues and how to resolve them immediately.</p>
<b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<u> X </u> No additional evidence is required		

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center"><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></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>TDOE’s 2016-17 plan for monitoring schools was structured as a fact finding visit. The state monitored testing but also wanted to find out what challenges the districts encountered as they began testing online.</p> <p>Objectives included interviews with various staff members involved in testing to ensure that all were trained and confident about responsibilities: test administration, test security, handling secure test materials, etc. Monitoring was done by TDOE staff members, including members of the Assessment Logistics team and CORE regional offices. There were 31 interviews conducted across 12 districts. Schools were selected based on several factors: a high number of reports of irregularity or a potential breach situation; a high percentage from erasure analysis; or some schools were selected at random.</p> <p>These visits were designed to provide support to the schools in addition to serving the purpose of monitoring assessment administration integrity.</p>	<p>This evidence describes an appropriate approach as there is a focus on schools that have a high risk actor, but the state implied that there could be a visit at any time as they are on a surprise and case by case basis.</p>
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<u> X </u> 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 Tennessee**

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

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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence of the state’s implementation of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through prevention of assessment irregularities:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.1</b> 19300_TN1704_TAM_v01_09_optimized v220170411T165359_001, pages 10-19, 23-28 and 30-31</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.2</b> 19615_TN1705_TAM_v01_12_optimized v220170411T165531_001, pages 10-19, 23-28, and 30-31</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017, pages 8-18, pages 23-30</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.4</b> 19302_TN1704_TAP_ALG_GEO_FINAL v320170411T173711_001 (Section I: Test Security)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.5</b> 19620_TN1705_TAPS_6-8_ELA_FINALr1v220170411T225901_001 (Section I: Test Security)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.5.3</b> Lead System Testing Coordinator 2016102520161024T131701_001, slides 47-68</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of specific test security instructions for accommodations providers:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.1</b> 19300_TN1704_TAM_v01_09_optimized v220170411T165359_001, pages 57-59</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.2</b> 19615_TN1705_TAM_v01_12_optimized v220170411T165531_001, pages 58-60</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017, pages 47-49</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017 (page 15): Immediately upon receipt of any information concerning a potential breach of security, the System Testing Coordinator must contact the Executive Director of the Office of Assessment Logistics. School and system administration must initiate an immediate and thorough investigation into the circumstances of the potential breach. The investigation should include written statements of all parties involved, including students if necessary, and any other evidence available to substantiate the claims of a breach in security.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.5.7 -- Exhibit 2.5.10:</b> Erasure analyses appear limited to EOC tests. What forensics analyses are applied to other required tests? May consider using person fit analysis.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.5.5</b> Summary RIs 2016-17: For students who took the wrong test or subtest, the State took four different actions (most frequent was to nullify the test-304, but 49 were processed normally). Are State actions consistent across tests, districts, etc.?</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.5.6:</b> is a decision tree used by TDOE staff to respond to test irregularities; it would be helpful to have examples of the documentation system and typical timelines associated with responses.</p> <p><b>Exhibits 2.3.1 (pages 68-73) -- Exhibit 2.3.3 (pages 55-58):</b> (Test Administration Manuals) presents Report of Irregularity explanations, responsibilities for school test administrator, school and district test coordinators, and other reporting procedures.</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 Tennessee**

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>established consequences for confirmed violations of test security:  <b>Exhibit 2.5.1</b> TNCodeSecurity  <b>Exhibit 2.5.2</b> SBE Licensure Policies, page 11, (g), (h), and (k)</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence that annual test security training is required at the district and school levels for all staff involved in test administration:  <b>Exhibit 2.5.3</b> Lead System Testing Coordinator 2016102520161024T131701_001, slides 47-68</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the State’s test administration training covers relevant aspects of the State’s test security policies:  <b>Exhibit 2.5.3</b> Lead System Testing Coordinator 2016102520161024T131701_001, slides 47-68  <b>Exhibit 2.5.4</b> Opening PPT Item Review Sept. 2017, slides 4-15</p> <p>For the State’s technology-based assessments, the following exhibit provides evidence of procedures for addressing test security specific to computer-based assessments:  <b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017, page 12</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of incident reporting procedures:  <b>Exhibit 2.3.8</b> SampleRI provides a sample of the interface used to document incidents  <b>Exhibit 2.3.9</b> 2016-2017 Reports of Irregularity Summary provides a summary of documented incidents during the 2016-17 test administration.</p>	<p>The State has plans/procedures for handling test security incidents.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.1 -- Exhibit 2.3.3:</b> Nice schematic for the breach of security procedures; however, more detailed standard procedures and strategies for conducting investigations would be helpful.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes</b>  State provided sufficient evidence that it maintains 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.</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 Tennessee**

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>The following exhibits provide evidence of the post-administration data forensics analysis that the State conducts:  <b>Exhibit 2.5.7</b> Erasure Analysis sample documentation  <b>Exhibit 2.5.8</b> Tennessee Erasure Analyses- State Summary-1703  <b>Exhibit 2.5.9</b> Tennessee Erasure Analyses- State Summary-1704  <b>Exhibit 2.5.10</b> Tennessee Erasure Analysis-Memo</p> <p>The following exhibit provides a summary of test security incidents from the most recent year of test administration and shows how each was addressed by the State:  <b>Exhibit 2.5.5</b> Summary RIs 2016-17</p> <p>The following exhibits contain evidence of procedures for remediation of test irregularities:  <b>Exhibit 2.5.6</b>  DecisionTreeOperationalTestAsPractice  <b>Exhibit 2.3.1</b>  19300_TN1704_TAM_v01_09_optimized  v220170411T165359_001, Section V: Report of Irregularity  <b>Exhibit 2.3.2</b>  19615_TN1705_TAM_v01_12_optimized  v220170411T165531_001 Section V: Report of Irregularity  <b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017, Section V: Report of Irregularity</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 Tennessee**

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>The following exhibits provide evidence of procedures for investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.1</b> 19300_TN1704_TAM_v01_09_optimized v220170411T165359_001, pages 10, 14-19</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.2</b> 19615_TN1705_TAM_v01_12_optimized v220170411T165531_001, , pages 10, 14-19</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017,pages 8, 14-18</p>	
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required		

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

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></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"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence of policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of test materials and test-related data:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.1</b> Security_info from proposal text</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.2</b> TN Contract Pages- 33111-01816_final_7.06 (Sections A9, A10, and A11a(2), A11a(3), A11a(6), and A11c)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport, section 3.2</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport, page 30</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.1</b> 19300_TN1704_TAM_v01_09_optimized v220170411T165359_001, pages 10-19</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.2</b> 19615_TN1705_TAM_v01_12_optimized v220170411T165531_001, pages 10-19</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.3</b> Online TAM FINAL2017, pages 8-18</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.5</b> Full Book, pages 2, 4, and 8</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.8</b> TN_ESSA_State_Plan_Approved, pages 60-61</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.6</b> PII PPT_updated_10242017</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.7</b> Questar-DR Overview_2017</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.1:</b> State required its testing contractor to comply with security procedures outlined in proposal and contract Exhibit 2.6.2.</p> <p>Testing contracts may demonstrate proper intentions, but does not substitute for State policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> and <b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> not helpful for this Critical Element.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.1 -- Exhibit 2.3.3:</b> include security procedures.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.5</b> (pages 2 and 4): When working with contacts internal to the DOE, student level data, even if it includes their ID without names, should be taken into careful consideration. Possible options for secure transmission are secure email, SFTP or Thumb drive. Be especially mindful with assessments scores.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.8 (page 61):</b> Minimum N was defined.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.6:</b> Is a general training document. Do not know how broadly it was used.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.7:</b> Quick recovery of all data in the event of a disaster that results in a potential data loss. Vendor adheres to industry standards and best practices regarding backup and data archiving.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b></p> <p>In 2.6.5, the Peers strongly advise TN to refrain from using a thumb drive or email as vehicles for sharing secure student data.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		We need more technical detail regarding how the State protects the integrity and confidentiality of its personally identifiable student information

<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its personally identifiable student information.</li> </ul>		

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibits describes the overall validity evidence from the 2016-17 technical reports:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 10: Validity</li> <li>• Chapter 2 - Test Development;</li> <li>• Chapter 5 - Calibrations and Scaling;</li> <li>• Chapter 6 - Equating and Linking;</li> <li>• Chapter 7 - Standard Setting;</li> <li>• Chapter 8: Reporting - subscore expectations</li> <li>• Chapter 9 - Reliability</li> <li>• Appendix J - Reliability: Inter-correlations Between Subscores - Tables J.1 - J.6B for ELA &amp; Tables J.7 - J.12 for math.</li> <li>• Appendix K - Validity: Principal components analyses (PCAs) Table K.1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport</p> <p>Chapter 8: Validity  Chapter 3: Test Development,  Chapter 11: IRT Calibration, Equating, &amp; Scaling,  Chapter 9: Reliability,  Chapter 13: Student Performance Results (Diagnostic Information section for subscore expectations)  Tables 13.51 &amp; 13.52,  Appendix D: Subscore Expectation Methodology. Correlations Between Subscores -- Alg I: Tables 8.1 &amp; 8.2; Alg II: Tables 8.3 &amp; 8.4; ELA I-III: Tables 8.9 - 8.14; Geom: Tables 8.15 &amp; 8.16; Int Math I-III: Tables 8.17 - 8.22.  Table 8.25 Principal components analyses (PCAs)  Chapter 13: Student Performance Results -- Tables 13.51 and 13.52 -- subscore expectations for non-science EOCs.</p> <p>The following exhibits describe the structure of each assessment in terms of the number of items and</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibit 2.6.3 (ACH) and Exhibit 2.6.4:</b> The technical reports provide support for overall validity. Several chapters will be addressed under other Critical Elements. Test blueprints were previously addressed. Critical Element 6.1 addresses achievement standard setting. Granted they are all related to validity.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3 (ACH) (Page 80):</b> Approach by contractor --Validity argument for an interpretive argument: scoring, generalization, extrapolation, and implication are summarized. Item development, standard setting, scaling, equating, reliability, quality control are considered validity evidence for the ACH assessments.</p> <p>(Page 85): In general, validity arguments based on rationale and logic strongly supported for TN ACH. The empirical validity evidence for the scoring and the generalizability validity arguments for the ACH assessments are also quite strong. Reliability indices, model fit and dimensionality studies provide consistent results, indicating the ACH assessments are properly scored and scores can be generalized to the universe score. Less strong is the empirical evidence for extrapolation and implication. This is due in part to the absence of criterion studies.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4 (EOC) (page 61):</b> validity arguments based on rationale and logic is strongly supported for Tennessee assessments. The empirical validity evidence for the scoring and the generalizability validity arguments for the EOC assessments are also quite strong. Reliability indices, model fit and dimensionality studies provide consistent results, indicating the EOC assessments are properly scored and scores can be generalized to the universe score.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>representation of standards:  <b>Exhibit 2.1.1</b> Grade 3_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.2</b> Grade 4_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.3</b> Grade 5_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.4</b> Grade 6_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.5</b> Grade 7_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.6</b> Grade 8_Math Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.7</b> Alg I_Internal Blueprints_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.8</b> Algebra II_Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.9</b> Geometry_Internal Blueprints_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.10</b> Integrated Math I_Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.11</b> Integrated Math II_Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.12</b> Integrated Math III_Internal Blueprint_6_16  <b>Exhibit 2.1.13</b> ELA Internal Blueprints 2016-2017</p> <p>The following exhibits are test forms from assessments administered in Spring 2016-17, one from an elementary-level, a middle school-level, and a high school-level assessment in English language arts and mathematics:  <b>Exhibit 3.1.1</b> 19816-B_TN1705_ELA_G5B1_FINALr1  <b>Exhibit 3.1.2</b> 19836_TN1705_Math_G5_v1_FINAL  <b>Exhibit 3.1.3</b> 19316_TN1704_Algebra-I-B_v1_FINAL  <b>Exhibit 3.1.4</b> 19368_TN1704_ELA-I Form B1_FINAL  <b>Exhibit 3.1.5</b> 20093-A_TN1705_ELA_G8A1_FINAL  <b>Exhibit 3.1.6</b> 20129_TN1705_Math_G8_v2_FINAL</p> <p>The following exhibits demonstrate that the State’s assessment content is appropriately related to the specific inferences made from test scores about student proficiency in the State’s academic content</p>	<p>Less strong is the empirical evidence for implication. Further studies are needed to verify some implication arguments.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.1 -- Exhibit 2.1.13:</b> The internal blueprints could be improved by building in DOK or level of cognition and possibly referencing achievement level. See 3.2</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.1:</b> The vast majority of DOKs for grades 3 – 8 ELA are 2s with a few 3s.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.2:</b> The vast majority of DOKs for grades 3 – 8 Math are 1s and 2s with four 3s at grade 8. See 4.3</p> <p>Test reliability, overall and conditional standard error of measurement, and consistency and accuracy of estimates are addressed under Critical Element 4.1</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b> State should have an independent alignment study conducted to document sufficient alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards.</p> <p>If not previously approved, the State must submit validity evidence regarding its alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	standards for all student groups: <b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport <b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport 1. Chapter 9 - Reliability -- Alphas: Table 9.1; Classification Consistency and Accuracy: Table 9.2.  2. Chapter 11 - IRT Calibration, Equating, and Scaling -- Scale Scores and CSEMs: Alg I-II Tables 11.3 & 11.4; ELA I-III Tables 11.7 - 11.9; Geom Table 11.10; Int Math I-III Tables 11.11 - 11.13.  3. Reliability by Subgroup - Appendix B: Alg I-II Tables B.1 & B.2; ELA I-III Tables B.5 - B.7; Geom Table B.8; Int Math I-III Tables B.9 - B.11.	
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document sufficient alignment between TN's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments (conduct an independent alignment study). A timeline for planning, conducting, and using independent alignment study results is required.</li> </ul>		

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></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><b>Exhibit 4.3.1</b> TN1705_ELA_DOK_SUMMARY (One Table)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.2</b> TN1705_MATH_DOK_SUMMARY (One Table)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.3</b> TN1704_EOC_DOK_SUMMARY_4.3</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 10 - Item-level (not summary) Statistics -- Alg I &amp; II: Tables 10.1 &amp; 10.2; ELA I-III: Tables 10.5 - 10.7; Geom: Table 10.8; Int Math I-III: Tables 10.9-10.11.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibits 4.3.1 through 4.3.3:</b> The vast majority of DOKs equaled Level 2. The data do not appear to connect directly to individual content standards.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.1:</b> The vast majority of DOKs for grades 3 – 8 ELA are 2s with a few 3s.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.2:</b> The vast majority of DOKs for grades 3 – 8 Math are 1s and 2s with four 3s at grade 8. See 4.3</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4 (pages 77-99):</b> Item difficulty and item discrimination indices were provided for operational items for the 2016-2017 EOC administrations. Do not know the relationships among the indices and levels of cognition.</p> <p>Studies including cognitive labs, professional judgment and empirical studies of draft items and known items (e.g., high cognitive level) should be considered. Alignment study would also be helpful.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b></p> <p>If not previously approved, the State must submit validity evidence that its alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TN needs to provide validity evidence that the State’s assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>		

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></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><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix J - Correlations between subscores in Tables J.1 - J.6B for ELA &amp; Tables J.7 - J.12 for math.</li> <li>Overall Test Reliability: Table J.19; Subgroup Reliabilities: Table J.20 &amp; J.21.</li> <li>Principal Components Analysis: Table K.1.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.1</b> Tech Report_Subject Corrs_RC Reliability_PValues_3.3_3.4</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.2</b> Confirmatory Factor Analysis Proposal for Achievement Assessments_3.3</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correlations Between Subscores -- Alg I: Tables 7.1 &amp; 7.2; Alg II: Tables 7.3 &amp; 7.4; ELA I-III: Tables 7.9 - 7.14; Geom: Tables 7.15 &amp; 7.16; Int Math I-III: Tables 7.17 - 7.22.</li> <li>Overall Test Reliability: Table 8.1.</li> <li>Item-total Correlations: Alg I &amp; II - Tables 9.1 &amp; 9.2; ELA I-III - Tables 9.5-9.7; Geom - Table 9.8; Int Math I-III - Tables 9.9-9.11.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.3</b> TN Reporting Category Reliabilities - 1703_3.3_4.1_4.4</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.4</b> TN Reporting Category Reliabilities - 1704_3.3_4.1_4.4</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.5</b> TN1703 Item Statistic Summary Stats New_3.3_4.1_4.4</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.6</b> TN1704 Item Statistic Summary Stats New_3.3_4.1_4.4</p> <p>The following exhibits show that the dimensionality of the assessments is consistent with the structure of the Tennessee Academic Standards and the intended interpretations of results:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3 (page 82): and Exhibit 2.6.4:</b> IRT models for Tennessee assessments assume the domain being measured by the test is relatively unidimensional. To test this assumption, a principal-axis common factor analysis is performed. Appendix K provides the first and second eigenvalues, the ratio between the two eigenvalues, and the percentage of total test score variance accounted for by the first eigenvalue for each ACH assessment. This table provides evidence that the Tennessee assessments measure one dominant dimension. The first eigenvalue is much larger than 1, yet the second eigenvalue for every test is smaller than or around 1. The first eigenvalue is, on average, about ten times larger than the second eigenvalue, and in most cases it explains nearly 90% of the estimated total common variance, indicating the presence of a single, dominant factor for each assessment.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.2:</b> Confirmatory factor analysis proposal for achievement assessments appears appropriate. Results from EOC are included, though dimensions are missing from the table. Questionable use of fit statistics (default to CFI is suspect; should incorporate multiple measures of fit to identify patterns, such as AIC/BIC).</p> <p>To be performed with spring 2018 administration for TNReady Grades 3-8.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4:</b> Correlations among sub scores look OK.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.3 -- Exhibit 3.3.4:</b> Should the “Major Work of the Grade” from the internal blueprints match the “Reporting Categories”? Some reliability coefficients were low: Interpreting Data =</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 Tennessee**

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"> <li>• Appendix K - Validity: Principal components analyses (PCAs) Table K.1.</li> <li>• Chapter 10: Validity</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal components analyses (PCAs) in Chapter 8 of 2016-17 technical report.</li> <li>• Chapter 8: Validity</li> </ul> <p>The following exhibit provides evidence that ancillary constructs needed for success on the assessments do not provide inappropriate barriers for measuring the achievement of all students:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.7</b> Combined Tennessee Style Guide_10.26.17 , page 17</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport Chapter 2: Test Development - Sections 2.5 (Test Construction) and 2.6 (Field Testing).</p> <p><b>DIF analyses:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.8</b> MATH3_G3_Data Review_new_FT</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.9</b> MATH3_G3_Data Review_new_OP</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.10</b> MATH4_G4_Data Review_new_FT</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.11</b> MATH4_G4_Data Review_new_OP</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.12</b> MATH5_G5_Data Review_new_FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.13</b> MATH5_G5_Data Review_new_OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.14</b> MATH6_G6_Data Review_new_FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.15</b> MATH6_G6_Data Review_new_OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.16</b> MATH7_G7_Data Review_new_FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.17</b> MATH7_G7_Data Review_new_OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.18</b> MATH8_G8_Data Review_new_FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.19</b> MATH8_G8_Data</p>	<p>0.348837009; most OK.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3 (page 309):</b> Proportion of common variance explained by first Eigenvalue ranged from 0.80 (3<sup>rd</sup> grade ELA) to 0.96 (4<sup>th</sup> grade Science).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4 (page 69):</b> Proportion of common variance explained by first two Eigenvalues ranged from 0.71 (Integrated Math I-Fall 2016) to 0.99 (Biology and Integrated Math I-Spring 2017)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.8 -- Exhibit 3.3.31:</b> DIF analyses were performed on both field test and operational items for all ACH assessments.</p> <p>Most Math items did not show DIF (As) across much SAS output. Summarized output would be helpful.</p> <p>Most ELA items did not show DIF (As); maybe higher percentages of Bs and Cs with ELA than Math.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.32 -- Exhibit 3.3.73:</b> DIF analyses were performed on both field test and operational items for all EOC assessments.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.32 – 3.3.73 (DIF) (EOC):</b> Most EOC items did not show DIF.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b> In Exhibit 3.3.1, are the scoring and reporting structures consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards?</p> <p>It’s unclear what procedure was followed to act upon the DIF results presented.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Review_new_OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.20</b> Data Review ELA Grade 3 FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.21</b> Data Review ELA Grade 3 OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.22</b> Data Review ELA Grade 4 FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.23</b> Data Review ELA Grade 4 OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.24</b> Data Review ELA Grade 5 FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.25</b> Data Review ELA Grade 5 OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.26</b> Data Review ELA Grade 6 FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.27</b> Data Review ELA Grade 6 OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.28</b> Data Review ELA Grade 7 FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.29</b> Data Review ELA Grade 7 OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.30</b> Data Review ELA Grade 8 FT.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.31</b> Data Review ELA Grade 8 OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport Chapter 11: Table 11.4. DIF analyses</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.32</b> ALG1_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.33</b> ALG1_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_OP</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.34</b> ALG1_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_FT</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.35</b> ALG1_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_OP</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.36</b> ALG2_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.37</b> ALG2_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_OP</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.38</b> ALG2_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_FT</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.39</b> ALG2_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_OP</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.40</b> ENG1_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.41</b> ENG2_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.42</b> ENG3_EOC_TN1703_Data</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.43</b> IM1_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.44</b> IM2_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.45</b> IM3__EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.46</b> GEO_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.47</b> GEO_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_OP <b>Exhibit 3.3.48</b> GEO_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.49</b> GEO_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_OP <b>Exhibit 3.3.50</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ALG1 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.51</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ALG1 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.52</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ALG2 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.53</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ALG2 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.54</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG1 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.55</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG1 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.56</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG2 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.57</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG2 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.58</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG3 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.59</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG3 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.60</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - GEO CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.61</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - GEO	

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.62</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM1 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.63</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM1 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.64</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM2 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.65</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM2 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.66</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM3 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.67</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM3 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.68</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - ENG I <b>Exhibit 3.3.69</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - ENG II <b>Exhibit 3.3.70</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - ENG III <b>Exhibit 3.3.71</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - IM I <b>Exhibit 3.3.72</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - IM II <b>Exhibit 3.3.73</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - IM III	
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TN did not submit 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 for its Grades 3-8 TNReady assessments, which is required.</li> </ul>		

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence of positive correlations between state assessment results and the external measures of NAEP and ACT:  <b>Exhibit 3.4.2</b> PR-3.2 State Mapping Study 2015 NAEP and 2017 Tenn (for ACH)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.4.1</b> PR-3.2 Relationships between 2017 EOC and 2017 Junior ACT .</p> <p>The following exhibit provides evidence of relationships between State assessments and college readiness:  <b>Exhibit 3.4.3</b> TNReady Letter</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of relationships between scores on state assessments:  <b>Exhibit 3.3.1</b> Tech Report_Subject Corrs_RC Reliability_PValues_3.3_3.4  <b>Exhibit 3.3.74</b> EOC (1704)_correlations between tests_3.4</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.75</b> TNReady Final Report 4Oct2017 , pages 6-7  <b>Exhibit 3.3.76</b> TNReady Stan Sett Plan_July 5 2016 , pages 10, 16, 18</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibit 3.4.2:</b> Compares 2015 NAEP with 2017 TN (ACH); overall the scores are fairly comparable, though TN’s assessments are slightly easier.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.4.1:</b> 2017 EOC Tests and 2017 ACT1; the magnitudes of the correlation coefficients are interesting.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.4.3:</b> “As leaders of the state’s higher education systems and organizations, we consider the new TNReady test replacing the TCAP assessments in our state’s K-12 schools a better barometer for how prepared Tennessee’s high school seniors are for college-level math and English. We submit this letter to affirm our continued support for the state’s progress toward ensuring students who graduate from Tennessee’s high schools are college-and career-ready.”</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.1 and Exhibit 3.3.74:</b> shows the correlations among scores on each of the State assessments.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b>            What EOC correlation results was the state expecting? Some of the correlations that we would expect to be high, such as EOC math to ACT math, were low. These correlations were also higher with other content areas, which is confusing (see 3.4.1)</p> <p>Adequate support convergent and divergent validity is provided. However, TN should consider gathering criterion-related evidence for Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></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 Tennessee

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></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"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence of reliability evidence for the state assessments:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 9: Overall Reliability;</li> <li>• Appendix J - Reliability: Inter-corelations Between Subscores: Tables J.1 - J.6B for ELA &amp; Tables J.7 - J.12 for math;</li> <li>• Alpha and SEMs: Table J.19 for ELA and math; alpha for subgroups: Table J.20 for ELA &amp; Table J.21 for math.</li> <li>• Summary statistics for p-values, pt. bis., and IRT estimates: Tables I.1 - I.6B. Distributions of p-values &amp; pt.bis.: Tables I.7 &amp; I.8.</li> <li>• RS-SS &amp; CSEM tables: ELA - Tables E.2 - E.7B; math - Tables E.8 - E.13</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.3</b> TN Reporting Category Reliabilities - 1703_3.3_4.1_4.4</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.4</b> TN Reporting Category Reliabilities - 1704_3.3_4.1_4.4</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correlations Between Subscores -- Alg I: Tables 8.1 &amp; 8.2; Alg II: Tables 8.3 &amp; 8.4; ELA I-III: Tables 8.9 - 8.14; Geom: Tables 8.15 &amp; 8.16; Int Math I-III: Tables 8.17 - 8.22.</li> <li>• Chapter 9 - Reliability -- Alphas: Table 9.1; Classification Consistency and Accuracy: Table 9.2.</li> <li>• Reliability by Subgroup - Appendix B: Alg I-II Tables B.1 &amp; B.2; ELA I-III Tables B.5 - B.7; Geom Table B.8; Int Math I-III Tables B.9 - B.11.</li> <li>• RS-SS &amp; CSEM tables: Tables 11.3, 11.4, 11.7-11.13.</li> </ul> <p>The following exhibits provide documentation of reliability evidence through results of internal</p>	<p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> G 3-8 TNReady (page 286): Overall KR-20 reliability estimates for ELA, Math and Science grades 3 through 8 range from 0.85 (5<sup>th</sup> ELA) to 0.94 (4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Math and 7<sup>th</sup> Grade Science).</p> <p>Subgroup reliabilities estimates (ELA) are typically above 0.80 (exception ELL 0.62 Grade 5A); subgroup reliabilities estimates for Math and Science are typically higher than ELA’s.</p> <p>Pages 294 – 304 show TIF and CSEM; typically graphs show intermediate abilities provide the greatest test information and lowest CSEM.</p> <p>Decision accuracy refers to the extent to which the classifications of test takers based on their scores on the test form agree with the classifications made on the basis of the classifications that would be made if the test scores were perfectly reliable.</p> <p>Decision consistency refers to the agreement between these classifications based on two non-overlapping, equally difficult forms of the test. Most coefficients above 0.70 (overall, higher at each cut score); exceptions were 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> grade ELA consistency (Page 305-307).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC (page 73): Alpha coefficients for Spring 2017 were typically above 0.80. English 1 was an exception at 0.76. English 1 for Fall 2016 was 0.91. What happened?</p> <p>Overall and Level 2/Level 3 estimates of cut score Classification Accuracy and Consistency appear generally sufficient.</p> <p>Pages 195 – 207: The EOC subgroup (Spring 2017) alpha coefficients appear generally sufficient.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>consistency reliability statistics:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3 ACH2017TechReport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 9: Reliability;</li> <li>• Appendix J - Reliability: alpha and SEMs -- Table J.19; alpha for subgroups: Table J.20 for ELA &amp; Table J.21 for math.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4 EOC2017TechReport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 9 - Reliability -- Alphas: Table 9.1;</li> <li>• Classification Consistency and Accuracy: Table 9.2.</li> </ul> <p>Reliability by Subgroup - Appendix B: Alg I-II Tables B.1 &amp; B.2; ELA I-III Tables B.5 - B.7; Geom Table B.8; Int Math I-III Tables B.9 - B.11.</p> <p>The following exhibits provide reports of standard errors of measurement and conditional standard errors of measurement, in terms of cut scores specified in the academic achievement standards:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3 ACH2017TechReport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 9: Overall Reliability;</li> <li>• Appendix E - Summary of Reporting Scales: Tables E.2 - E.7 for ELA SSs &amp; CSEMs, Tables E.8 - E.19 for math SSs &amp; CSEMs;</li> <li>• Appendix J - Reliability: INFs &amp; CSEMs: Figures J.1 - J.10 for ELA, Figures J.11 - J.22 for math.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4 EOC2017TechReport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 9: Overall Reliability;</li> </ul> <p>Chapter 11 IRT -- SSs &amp; CSEMs: Alg I-II Tables 11.3 &amp; 11.4; ELA I-III Tables 11.7-11.9; Geom Table 11.10; Int Math I-III Tables 11.11-11.13.</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of decision</p>	<p>Appendix F: TCCs, INF Curves, and CSEM Curves (pages 253 -- 283). Some of the INF curves do not appear as expected. That is, there appears to be less information around the cut scores. See INFs for Fall 2016 Eng1, 2, and 3 (pages 258-260), Spring 2017 Eng1 (page 270), and Eng3-PBT (page 273). What are the implications, if any?</p> <p>TN assessments are not computer adaptive.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	consistency and accuracy for the classification of achievement levels for state assessments: <b>Exhibit 2.6.3 ACH2017TechReport:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 9: Reliability; Classification consistency/accuracy: Table J.23 for ELA &amp; Table J.24 for math.</li> </ul> <b>Exhibit 2.6.4 EOC2017TechReport:</b> Chapter 9 - Reliability -- Classification Consistency and Accuracy: Table 9.2.	<b>Peer Notes:</b>  Has TN determined why its reliability coefficients for EL students are so much lower than other student groups? The Peers strongly recommend that TN determine the root causes of this discrepancy.  TN did not submit its alternate assessments (this will be done in December 2018).
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's unclear how TN interprets the TIF and CSEM results presented in Appendix F Exhibit 2.6.4, nor how they plan to address the noted patterns. TN must provide their interpretation and next steps related to these results, likely with consultation of its TAC (see INF functions for Fall 2016 ENG1 – ENG3 Pages 258-260; Spring 2017 ENG1 Page 270; ENG3 PBT Page 273 for concerning examples where it appears that there is less information around the cut scores).</li> </ul>		

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>The following exhibit provides evidence that universal design principles are followed in the creation of all state assessments:  <b>Exhibit 3.3.7 Combined Tennessee Style Guide_10.26.17 , page 17</b></p> <p>The following exhibit provides evidence that experts in the assessment of students with disabilities and English learners participate in the development of state assessments:  <b>Exhibit 2.2.6 Peer Review_Committee Applicant Demographics</b>                      The following exhibit provides evidence of accessibility tools and features that are used on state assessments:  <b>Exhibit 2.3.18 Accommodation Chart_16_17</b></p> <p>The following exhibit provides evidence of bias and sensitivity training that is provided to item reviewers:  <b>Exhibit 2.2.25 Bias_Sensitivity Passage Training</b></p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of steps that Tennessee has taken to conduct empirical analyses that identify possible bias or inconsistent interpretations of results across student groups:  <b>Exhibit 2.6.3 ACH2017TechReport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 2: Test Development - Sections 2.5 (Test Construction) and 2.6 (Field Testing).</li> </ul> <p>DIF analyses:  <b>Exhibit 3.3.8 MATH3_G3_Data Review_new_FT</b>  <b>Exhibit 3.3.9 MATH3_G3_Data Review_new_OP</b>  <b>Exhibit 3.3.10 MATH4_G4_Data Review_new_FT</b>  <b>Exhibit 3.3.11 MATH4_G4_Data Review_new_OP</b>  <b>Exhibit 3.3.12 MATH5_G5_Data</b></p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibit 3.3.7 Combined Tennessee Style Guide was not located.</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.2.6:</b> Peer Review Committee Applicant Demographics: presents demographics of participants.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.18 Accommodation Chart (page 1):</b>                      The charts provide to inform educators, parents, and students about the most common testing conditions and accommodations as they apply to paper based assessments. The goal is to assist decision makers to identify which feature requires an IEP/504 plan, an English Learner (EL) status, or is available to any student with an identified need.</p> <p>What about online test administrations?</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.2.25:</b> The vendor passage training did provide some good positive-negative examples.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3 ACH (pages 20-21):</b> Separate teacher committees selected by TDOE convene to review items for bias and sensitivity. These committee members receive an extensive training session regarding sensitivity/bias TCAP Achievement Technical Bulletin 2016-2017 review. This review ensures the items are not offensive to students and that topics of a sensitive nature (e.g., divorce, disease, violence) are avoided. Items are also scrutinized to ensure that large segments of the population are not disadvantaged by the content.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.3.8 – 3.3.19 (DIF) (ACH):</b> Includes both field test and operational items for Math at Grades 3 – 8.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Review_new_FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.13</b> MATH5_G5_Data  Review_new_OP.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.14</b> MATH6_G6_Data  Review_new_FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.15</b> MATH6_G6_Data  Review_new_OP.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.16</b> MATH7_G7_Data  Review_new_FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.17</b> MATH7_G7_Data  Review_new_OP.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.18</b> MATH8_G8_Data  Review_new_FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.19</b> MATH8_G8_Data  Review_new_OP.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.20</b> Data Review ELA Grade 3 FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.21</b> Data Review ELA Grade 3 OP.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.22</b> Data Review ELA Grade 4 FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.23</b> Data Review ELA Grade 4 OP.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.24</b> Data Review ELA Grade 5 FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.25</b> Data Review ELA Grade 5 OP.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.26</b> Data Review ELA Grade 6 FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.27</b> Data Review ELA Grade 6 OP.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.28</b> Data Review ELA Grade 7 FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.29</b> Data Review ELA Grade 7 OP.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.30</b> Data Review ELA Grade 8 FT.xml  <b>Exhibit 3.3.31</b> Data Review ELA Grade 8 OP.xml</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport  Chapter 11: Table 11.4.  DIF analyses  <b>Exhibit 3.3.32</b> ALG1_EOC_TN1703_Data  Review_FT  <b>Exhibit 3.3.33</b> ALG1_EOC_TN1703_Data  Review_OP  <b>Exhibit 3.3.34</b> ALG1_EOC_TN1704_Data  Review_new_FT  <b>Exhibit 3.3.35</b> ALG1_EOC_TN1704_Data</p>	<p>Most Math items did not show DIF (As) across much SAS output. Summarized output would be helpful. See Critical Element 3.3</p> <p><b>3.3.20 -- 3.3.31 (DIF) (ACH):</b> Includes both field test and operational items for ELA at grades 3 – 8.</p> <p>Most ELA items did not show DIF (As); maybe higher percentages of Bs and Cs with ELA than Math.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4 EOC2017TechReport:</b> Table 12.4 summarizes the results for EOC field test DIF analyses. Spring 2017 showed higher percentages of As than Fall 2016. The Spring 2017 data were</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Review_new_OP <b>Exhibit 3.3.36</b> ALG2_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.37</b> ALG2_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_OP <b>Exhibit 3.3.38</b> ALG2_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.39</b> ALG2_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_OP <b>Exhibit 3.3.40</b> ENG1_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.41</b> ENG2_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.42</b> ENG3_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.43</b> IM1_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.44</b> IM2_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.45</b> IM3__EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.46</b> GEO_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.47</b> GEO_EOC_TN1703_Data Review_OP <b>Exhibit 3.3.48</b> GEO_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_FT <b>Exhibit 3.3.49</b> GEO_EOC_TN1704_Data Review_new_OP <b>Exhibit 3.3.50</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ALG1 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.51</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ALG1 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.52</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ALG2 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.53</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ALG2 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.54</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG1	positive.  <b>Exhibit 3.3.32 – 3.3.73 (DIF) (EOC):</b> Most EOC items did not show DIF.  <b>Peer Notes:</b>  In Exhibit 2.2.6, populations of color, particularly the Hispanic population, appear to be under-represented within the stakeholder groups employed by TN, including the content and bias reviews and rangefinding when compared to current TN census data (US Census, 2017). Future item development procedures should make efforts to involve more diverse stakeholder groups. TN could consider invitations to targeted members reflective of populations of color.  Guidelines for accessibility and accessibility tools and features would have been helpful.  In Exhibits 3.3.32-3.3.73, it is unclear what actions were taken based on DIF results.

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.55</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG1 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.56</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG2 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.57</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG2 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.58</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG3 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.59</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - ENG3 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.60</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - GEO CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.61</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - GEO PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.62</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM1 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.63</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM1 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.64</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM2 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.65</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM2 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.66</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM3 CBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.67</b> OP Item and DIF Analysis - IM3 PBT <b>Exhibit 3.3.68</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - ENG I <b>Exhibit 3.3.69</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - ENG II <b>Exhibit 3.3.70</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - ENG III <b>Exhibit 3.3.71</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - IM I <b>Exhibit 3.3.72</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - IM II <b>Exhibit 3.3.73</b> TN1704 OP and FT IA DIF - IM III	
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

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"> <li>TN must submit a timeline, plan, and report related to the DIF methodology employed, as well as a process for determining State responses to the DIF results on items (e.g., keep, revise, discard).</li> </ul>

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence of the distribution of cognitive complexity and item difficulty indices that demonstrate the items included in each assessment adequately cover the full performance continuum:  <b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix I -Summary of Item-Level Performance: Summary of classical and IRT statistics - Tables I.1 - I.6B; Tables I.7 and I.8 for p-value and point biserial distributions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.1</b> TN1705_ELA_DOK_SUMMARY (One Table)  <b>Exhibit 4.3.2</b> TN1705_MATH_DOK_SUMMARY (One Table)  <b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 10 - Item-level (not summary) Statistics -- Alg I &amp; II: Tables 10.1 &amp; 10.2; ELA I-III: Tables 10.5 - 10.7; Geom: Table 10.8; Int Math I-III: Tables 10.9-10.11.</li> </ul> <p>Item level summary stats:  <b>Exhibit 4.3.3</b> - TN1704_EOC_DOK_SUMMARY_4.3</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of conditional standard errors of measurement at various points along the score range:  <b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix E - Summary of Reporting Scale: SSs, CSEMs, &amp; achievement levels for ELA in Tables E.2 - E.7; Tables E.8 - E.13 for math.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport  Chapter 11 IRT -- SSs &amp; CSEMs: Alg I-II Tables 11.3 &amp; 11.4; ELA I-III Tables 11.7-11.9; Geom Table 11.10; Int Math I-III Tables 11.11-11.13.</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of test information functions and ability estimates for students at different performance levels:</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH (pages 272 -273): P-values and point biserial distributions (percentages) results ELA and math are generally supportive; however, there is some concern about sufficiency of scale for higher performers.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.1:</b> The vast majority of DOKs for grades 3 – 8 ELA are 2s with a few 3s.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.2:</b> The vast majority of DOKs for grades 3 – 8 Math are 1s and 2s with four 3s at grade 8.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> (EOC) (Pages 77 - 95): Item-total correlation measures how well an item discriminates between low- and high-achieving students. English 1, 2, &amp; 3 showed several low and negative correlation coefficients (see 4.1 Summary Statement).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.3</b> The vast majority of DOKs for EOCs are 2s.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3 and Exhibit 2.6.4:</b> Inspection of CSEMs at various points along the score range suggest greater error with ELA than Math (ACH), higher CSEM at lower than higher scores (EOC) and the typical U shape.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3 (ACH):</b> Subgroup reliabilities estimates (ELA) are typically above 0.80 (exception ELL 0.62 grade 5A); subgroup reliability estimates for Math are typically higher than ELA’s.</p> <p>Pages 294 – 304 show TIF and CSEM; typically graphs show intermediate abilities provide the greatest test information and lowest CSEM.</p> <p>Decision consistency coefficients above 0.70 (overall,</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Exhibit 4.3.1</b> TN1705_ELA_DOK_SUMMARY (One Table)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.2</b> TN1705_MATH_DOK_SUMMARY (One Table)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall reliability: Table J.19; QAI provided reliability by subscores;</li> <li>• Total test mean p-values, pt. bis., &amp; IRT estimates: Tables I.1 - I.6B; total test distributions of p-values &amp; pt. bis: Tables I.7 &amp; I.8</li> <li>• Appendix J - Reliability: TIFS &amp; CSEMs -- Figures J.1 - J.10 for ELA; Figures J.11 - J.16 for math (QAI provided vertical lines at cut scores).</li> <li>• Decision consistency &amp; accuracy: Tables J.23 &amp; J.24.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix F TIF &amp; CSEM figures</li> <li>• Overall reliability: Table 8.1; reliability by subscores - see row 28.</li> <li>• Item-level p-values in Tables 9.1, 9.2, 9.5 –</li> <li>• Decision consistency &amp; accuracy: Table 8.2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 4.3.3</b> TN1704_EOC_DOK_SUMMARY_4.3</p>	<p>higher at each cut score); exceptions were 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> grade ELA consistency (page 305-307).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4 EOC (page 73):</b> Alpha coefficients for Spring 2017 were typically above 0.80. English 1 was an exception at 0.76. English 1 for Fall 2016 was 0.91. What happened?</p> <p>Overall and Level 2/Level 3 estimates of cut score Classification Accuracy and Consistency appear generally sufficient.</p> <p>Pages 195 – 207: The EOC subgroup (Spring 2017) alpha coefficients appear generally sufficient.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b> The State should improve the DOKs with higher levels as appropriate.</p> <p>The summarized DOKs do not demonstrate that the items included in each ACH and EOC assessment adequately cover the full performance continuum.</p> <p>An alignment study could provide critical information.</p>
<b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TN must provide evidence that the full performance continuum is reflected in its ELA and math assessments, such as theta distributions (person estimates), particularly at the upper end of the distribution (see Section 2.1 notes for related DOK concerns).</li> </ul>		

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 Tennessee**

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

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence that scoring procedures are addressed in technical reports for state assessments:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 5: Calibrations and Scaling (includes rationale for scaling).</li> <li>• Chapter 4: Scanning &amp; Scoring (quality control).</li> <li>• Appendix C: Sample Reports (describe how to interpret scores &amp; performance levels).</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 6: Calibrations and Scaling (includes rationale for scaling).</li> <li>• Chapter 5: Scanning &amp; Scoring (quality control).</li> <li>• Appendix E: Sample Reports (describe how to interpret scores &amp; performance levels).</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total test mean p-values, pt. bis., &amp; IRT estimates: Tables I.1 - I.6B; total test distributions of p-values &amp; pt. bis: Tables I.7 &amp; I.8</li> <li>• Overall reliability: Table J.19</li> <li>• Appendix E - Summary of Reporting Scale -- Scale scores and corresponding CSEMs: Tables E.2 - E.7 for ELA, Tables E.8 - E.13 for math. Appendix H - Summary of Examinee Performance by Reporting Scale: Subscore descriptors - Table H.1 for ELA and Table H.2 for math.</li> <li>• Decision consistency &amp; accuracy: Tables J.23 &amp; J.24.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 10 - Item-level (not summary) Statistics -- Alg I &amp; II: Tables 10.1 &amp; 10.2; ELA I-III: Tables 10.5 - 10.7; Geom: Table 10.8; Int Math I-III: Tables 10.9-10.11.</li> <li>• Chapter 9 - Reliability -- Alphas: Table 9.1; QAI</li> </ul>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b> For 2017–18 online testing is required for high schools and is optional for Grades 5–8.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3 and Exhibit 2.6.4:</b> The ACH (Appendix A) test blueprints should be more detailed (e.g., DOK). Documentation that the State produces student results in terms of its academic content standards could be stronger.</p> <p>Calibrations, scaling, methods used to create raw-to-scale score tables and corresponding CSEMs are adequately addressed.</p> <p>The three-parameter logistic model (3PL) was used to estimate the parameters for the dichotomously scored items, while the generalized partial credit model was used to calibrate the polytomously scored items. It is unclear how TN is using the information provided by the 3PL model (i.e., item discrimination and guessing parameter).</p> <p>Quality control stressed throughout the scoring procedures.</p> <p>Documentation that the system produces student results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p> <p>The system includes four achievement levels (from Below to Mastered). Reporting categories or subscores match the test blueprints</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.4.1 -- Exhibit 4.4.13:</b> Vendor’s scoring training process for EOC items seems sufficient with quality controls (e.g., responses are randomly chosen and redistributed throughout the day to be scored independently by a different scorer in the room</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>provided reliability by subscores.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision consistency &amp; accuracy: Table 9.2.</li> <li>Chapter 11: SSs and CSEMs. Chapter 13: Subscore descriptors - Tables 13.52 for non-science EOCs.</li> </ul> <p>Mean p-values by subscores. See section 3.3:  <b>Exhibit 3.3.3</b> TN Reporting Category Reliabilities - 1703_3.3_4.1_4.4  <b>Exhibit 3.3.4</b> TN Reporting Category Reliabilities - 1704_3.3_4.1_4.4  <b>Exhibit 3.3.5</b> TN1703 Item Statistic Summary Stats New_3.3_4.1_4.4  <b>Exhibit 3.3.6</b> TN1704 Item Statistic Summary Stats New_3.3_4.1_4.4</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.4.1</b> Operational Training-Scoring_TN Scoring rubrics:  <b>Exhibit 4.4.5</b> Rubric_Gr4-5_Explanatory  <b>Exhibit 4.4.6</b> Rubric_Gr4-5_Narrative  <b>Exhibit 4.4.7</b> Rubric_Gr4-5_Opinion  <b>Exhibit 4.4.8</b> Rubric_Gr6-8_Argument  <b>Exhibit 4.4.9</b> Rubric_Gr6-8_Explanatory  <b>Exhibit 4.4.10</b> Rubric_Gr6-8_Narrative  <b>Exhibit 4.4.11</b> Rubric_Gr9-12_Argument  <b>Exhibit 4.4.12</b> Rubric_Gr9-12_Explanatory  <b>Exhibit 4.4.13</b> Rubric_Gr9-12_Narrative  <b>Exhibit 3.1.4</b> 19368_TN1704_ELA-I Form B1_FINAL  <b>Exhibit 3.1.5</b> 20093-A_TN1705_ELA_G8A1_FINAL</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.1.2</b> 19836_TN1705_Math_G5_v1_FINAL  <b>Exhibit 4.4.41</b> 12 TN926781 Kilometers G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.42</b> 14 TN527194 Subtracted Value G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.43</b> 15 TN128101 Parentheses G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.44</b> 18 TN927090 Decimal Value G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.45</b> 2 TN326837 500 to 50 G5</p>	<p>(scorer 2). Rubrics for Writing scored from 1 to 4.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.4.41 -- Exhibit 4.4.65:</b> Training materials for scorers to be used in scoring the grade 5 math test</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p> <b>Exhibit 4.4.46</b> 21 TN227033 Go Forth and G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.47</b> 22 TN720275 Rectangle Area G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.48</b> 25 TN427185 Fraction Value G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.49</b> 26 TN026887 Exponential Value G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.50</b> 28 TN327204 Swimmngly G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.51</b> 3 TN416971 Plotted Point G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.52</b> 34 TN826743 Fruit Punch G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.53</b> 38 TN627224 Cookies G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.54</b> 41 TN326817 Bags o' Spuds G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.55</b> 44 TN826933 Audrey Jr G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.56</b> 47 TN320172 Chocolate Bars G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.57</b> 5 TN827170 Expression Value G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.58</b> 51 TN326811 Wooden Boards G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.59</b> 54 TN626943 Clothes Shopping G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.60</b> 55 TN820246 Bellyache G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.61</b> 59 TN626752 Tie a Yellow G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.62</b> 6 TN127043 Multiplied Value G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.63</b> 60 TN420249 Tea G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.64</b> 63 TN720252 Symbols G5  <b>Exhibit 4.4.65</b> 9 TN127139 Granola G5  <b>Exhibit 3.1.3 19316_TN1704_Algebra-I-B_v1_FINAL</b>  <b>Exhibit 4.4.18</b> TN1703 ALG 1 Item 29 ICCR 6285Anchor  <b>Exhibit 4.4.19</b> TN1703 ALG 1 Item 32 Ims 8636 Anchor  <b>Exhibit 4.4.20</b> TN1703 ALG 1 Item 48 FT Anchor  <b>Exhibit 4.4.21</b> TN1703 ALG 1 Item 55 FT Anchor  <b>Exhibit 4.4.28</b> - 25 TN739766 Fewest Terms A1  <b>Exhibit 4.4.29</b> - 26 TN840074 Value of b A1  <b>Exhibit 4.4.30</b> - 29 TN940043 Values of x A1  <b>Exhibit 4.4.31</b> - 32 TN940088 Pentagon Area A1  <b>Exhibit 4.4.32</b> - 53 TN040092 Baseball Cards A1  <b>Exhibit 4.4.33</b> - 58 TN240094 French Fries A1   <b>Exhibit 4.4.39</b> TN1704 - Spring EOC - CDF File Layout - 20171002                 </p>	<p> <b>Exhibit 4.4.18 -- Exhibit 4.4.33:</b> Training materials for scorers to be used in scoring the Algebra I test.                 </p> <p> <b>Exhibit 4.4.35 -- Exhibit 4.4.38:</b> 3-8 Spring OP report includes reader reliability and read behind summary by reporting category for ELA and math.                 </p> <p> <b>Exhibit 4.4.40:</b> Many aspects of test security are sufficiently presented in the 2017 TCAP Test Administration Manual, TNReady Online Assessments.                 </p> <p> <b>Peer Notes:</b>                      TN has addressed score interpretation and uses within its technical reports; however, we recommend that similar information is included in reports to parents, teachers, administrators, and other data users in a manner that can be understood. This should help facilitate valid score interpretations.                 </p> <p>                     In 2.6.3ACH2017, Appendix G &amp; 2.6.4EOC Appendix F, the grade level assessments appear to be on the same scale. It is unclear whether the Grade 3-8 and EOC assessments are mapped to a common scale. Does TN intend to measure growth with its new assessments? If TN is not measuring growth, it may be misleading for the field to have a common scale (200-450) associated with performance across grades (i.e., the TCCs make it appear that the tests are built upon a common, or vertical, scale). Does TN ensure that stakeholders will not make cross-grade level interpretations, if that is not the intent?                 </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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p>Inter-rater reliability report for ACH (1705) - includes exact &amp; adjacent: <b>Exhibit 4.4.35</b> TN1705                      ReaderReliabilityReadBehindSummary_4.4  <b>Exhibit 4.4.36</b> TN1703                      ReaderReliabilityReadBehindSummary_4.4  <b>Exhibit 4.4.37</b> TN1704                      ReaderReliabilityReadBehindSummary_4.4  <b>Exhibit 4.4.38</b> TN1714                      ReaderReliabilityReadBehindSummary_4.4</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport:                      Appendix C: Sample score reports &amp; interpretation of performance levels.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport                      Appendix E: Sample score reports &amp; interpretation of performance levels.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport:                      Chapter 6: Equating and Linking - Table 6.1 lists exclusion rules.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport                      Chapter 6: Preparation of Data Analysis Files - describes exclusion rules.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.4.34</b> -                      20602_TN1708_TAM_v02_11_optimized                      v220170411T165622_001 (Conditions under which test results are invalidated in TAM Report of Irregularity Section pages 14-17 and table on pages 54-57).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.3.8</b> SampleRI.jpg  <b>Exhibit 4.4.40</b> TN170420Online20TAM20FINAL (Breach of security page 14)</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required		

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

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></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><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 6: Equating and Linking</li> <li>• Chapter 6.4 describes FT equating;</li> <li>• Chapter 6.3: Post-equating - describes common items between forms and year-to-year equating.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 11: IRT Calibration, Equating, and Scaling -- describes pre- and post-equating procedures, common items between forms and year-to-year equating.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 4.5.1</b> TN1712 SAFT sampling overview to TDOE_v3</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.5.2</b> TN1705 MPS (New Format)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.5.3</b> TN1705 Analysis Plan 2017-04-26, sections 4.5 &amp; 4.6</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.5.4</b> TN1704 Analysis Plan 2017-04-26, sections 4.5 &amp; 4.6</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 2: Test Development (pages 21-24 describe anchor item process);</li> <li>• Chapter 6: Equating and Linking.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4</b> EOC2017TechReport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 3: Test Development (pages 26-28 describe anchor item process);</li> </ul> <p>Chapter 11: IRT Calibration, Equating, and Scaling</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b> For 2017–18 online testing is required for high schools and is optional for Grades 5–8.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.3:</b> Pre-equated scoring tables are always validated after administration through post-equating (Page 17). Anchor items support post-equating.</p> <p>Grades 3-8 TNReady assessment data are calibrated using the 3PL and the Generalized Partial Credit IRT models.</p> <p>(Page 56) It is a standard procedure for TCAP that two psychometricians conduct each of the equating activities independently; their results are compared and must match or be resolved. This practice is commendable.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.4:</b> EOC similar to ACH. The use of online testing will probably be phased in with some paper-pencil and some schools using online.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.5.1:</b> Stand-alone field test (SAFT) samples matched the following variables for each assessment: region, area, gender, ethnicity, economically disadvantaged status, and special education status. After multiple replications, a sample that best matches to the state population targets was selected.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.5.3 (ACH) -- Exhibit 4.5.4 (EOC)</b> The TCAP Grades 3–8 and the EOC data analyses plans were reviewed by the TAC.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b> The State should plan for and conduct appropriate comparability studies between online and</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>paper/pencil assessments, possibly in consultation with their TAC members (see 4.6 Summary Statement).</p> <p>It would be helpful to have the TAC minutes related to Exhibit 4.5.3 &amp; 4.5.4.</p>
<b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required		

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

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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p align="center"><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></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"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibit provides evidence of a comparability study of different versions of the assessments (computer-based vs. paper-based):</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.6.1.TDOE 2017 OP Comparability_4.6</b></p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b> Tennessee does not administer assessments in languages other than English.</p> <p>The 2017-2018 school year is the first year in which assessments other than EOC exams will be offered as computer-based, so a comparability study is not yet available for Grades 3-8 assessments.</p> <p>In 2016-17, computer-based testing was optional for EOC. A small number of online tests were taken.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 4.6.1: Two research questions:</b> Can the scores that arise from students testing in CBT and PBT be used interchangeably? And, are the raw score-to-scale score tables produced for each Spring 2017 EOC assessment comparable across administration modes?</p> <p>The study methods appear sound and should be replicated/possibly expanded as more students take PBT.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b> Plans for handling comparability issues should be for EOC and ACH should be discussed with the TAC.</p> <p>What actions have been taken to ensure that “block scheduled” and “traditionally” scheduled courses of the same name are comparable? See 6.2</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of score comparability across computer-based versus paper/pencil versions of the Grades 3-8 and EOC accountability assessments.</li> </ul>		

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence that Tennessee has a system for monitoring and maintaining the quality of its assessment system:  <b>Exhibit 2.6.3</b> ACH2017TechReport: Chapter 2: Test Development; Chapter 9: Reliability; Chapter 10: Validity.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.6.2</b> TN Contract Pages- 33111-01816_final_7.06 (A.7 psychometric activities pages 31-32)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.57</b> TAC Notes_10 27 16_10 28 16_QAI_11 09 16</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibit 2.6.2:</b> The State’s assessment contract provides an annual Work Plan that serves as a monitoring document to be used by the State to assure timely completion of tasks as scheduled.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.57:</b> provides evidence that the TAC is involved in the State’s assessment system. Only the October 2016 TAC minutes were submitted. How is the TAC currently being used (schedule, issues, etc.?)</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b>                      The contract details must be monitored, maintained and improved, but this is insufficient.</p> <p>It would be helpful if TN had shared item fit statistics with reviewers, including point-biserials, outfit mean square, etc., with the panelists to help us review item, and then test, quality. This would also serve as a foundation for ongoing item development and improvement. Without this information, we cannot provide substantive feedback.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence that TN has clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments, including documentation that they have procedures in place to improve the assessments annually (e.g., field test item replenishment plan, item fit statistics, etc.).</li> </ul>		

**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
------------------	--	--

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibits describe the evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all students with disabilities:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.1 Accessibility Accommodation Guidance 2016 17</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.2</b> Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the Alternate Assessment 2017</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.3</b> Sample IEP – Blank</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.4</b> IAIEP TtT 3_13_17_CR_FINAL (Slides 50-61)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.5</b> Updated Accessibility Guide Sept. 2017</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.6 Accommodation Chart 16 17</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.7 Determining Appropriate Accommodations</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.8</b> Parent Guide to TNReady Supports</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.9</b> SPED Framework Component 6</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.10</b> Test Administration Manual Grades 3-8 (pgs 47-60)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.11</b> Test Administration Manual EOC (pgs 47-60)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.2.12</b> TNReady March District Meetings_Book 3-3-15 FINAL, pages 104-124</p> <p>The following exhibits describe the evidence that the implementation of the State’s alternate academic achievement standards promotes student access to the general curriculum:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.2</b> Guidance for IEP teams on Participation Decisions for Alternate Assessments 2017</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.12</b> Alternative Assessment Memo 1Percent</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.13</b> ESSA One Percent Guidance_110117</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.14</b> 2017_18 IEP Monitoring Student Review Protocol Component 26</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.15</b> WBMS Noncompliance bt Area Report Statewide Public 2016-17</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b> <b>Exhibits 5.1.1, 5.1.6, &amp; 5.1.7 were not located.</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.2:</b> provides guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments: whether a student with a disability should participate in the general assessment with or without accommodations, or in an alternate assessment. Guidance outlines steps that an IEP team should take in determining whether the alternate assessment is appropriate for a student (page 3).</p> <p>Participation Guidelines are provided in Appendix A (Pages 15-16), Appendix B alternate assessment participation decision documentation (Pages 17-18) includes sources of evidence, and Appendix C participation decision flowchart (Page 19). They seem appropriate.</p> <p>The State uses MSAA as its alternate assessment of English language arts (reading and writing) and mathematics in grades 3-8 and 11. It is described.</p> <p>The student is learning content linked to (derived from) state standards (Page 7).</p> <p>IEP information to determine whether an alternate assessment is warranted and information not to be used for an individual student (Page 7).</p> <p>Frequently Asked Questions address several element components.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.3</b> Sample IEP: Informed Parental Consent (page 12).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.4</b> IAIEP: IEP training document looks</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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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);</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Exhibit 5.1.1</b> Accessibility Accommodation Guidance2016-17</p>	<p>good.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.5:</b> This guidebook represents the best thinking up to the point of publication and was developed to reflect current state-level accessibility policies and practices that support students with diverse needs and characteristics and account for instructional and assessment implications, particularly when differentiating among TNReady assessments, the English language proficiency assessment, and alternate assessments.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.8</b> Parent Guide: Designed to improve parent’s understanding of the use of accommodations for instruction and assessment and commendable, though still rather text-heavy. It may be more effective for parents if TN takes a reduced text approach, possibly including succinct bullet points of critical information that are published in a brochure, to make information more digestible and accessible for parents. It’s recommended that the brochure also include information regarding how accommodations promote access to the general curriculum (i.e., include instructional accommodations information).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.9:</b> Supports writing IEPs.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.12:</b> conveys the expectation that parents are informed of possible consequences of participation in an AA-AAS.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b> Though not reviewed by the Peers for this cycle, we recommend that TN describe its approach to waivers related to the 1% participation cap and how the State will handle such requests. Evidence submitted suggests that TN had a 1.44%</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		participation rate in 2016-17 on the MSAA, so this is clearly a concern moving forward (see 5.1.13). It is also recommended that TN review participation rates related to student demographics to ensure that students of color are not participating in the MSAA at unexpected rates.

<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required

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

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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></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"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibits describe the evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the States assessment system:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.2.1</b> WIDA ACCESS 2.0 for English Learners</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.5</b> Updated Accessibility Guide Sept. 2017</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.2.2</b> FAQ Disability Guidance</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.10</b> Test Administration Manual Grades 3-8 (pgs 47-60)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.11</b> Test Administration Manual EOC (pgs 47-60)</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.2.1:</b> In addition to participating in regular state testing, EL students must take annually WIDA’s ACCESS 2.0, an English Language Proficiency Assessment.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.5:</b> ELs have access to available accessibility tools, features and assessment accommodations.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.2.2:</b> All ELs are supported through the assessment based on universal design for learning, administrative considerations, and universal tools.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.10 Test Administration Manual (page 47):</b> Provides information for educators of English Language Learners to use in selecting and administering accessibility features needed by individual EL students. It accentuates an individualized approach to the implementation of assessment practices for participating students.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b></p> <p>It is unclear whether the accommodations that are provided to ELs are sufficient to provide them access to the TCAP. In particular, the Peers are concerned about access to items where English language skills are not part of the construct being tested (i.e., mathematics, and science). While Exhibits 5.1.10 and 5.1.11 state that a human read aloud is offered for EL students, it is not clear if the presentation or response to items is conducted in the student’s language of origin.</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 Tennessee**

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

**Section 5.2 Summary Statement**

No additional evidence is required

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></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"> <li>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;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>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;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Exhibit 5.1.5</b> Updated Accessibility Guide Sept. 2017</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.1</b> Accessibility Accommodation Guidance2016-17</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.6</b> Accommodation Chart_16_17</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.3.1</b> Assessment Accommodation Memo 16_17</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.7</b> Determining Appropriate Accommodations</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.3.3</b> Accommodation for EL and SpecEd Frequency DistributionSY16-17</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.3.4</b> Unique_Accommodation_Request_Form</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.3.5</b> Braille TDOE</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibits 5.1.1, 5.1.6, and 5.3.1 were not located.</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.2:</b> provides guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments: whether a student with a disability should participate in the general assessment with or without accommodations, or in an alternate assessment. Guidance outlines steps that an IEP team should take in determining whether the alternate assessment is appropriate for a student (Page 3).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.3.2 (ACH):</b> Accommodation for EL and SpecEd frequency distribution. In 2016-17, about twice as many EL students were tested with accommodations than were tested without accommodations. For EOCs (<b>Exhibit 5.3.3</b>) the distributions are more equal.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.3.4 Unique Accommodation Request Form:</b> If a student with a disability or an English learner requires an accommodation (i.e., a “unique accommodation”) that is not listed and does not change the construct being measured by the test, the school may request approval for use of the accommodation using this request form. If approved, the accommodation must be listed in the Individual Education Plan or 504 plan for a student with a disability; and an English Learner Plan, if used by the district.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b>  As described in section 5.2, Exhibits 5.1.10 and 5.1.11 state that a human read aloud is offered for EL students; however, it is not clear if the presentation or response to items is conducted in the student’s language of origin. TN should clarify what kind of support the ESL team is allowed to provide.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		Are the frequencies in 5.3.2 as expected?

<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TN must provide evidence that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, and (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.</li> </ul>		

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center"><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></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"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence to support this critical element for the State’s test administration monitoring:  <b>Exhibit 5.1.14</b> 2017_18 IEP Monitoring Student Review Protocol Component 26  <b>Exhibit 5.1.15</b> WBMS Noncompliance by Area Report Statewide Public 2016-17  <b>Exhibit 5.4.1</b> 2017 AUDIT Authorization Packet  <b>Exhibit 5.4.2</b> 2017 Interview Packet  <b>Exhibit 5.3.2</b> Accommodation for EL and SpecEd Freq Distribution SY16-17-Out</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b>  <b>Exhibit 5.1.14</b> 2017-18 IEP Monitoring Student Review Protocol</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.1.15 Noncompliance:</b> Compliance Area/Indicator: Statewide Assessment - (64 of 67 individual Items of noncompliance were corrected).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.4.1:</b> TCA § 49- 1- 607, the Tennessee DOE is responsible for conducting random visits during TCAP testing to ensure consistency of administration.</p> <p>The primary objective of the visit is to assess any operational challenges associated with the storage, transfer and administration of the TCAP TN Ready paper materials or online Nextera platform. The TDOE representative will assess general test administration policies and procedures, including the provision of accessibility supports and accommodations, and conduct a series of interviews with appropriate members of the school assessment team.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 5.4.2</b> 2017 Interview Packet: Did not locate interview results or reports.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b>  The interview results and compliance results should be applied to relevant assessment decisions.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**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
------------------	--	--

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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence of adoption of academic achievement standards for grades 3-8 English language arts, grades 3-8 mathematics, and high school end of course exams in English language arts and mathematics:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.1.1</b> 10-14-16_IV_U_Standards_Setting_for_End-of-Course_Assessments_Cover_Sheet</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.1.3</b> 8-25-17_IV_C_Standards_Setting_Cover_Sheet</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the state assessments each have four levels of achievement, including two levels of high achievement (On Track and Mastered) and two levels of lower achievement (Below and Approaching):</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.1.2</b> 10-14-16_IV_U_Standards_Setting_for_End-of-Course_Assessments_Attachment_updated, pages 2-3</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.1.4</b> 8-25-17_IV_C_Standards_Setting_Attachment_Clean_Copy, pages 1-2</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.1.5</b> 8-25-17_IV_C_Standards_Setting_Attachment_Powerpoint, pages 10-11</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibits 6.1.1 and 6.1.3:</b> Agenda from State Board of Education (SBE) meetings; the academic achievement standards for grades 3-8 English language arts, grades 3-8 mathematics, and high school end of course exams in English language arts and mathematics: were recommended.</p> <p><b>Exhibits 6.1.2 and 6.1.4:</b> State assessments have four levels of achievement as required.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.1.5:</b> Performance level descriptors for each academic achievement level that apply to the EOC and grade 3-8 assessments appear sufficient.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b></p> <p>While it is documented that the achievement standards were presented to the SBE based on the agenda, it is not clear whether the academic achievement standards were formally adopted by the SBE (anticipated in August 2017).</p> <p>Neither Science academic achievement standards nor alternate academic achievement standards were recommended/adopted by the SBE; according to the submitted evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that TN SBE formally adopted alternate academic achievement standards in the required tested grades for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> <li>• Evidence that TN SBE formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in science in the required tested grades (e.g., SBE minutes).</li> </ul>		
Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the State followed a technically sound method and process for its academic achievement standard setting process:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.2.1</b> TNReady Stan Sett Plan_July 5 2016</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.2.2</b> TNReady Final Report 4OCT2017</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.2.3</b> TNReady Final Report 25Oct2016</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.2.1 (EOC standard setting plan):</b> Eighteen (18) panelists were assigned to each panel. Job roles, race, sex, district size and location were considered in panel construction.</p> <p>Panelists used the ordered item booklet (OIB) procedure to identify cut scores by entering markers in a specially designed test booklet. The test booklet, referred to as the Ordered Item Booklet (OIB), consists of a set of items placed in difficulty order; easiest items first and hardest items last (Page 8).</p> <p>In order to account for the multiple assessments for both traditional and block schedules, a concurrent calibration of all items in the spring across both traditional and block schedule assessments was completed. A separate calibration was conducted for the fall block schedule assessment. The three parameter logistic model and the two parameter generalized partial credit model was used for the calibration (Page 9).</p> <p><b>Exhibits 6.2.2 (ACH) TN Ready Standard Setting Report:</b> Three procedures were used to validate standard setting. The primary source of internal validity evidence can be observed when looking at the variability of the cut point recommendations. The standard error of the median was calculated for every round of ratings, for each of the cut point recommendations. Table 7 (Page 12) provides the mean standard error value across all assessments, for each cut point recommendation, and for each round. The variability of the standard error did decline as panelists moved from the first to the second, and from the second to the third rounds, which is indicative of an increased degree of agreement across panelists.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p><b>Exhibits 6.2.3 (EOC) TN Ready Standard Setting Report:</b> Prior to the standard setting workshop, information was collected for the demographic characteristics of teachers across the entire state of Tennessee. Based upon this information, targets for the characteristics of the panel were created. The standard setting panels closely matched these targets.</p> <p>The three-parameter logistic model was used to estimate the parameters for all MC items while the 2PL model was used to calibrate all dichotomously scored items that were not multiple-choice. The partial credit model was used to calibrate all CR items (page 4).</p> <p>OIB was also used with EOC.</p> <p>The variability of the standard error declined as panelists moved from the first to the second and from the second to the third rounds, which is indicative of an increased degree of agreement across panelists. Some support for internal validity.</p> <p>For academic standard setting the State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b> State did not present Science academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards setting methods and processes.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that TN used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its Science academic achievement standards.</li> <li>• Evidence that TN used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its alternate academic achievement standards.</li> </ul>		

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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.2.2</b> TNReady Final Report 4OCT2017 (Process section &amp; Appendix C)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.2.3</b> TNReady Final Report 25Oct2016 (Process section &amp; Appendix C)</p> <p>The following exhibit provides evidence of the process followed by the state in developing the standard setting process, and provides evidence of ongoing improvement:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.57</b> TAC Notes_10 27 16_10 28 16_QAI_11 09 16, pages 6-8</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of the relationship between the State’s academic achievement standards and those of outside assessments (NAEP and ACT):</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.4.2</b> PR-3.2 State Mapping Study 2015 NAEP and 2017 Tenn (for ACH)</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.4.1</b> PR-3.2 Relationships between 2017 EOC and 2017 Junior ACT</p> <p>The following exhibit provides documentation that the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.4.3</b> TNReady Letter</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.2.2 (ACH) (page 5):</b> After reviewing the assessments, panelists were provided copies of the current PLDs that described the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected from students within content areas and within each of the four performance categories. Panelists reviewed and discussed the PLDs with their table groups. The panelists were then charged with developing threshold PLDs that would describe students who were just barely at each performance category.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.2.3 (EOC):</b> Use of PLDs similar to 6.2.2</p> <p><b>Exhibit 2.1.57:</b> The TAC discussed various standard setting issues, but did not approve the process (not requested by State).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.4.2 ACH and NAEP:</b> Data provide some evidence that the academic achievement standards are challenging.</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.4.1 2017 EOC and 2017 Junior ACT:</b> The correlation coefficients show reasonable relationships (most mid to high positive).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 3.4.3 (letter):</b> As leaders of the state’s higher education systems and organizations, we consider the new TNReady test replacing the TCAP assessments in our state’s K-12 schools a better barometer for how prepared Tennessee’s high school seniors are for college-level math and English. We submit this letter to affirm our continued support for the state’s progress toward ensuring students who graduate from Tennessee’s high schools are college-and career-ready.</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b></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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		The state did not provide evidence that the achievement standards are aligned to the state's content standards.

<b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b>
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required

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

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 Tennessee**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level:</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.2</b> TN1703 Class Roster - Algebra II - 20170216</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.3</b> TN1703 Class Roster - English I - 20170217 - V2</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.4</b> TN1703 Class Roster - Geometry - 20170216</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.5</b> TN1703 Disaggregation Summary E-M-SS - 20170210</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.6</b> TN1703 Individual Student Report E-M-SS - 20170215</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.7</b> TN1703 Standards Analysis - 20170213</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.8</b> TN1703 Student Label - E-M-SS - 20170209</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.9</b> TN1703 Student Label - E-M-SS special cases - 20170210</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.10</b> TN1703 Summary Report by Student - E-M-SS - 20170210</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.11</b> TN1703 Summary Reports E-M-SS - 20170210</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.12</b> TN EOC Class Roster - Integrated Math II</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.13</b> TN EOC Disaggregation Summary E-M-SS</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.14</b> TN EOC District Sub-score Summary Report - Algebra II</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.15</b> TN EOC Individual Student Report E-M-SS - 20170911</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.16</b> TN EOC School Response Summary - Algebra</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.17</b> TN EOC School Sub-score Summary Report - Algebra II</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.18</b> TN EOC Standards Analysis</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.19</b> TN EOC State Sub-score Summary Report - Algebra II</p>	<p><b>Peer Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Exhibits 6.4.2 through 6.4.39:</b> Each report type is available for each State assessment (ELA and math grades 3-8 and EOC exams).</p> <p><b>Exhibit 6.4.49, Exhibit 6.4.50 and Exhibit 6.4.51:</b> State Commissioner’s communications to district test directors includes releases of test data. Various reports are available online through Nextera.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Exhibit 6.4.20</b> TN EOC Student Label - E-M-SS  <b>Exhibit 6.4.21</b> TN EOC Student Response Roster - Algebra  <b>Exhibit 6.4.22</b> TN EOC Student Response Roster - English  <b>Exhibit 6.4.23</b> TN EOC Summary Report by Student - E-M-SS  <b>Exhibit 6.4.24</b> TN EOC Summary Reports E-M-SS – 20170821  <b>Exhibit 6.4.26</b> TN 3-8 Class Roster - English - 20170810  <b>Exhibit 6.4.27</b> TN 3-8 Class Roster - Math Gr 4 - 20170810  <b>Exhibit 6.4.28</b> TN 3-8 Class Roster - Math Gr 6 - 20170810  <b>Exhibit 6.4.29</b> TN 3-8 Disaggregation Summary E-M-SS - 20170810  <b>Exhibit 6.4.30</b> TN 3-8 District Sub-score Summary Report - Math Gr 6  <b>Exhibit 6.4.31</b> TN 3-8 Individual Student Report E-M-SS Special Cases  <b>Exhibit 6.4.32</b> TN 3-8 Individual Student Report E-M-SS  <b>Exhibit 6.4.33</b> TN 3-8 School Sub-score Summary Report - Math Gr 6  <b>Exhibit 6.4.34</b> TN 3-8 Standards Analysis - 20170810  <b>Exhibit 6.4.35</b> TN 3-8 State Sub-score Summary Report - Math Gr 6  <b>Exhibit 6.4.36</b> TN 3-8 Student Label_V2  <b>Exhibit 6.4.37</b> TN 3-8 Sub-score Summary Report - Math Gr 6 - 20170810  <b>Exhibit 6.4.38</b> TN 3-8 Summary Report by Student - E-M-SS - 20170810  <b>Exhibit 6.4.39</b> TN 3-8 Summary Reports E-M-SS – 20170810</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the</p>	<p>Individual student reports (Exhibits 6.4.15 and 6.4.32) contain achievement level data, comparative data, performance level descriptors, and subscore performance information, including strengths, areas for improvement, and next steps.</p> <p>The Guides to Test Interpretation are substantial and well done.</p> <p>However, these efforts may not be sufficient information for instruction; TN may consider developing multiple student reports depending upon audience (i.e., parents, teachers, administrators, general public).</p> <p><b>Peer Notes:</b>  In Exhibits 6.4.52 through 6.4.55, comprehensive assessment reports available to the public on the State’s assessment website. Huge amount of data; not sure how they’re shared or if the typical parent or community member could use the data.</p> <p>Did not locate the State’s process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>Did not locate documentation of how TN ensures that test results are interpreted for parents who do not use English. Peers felt that the information presented in the ISRs may not be accessible to parents due to text complexity. It is unclear whether parent groups were involved in the development/review of ISR content/accessibility.</p> <p>TN does not make student reports available in any</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>State reports results for use in instruction:  <b>Exhibit 6.4.49</b> ScoreRelease3  <b>Exhibit 6.4.50</b> ScoreRelease4  <b>Exhibit 6.4.51</b> ScoreRelease5</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence of instructions on the appropriate interpretations and uses of test results, which are provided to school and district personnel:  <b>Exhibit 6.4.25</b> XXXXX_TN1704_EOC_GTI_v03-02_b  <b>Exhibit 6.4.40</b> XXXXX_TN1705_3-8_GTI_v03_02_a  <b>Exhibit 6.4.41</b>  18261_TN1703_EOC_GTI_OPT_FINAL</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the state provides individual student reports on student achievement according to the domains defined in the state’s academic content standards, grade level achievement, and achievement levels:  <b>Exhibit 6.4.15</b> TN EOC Individual Student Report E-M-SS - 20170911  <b>Exhibit 6.4.32</b> TN 3-8 Individual Student Report E-M-SS</p> <p>The following exhibits contain evidence of interpretive guidance provided to parents, for help understanding student score reports:  <b>Exhibit 6.4.46</b> 18260_TN1703_Parent Brochure_FINAL  <b>Exhibit 6.4.47</b> 19608_TN1704_Parent Brochure_FINAL_v02  <b>Exhibit 6.4.48</b> 20202_TN1705_Parent Brochure_FINAL</p> <p>The following exhibits provide evidence that the State reports to the public its assessment results on</p>	<p>language other than English.</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 Tennessee**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	student achievement at each proficiency level: <b>Exhibit 6.4.52</b> tnready_suppressed_school_release_10-2017 <b>Exhibit 6.4.53</b> data_state_results_3-8_2017 <b>Exhibit 6.4.54</b> EOC_state_results_2017 <b>Exhibit 6.4.55</b> tnready_suppressed_system_release_3-8_10-2017	

<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that TN provides information to help parents interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.</li> <li>• Evidence that TN makes student reports available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille, large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> <li>• Documentation of the percentages of students not tested in the EOC assessments.</li> <li>• Evidence that the Grades 3-8 state, district, and school assessment results are published in the required disaggregated form by gender.</li> <li>• Evidence that the EOC state, district, and school assessment results are published in the required disaggregated form (i.e., by grade, by race/ethnicity, by gender).</li> </ul>

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.