



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Mike Morath  
Commissioner of Education  
Texas Education Agency  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78701

December 2, 2016

Dear Commissioner Morath:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of state assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in April 2016. State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their child's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on Texas Education Agency's (TEA) recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated Texas' submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) R/LA and Math 3-8), including the two accommodated versions of these tests, referred to as STAAR-A and STAAR-L for STAAR R/LA and Math 3-8. **Partially meets requirements.**

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

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

- R/LA and mathematics general assessments in high school (STAAR R/LA and Math HS), including the two accommodated versions of these tests, referred to as STAAR-A and STAAR-L for STAAR R/LA and Math HS. **Partially meets requirements.**
- R/LA and mathematics alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 and high school (STAAR Alternate 2 R/LA and Math). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in grade bands 3-5 and 6-8 (STAAR Science 3-8), including the two accommodated versions of these tests, referred to as STAAR-A and STAAR-L for STAAR Science 3-8. **Partially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in high school (STAAR Biology HS EOC), including the two accommodated versions of these tests, referred to as STAAR-A and STAAR-L for high school Biology end-of-course (EOC). **Partially meets requirements.**
- Science AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (STAAR Alternate 2 Science). **Substantially meets requirements.**

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

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

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

The Department notes that TEA submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking and listening that was approved on August 12, 2016, for the 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19 school years.

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Ary Amerikaner  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Penny Schwinn, Deputy Commissioner of Academics, TEA

**Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Texas' Assessment System**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b>	<p><u>For the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) mathematics general test in high school, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of clear, documented policy that all students are assessed against the same challenging academic standards and are assessed using the same assessment at each grade (e.g., provided on the State’s website and disseminated to all school districts).</li> </ul>
<b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b>	<p><u>For STAAR reading/language arts (R/LA), mathematics, science general and alternate assessments of alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that references students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services are included in the assessment system.</li> <li>• Additional documentation that clarifies policies for including all students in assessments in each grade level, specifically for the high school tests taken by students who take a high school test in middle school.</li> </ul>
<b>1.5 – Participation Data</b>	<p>TEA must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional documentation that clarifies how the participation of students in each grade level is reported for the tests that apply to that grade level.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	<p><u>For the STAAR R/LA, mathematics and science general tests at grades 3-8 and high school, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence associating the depth of knowledge (DOK) levels of STAAR to the DOK levels of TEKS to verify that the tests are meeting the cognitive demands of the State’s content standards.</li> <li>• Evidence of how Texas has addressed the recommendation in the State’s report from WestEd that the State use findings of its alignment study to more closely examine the cognitive complexity of items in all grade levels in all content areas as there is a very high percentage of items at DOK levels 1 and 2.</li> <li>• Evidence that the 2016 STAAR-L EOC Biology matched the blueprint of the 2012 STAAR EOC Biology test to support the exchange of items.</li> <li>• Evidence of how Texas will assess the State’s writing component of the R/LA content standards at grades 3, 5, 6 and 8.</li> <li>• Evidence of how Texas will assess the State’s R/LA content standards in speaking and listening at all grades. [NOTE: Texas has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect Texas to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.]</li> </ul> <p><u>For the STAAR 2 R/LA AA-AAAS, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test blueprints for the STAAR Alternate 2 in grades 4 and 7 writing; and evidence of how Texas will assess writing in AA-AAAS at grades 3, 5, 6 and 8.</li> <li>• Evidence of how Texas will assess the State’s R/LA content standards in</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	speaking and listening at all grades. NOTE: Texas has received a speaking and listening waiver; therefore, the Department does not expect Texas to submit additional evidence regarding speaking and listening during the period of the waiver.
<b>2.2 – Item Development</b>	<p><u>For the STAAR R/LA, mathematics and science general tests at grades 3-8 and high school, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that all items used for STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L are the same.</li> </ul> <p><u>For the STAAR 2 mathematics AA-AAAS, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of item specifications for mathematics for STAAR Alternate 2.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	<p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general and STAAR-2 AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that Texas has contingency plans to address possible technology challenges for all levels of the general assessment system.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	<p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general and STAAR-2 AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that defines the TEA role and responsibilities to detect and investigate test irregularities.</li> </ul> <p><u>For STAAR-2 R/LA, mathematics, science AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the STAAR Alternate 2 training for test administrators includes information about preventing assessment irregularities and ensuring integrity of test results.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that there are sufficient items in each reporting category to support alignment evidence (same concern as noted in 2.1 above).</li> <li>• Evidence associating DOK levels of STAAR items with the DOK levels of the content standards (related to concern noted in 2.1 above)</li> <li>• Texas’ expectations for the relationship between STAAR and TEKS DOK levels (related to concern in 2.1 above).</li> <li>• Timeline and plan to address the finding in the State’s WestEd alignment studies that the STAAR DOK levels appear inadequate in mathematics (all grade levels), science (all grade levels), and in R/LA in (grades 3, 6, and 7).</li> <li>• Evidence that the current Spanish STAAR-L and STAAR assessments are comparable.</li> <li>• Evidence that the STAAR A and the STAAR assessments are comparable.</li> <li>• Evidence that STAAR L EOC Biology’s item count per test blueprint reporting category the same as that for the STAAR EOC Biology test blueprint.</li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b>	<p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general and STAAR-2 AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that item writers and reviewers for each grade, subject, and component of the assessment system received criteria for determining and</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>guidelines for developing accessible items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that universal design and accessibility principles are applied to item development and item reviews for STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR L Spanish, STAAR Alternate 2 assessments.</li> <li>• Evidence that STAAR item reviewers have expertise in, or are special educators or English learner educators (all grades and subjects).</li> <li>• Evidence of a process to evaluate items for bias during pilot and field testing (both STAAR and STAAR 2, all grades and subjects).</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	<p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general and STAAR-2 AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the scoring procedures that are applied to STAAR A and STAAR L.</li> <li>• Evidence that the STAAR Alternate 2 scoring rubrics, for each of the four items in a cluster, appropriately samples the constructs measured by the rubrics.</li> <li>• Data for inter-rater reliability and inter-rater agreement for all human-scored assessments (STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR L, STAAR Alternate 2)</li> <li>• Clarification of evidence related to inter-rater reliability statistics in the State’s technical digest for STAAR (Chapter 4).</li> <li>• Evidence of the conditions under which test results are invalidated.</li> </ul>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b>	<p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of whether the state spiraled grade-level forms and, if so, how the forms were equated (STAAR).</li> <li>• Evidence of year-to-year equating procedures and results (STAAR).</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	<p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results for STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L, and STAAR EOC assessments.</li> <li>• Comparability studies for online and paper pencil assessments (STAAR).</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	<p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general and STAAR-2 AA-AAAS in high school, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the procedures for informing parents of the implications for graduation for students taking the STAAR 2 (AA-AAAS).</li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	<p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general, and STAAR 2 AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that accommodations used, (including those embedded in STAAR A and STAAR L), and accommodations used in STAAR 2 are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct being assessed, 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>• Evidence that Texas has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	accommodations beyond those expressly permitted by the State.
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b>	<p data-bbox="428 264 1474 331"><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general and STAAR 2 AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="428 336 1474 411" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="428 336 1474 411">• Evidence that the State monitors test administration for special populations as required in this critical element.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p data-bbox="428 449 1474 516"><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general and STAAR 2 AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul data-bbox="428 520 1474 814" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="428 520 1474 596">• Evidence that performance or achievement level descriptors are included with individual student reports (all assessments).</li> <li data-bbox="428 600 1474 676">• Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (all assessments).</li> <li data-bbox="428 680 1474 756">• Evidence that brochures/information are provided to parents/guardians who have students taking STAAR EOC tests.</li> <li data-bbox="428 760 1474 814">• Evidence of itemized score analyses and/or educator level reports for all assessments.</li> </ul>

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

## April, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3**  
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .... 3  
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards ..... 4  
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department Staff) ..... 7  
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department Staff)..... 8  
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department Staff)..... 10

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS ..... 11**  
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 11  
2.2 – Item Development..... 14  
2.3 – Test Administration ..... 17  
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department Staff) .... 20  
2.5 – Test Security ..... 21  
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 23

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 25**  
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 25  
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 27  
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 29  
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 30

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 31**  
4.1 – Reliability..... 31  
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 33  
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 38  
4.4 – Scoring ..... 39  
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 44  
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 46  
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance ..... 48

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 50**  
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 50  
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 53  
5.3 – Accommodations..... 55  
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 57

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 59**  
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 59  
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 61  
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 62  
6.4 – Reporting..... 63



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

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>Evaluate for all three subjects <b>STAAR</b> <b>Evidence provided:</b> <u>Detailed description of strategies used to ensure content standards adequately specify what students should know and be able to do</u> <u>Exhibit 1.2.1.a.</u> Describes process to establish Vertical Teams to develop College and Career Readiness Standards in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies that specify what students must know and be able to do to succeed in entry-level courses at postsecondary institutions in Texas; list of Vertical Team Members, p. 38. <u>Exhibit 1.2.1.a.</u>, p. 292, English: VT members examined CCRS, research, state and national standards in English and provided for public comment by The Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB)-ELA; p. 298 – Mathematics; Science; p. 304. <u>Exhibit 1.2.3.b.</u> April 2014 Process for Review and Revision of TEKS <u>Exhibit 1.2.5.b. Content Standards Process Summary, Math, Principle 1: College- and Career –Ready Expectations for All Students</u> <u>Exhibit 1.2.6.c.</u> Draft Recommendations on TEKS Math Content Standards <u>Exhibit 1.2.6.e.</u> Final Recommendations on Math Content Standards <u>Exhibit 1.2.1.b, 1.2.1.c.</u> CCRS/TEKS Mathematics and Science. Texas CCRS are broad; alignment tables to Texas Mathematics CCRS and TEKS – pp. 397 and Science CCRS and TEKS, pp. 411; ELA alignment between CRS and TEKS will be done in 2016 <u>Documentation of process used by State to benchmark its academic content standards to nationally or internationally recognized academic content standards</u></p>	<p>The required documentation was provided to address this critical element.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Reports of external independent review of the State’s academic content standards by content experts, summaries of reviews by educators in the State, or other documentation to confirm that the State’s academic content standards adequately specify what students should know and be able to do</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 1.2.4.a.</u> 2007 Expert Reviewers for ELA</p> <p><u>Exhibit 1.2.5.c., 1.2.5 d., 1.2.5.e., 1.2.5.f., 1.2.5.g.:</u> Lists of Math Expert Reviewers</p> <p><u>Exhibit 1.2.7.a.</u> Expert Reviewers’ Reports on Science Content Standards</p> <p><u>Exhibit 1.2.6.b., 1.2.6.d</u> Expert Reviewers’ Reports of Commissioners Draft</p> <p><u>Endorsements or certifications by state’s IHE’s, professional associations, business community that academic content standards</u></p> <p><u>Summary report of substantive involvement and input of educators . . . in the development of the State’s academic content standards</u></p> <p><u>Documentation of substantial involvement of subject-matter experts, including teachers in the development of the State’s academic content standards</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 1.2.4.b, 1.2.4.c:</u> ELA Content Standards committee members</p> <p><u>Exhibit 1.2.5.c., 1.2.5 d., 1.2.5.e.,</u> SBOE TEKS Review Committees-Mathematics</p> <p><u>Exhibit 1.2.7.b.</u> List of 2007 Science Content Standards Review Committees</p> <p><u>Description that demonstrate a broad range of</u></p>	

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>stakeholders were involved in the development of the State's academic content standards, including individuals representing groups such as students with disabilities, English learners and other student populations in the State; parents; and the business community</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 1.2.4.b, 1.2.4.c:</u> ELA Content Standards committee members  <u>Exhibit 1.2.5.c, 1.2.5 d., 1.2.5.e.,</u> SBOE TEKS Review Committees-Mathematics</p> <p><u>Exhibit 1.2.7.b.</u> List of 2007 Science Content Standards Review Committees</p> <p><u>Documentation of public hearings, public comment periods, public review, etc.</u></p> <p><u>Exhibits 1.2.5.f., 1.2.6.f., 1.2.7.f.</u> SBOE minutes</p>	
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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><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>Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column</p>	<p>Per the Technical Digest, 2014 – 2015, pages 86 – 88, (p 2446 – 2448 of Evidence exhibit Section #3) all of the assessment stipulated in section 1.3, “required assessments”, were administered in 2014 – 2015.</p> <p>State should clarify that all students are assessed against the same challenging academic standards and are assessed using the same assessment at each grade; it appears that in some cases, students who completed Algebra I in middle school are assessed on STAAR Algebra I in middle school (rather than the grade-level test). It also is not clear whether all middle school students who take Algebra I in middle school take a test in high school if that student’s district elects not to assess Algebra II</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of clear, documented policy that all students are assessed against the same challenging academic standards and are assessed using the same assessment at each grade (e.g., provided on the State’s website and disseminated to all school districts).</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p>	<p>There was not clear evidence of policies that reference the inclusion of students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools were included in the State system of standards and assessment.</p> <p>Also, there may be a need for additional documentation in this area, based upon answers to the questions the Department has about testing requirements in item 1.3 above.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation that references students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services are</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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>included in the assessment system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional documentation that clarifies policies for including all students in assessments in each grade level, specifically for the high school tests taken by students who take a high school test in middle school.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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><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>Prompts for Reviewers:                      --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science                      --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout                      --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data                      --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS</p>	<p>may need additional documentation in this area, based upon answers to the questions the Department has about testing requirements in item 1.3 above.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional documentation that clarifies how the participation of students in each grade level is reported for the tests that apply to that grade level.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>STAAR</b>  <u>Statement of Purpose</u>  <u>Exhibit 2.1.1.e.</u> Technical Digest 2014 – 2015, Chapter 4, p. 1</p> <p><u>Intended Interpretation and uses of results</u>  <u>Exhibit 2.1.1.e.</u> Technical Digest 2014 – 2015, Chapter 4, p. 1 10</p> <p><u>Description of structure of assessment</u>  <u>Test blueprints</u>            Exhibit 2.1.3 (p. 601). Test Blueprints. Larger Percentage of items is on readiness standards vs. support standards</p> <p>On request, on April 28 Texas provided supplemental evidence which documents that STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L are based use the same item specifications and test blue prints.</p> <p><u>Processes to ensure assessments tailored to knowledge and skills in academic standards, includes challenging content and higher order thinking skills</u>            Exhibit 2.1.5.b. A Study of the Alignment between the STAAR and the TEKS, Part II: Depth of Knowledge, p. 653. Very high percentage at DOK levels 1 and 2</p> <p>Texas does not administer computer-adaptive assessments.</p>	<p>The required documentation was provided to address the purpose and intended interpretation and uses of results component of this critical element.</p> <p>Required documentation for test blueprints is provided and is sufficient.</p> <p>Peers were unable to locate evidence associating the DOK levels of STAAR to the DOK levels of TEKS. Having this information would substantiate the claim that the assessments reflect the challenging content and expectations or applications of knowledge and skills resident in the standards. Without this documentation, it is not known if the test is meeting the cognitive demands of the standards. Additionally WestEd indicates that Texas may want to use findings of the alignment study that was conducted to more closely examine the cognitive complexity of items in all grade levels, all content areas. (p. 653). There is a very high percentage of items at DOK levels 1 and 2.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>STAAR L</b> TX 4/28/16 evidence submission, “test construction forms” folder “2016 STAAR grade 5 math.pdf”, “2016 STAAR L grade 5 math.pdf”, “2012 STAAR EOC biology.pdf”, and “2016 STAAR L EOC biology.pdf” files. Also, the “STAAR A and L clarification.docx” file is provided as evidence.</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b> <u>Statement of Purpose</u> <u>Exhibit 2.1.7</u> Educator Guide for STAAR Alternate 2, p. 3</p> <p><u>Intended Interpretation and uses of results</u> <u>Exhibit 2.1.7</u> Educator Guide for STAAR Alternate 2, p. 18</p> <p><u>Description of structure of assessment</u> <u>Test blueprints</u> <u>Exhibit 2.1.12</u> Test Blueprints for STAAR Alternate 2 Assessments</p> <p><u>Processes to ensure assessments tailored to knowledge and skills in academic standards, includes challenging content and higher order thinking skills</u> <u>Exhibit 2.1.13</u> Technical Digest 2014-2015, Chapter 5, STAAR Alternate 2, pp. 137-138. Description of development of essence statements that summarize the TEKS and student expectations and link the expectations to the prerequisite skills and assessment performance categories.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.1.14</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Item Specifications Guide and Sample, pp. 3-7. STAAR Alternate 2 uses “Levels of Complexity,</p>	<p><b>STAAR L</b> For the STAAR L EOC Biology test, it was mentioned that some items were exchanged to be more amendable to being accommodated. Reviewers were unable to locate a document showing how the 2016 STAAR L EOC Biology matched the blueprint of the 2012 STAAR EOC Biology test.</p> <p>Question about blueprints for Mathematics, grades 3-8 and Science, grades 5, 8, and Biology: Each year one reporting category will consist of eight items and the other three reporting categories will consist of four items. The reporting category with eight items will be rotated each year. TEA indicates the rationale is based on research supporting presentation of content in small components; however, it is not clear how rotating a reporting category with eight items each year accomplishes this. What is the rationale for this practice? What is the rationale for not applying this practice to reading?</p> <p>It is noted that composition will not be assessed in English II and I. What is the rationale? Writing is not assessed in grade 4 or grade 7; however, writing is assessed in these grades on STAAR. What is the rationale for not assessing writing on STAAR Alternate 2?</p> <p>However, <u>Exhibit 2.3.18</u>, p. 3 states that writing is assessed in grades 4 and 7. Please clarify if writing is assessed and reported in grades 4, 7 and EOC English I and II.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>which provide student access to assessment: Model-focuses on one or two images of concept; Match-requires match of identical, partially the same, or new image/concept answer choices to stem; Recall-requires prior knowledge and has three answer choices; Apply-requires inference, drawing conclusions, and/or making evaluations. And, there appears to be 3 levels of complexity within each type of item. For each type of item (model, match, recall, and apply there are 3 levels of difficulty) (General specifications for items across the Difficulty Ranges)</p> <p>Text complexity increases from grade 3 through English II (p. 8)</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.1.16</u> Essence Statement Rotation Tracking. Does this exhibit reflect the practice described in Exhibit 2.1.12, Test Blueprints for STAAR Alternate 2 Assessments?</p> <p>STAAR Alternate 2 is not a computer adaptive assessment</p>	<p><b>It is not clear how this exhibit reflects the practice described in Exhibit 2.1.12, Test Blueprints for STAAR Alternate 2 Assessments</b></p>
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence associating the DOK levels of STAAR to the DOK levels of TEKS because it is not known if the test is meeting the cognitive demands of the standards.</li> <li>• How Texas has addressed the recommendation in the WestEd report that Texas may want to use findings of the alignment study that was conducted to more closely examine the cognitive complexity of items in all grade levels in all content areas as there is a very high percentage of items at DOK levels 1 and 2.</li> <li>• Evidence that writing is assessed in STAAR Alternate 2 in grades 4, 7, and high school since writing is assessed in STAAR grades 4, 7, EOC English I and II.</li> <li>• Evidence that the 2016 STAAR L EOC Biology matched the blueprint of the 2012 START EOC Biology test.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>STAAR</b>  <u>Exhibit 2.2.1.b.</u> Technical Digest 2014-2015, Chapter 2.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.4.</u> Item development guides for math and reading; ELA Writing coding sheet, editing and revising, writing directives, review requirements, item specifications for biology, science; English I, II, III; Spanish, Algebra I and II, mathematics, and Spanish writing directives</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.5</u> Instructions to math item review committees</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.6</u> Documentation that items were developed by individuals with content area expertise, expertise as educators, and teaching students with disabilities, and English learners.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.9</u> STAAR Development Process</p> <p><b>STAAR A</b>  <u>Exhibit 2.2.4</u> Item development guides for math and reading; ELA Writing coding sheet, editing and revising, writing directives, review requirements, item specifications for biology, science; English I, II, III; Spanish, Algebra I and II, mathematics, Spanish writing directives Exhibit 2.2.5, Instructions to math item review committees  <u>Exhibit 2.2.6</u> Documentation that items were developed by individuals with</p>	<p>The required documentation was provided to address this critical element.</p> <p>It is not clear if all items used for STAAR and STAAR A and STAAR L the same.</p> <p>STAAR L  Items in the Test Summary Report for grade 5 mathematics 2015 STAAR are identical to that in the 2015 STAAR L. Many items in the Test Summary Report for the Biology EOC are similar, but not all. The state provides item statistical evidence that replaced items come from the state’s STAAR bank. No further evidence required for STAAR L.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>content area expertise, experience as educators, students with disabilities, English learners</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.9</u> STAAR Development Process</p> <p><b>STAAR L</b> TX 4/28/16 evidence submission, “test construction forms” folder “2016 STAAR grade 5 math.pdf”, “2016 STAAR L grade 5 math.pdf”, “2012 STAAR EOC biology.pdf”, and “2016 STAAR L EOC biology.pdf” files. Also, the “STAAR A and L clarification.docx” file is provided as evidence.</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b></p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.10.a and b</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Item Specifications Guide. This guide provides general guidelines for developing items and specifications for items across difficulty ranges, item specification for reading selections, and genres to be assessed at each grade level. Science item specifications are provided for grades 5, 8, and Biology for each reporting category. Item specifications similar to science were not located for reading or mathematics.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.11</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Cognitive Lab Results. The summary of the cognitive lab supports the use of an item-based AA-AAS.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.13</u> 2014 Item Review Demographic Tables. Special educators</p>	<p>Evidence of item specifications, as was provided for science, is needed for reading and mathematics.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>were members of each review team and 4/6 of the teams included ESL teachers.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.14.a - e</u> 2014 Item Review Judgment Reports. Math 3-8 and algebra; Science grades 5, 8, and biology; Reading 3-8 and English I and II, reading and writing.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.2.12</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Pilot Test Results. The STAAR Alternate 2 Pilot test was conducted during December 2013 and January 2014 for the purpose of gathering performance and survey data from students and test administrators regarding redesigned STAAR Alternate test items.</p>	
<b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> <li>• For STAAR Alternate 2, evidence of item specifications, as was provided for science, is needed for reading and mathematics.</li> <li>• Evidence that all items used for STAAR and STAAR A and STAAR L are the same.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>STAAR</b>  <u>Communicates to educators standardized procedures to administer assessments, including accommodations</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.1.a.</u> District and Campus Coordinator Manual</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.2</u> 2016 Test Administration Manuals for grades 3-5, 6-8 and EOC (see Note)</p> <p><u>Accommodations</u>  <u>Exhibit 2.3.3</u> District and Campus Coordinator Manual  <u>Exhibit 2.3.4 Test Administration Manuals</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.5</u> 2016 Linguistic Accommodations for ELLs Participating in STAAR</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.6</u> 2016 Accommodations for Students With Disabilities Participating in STAAR</p> <p><u>Training on procedures for administration of assessments</u>  <u>Exhibit 2.3.1</u> District Coordinators must attend training annually, p. S-11; Campus Coordinators required to attend annual training; Principals and Test administrators required to attend annual training p. S-16; all must sign oath that they have completed training in test administration</p> <p><u>Technology-based assessments: defined requirements, procedures for test administration, established contingency plans to address possible technology challenge</u>  <u>Exhibit 2.3.4</u> Test Administration Manuals include</p>	<p>Note: 2016 Test Administration Manuals (TAM) were submitted. The assessments being reviewed were administered in 2014-2015. Is the information in the 2016 TAM the same as the 2014-’15 TAM? Was there consistency in test administration such that the 2016 TAM is the same as previous test years?</p> <p>Suggestion          There is not a standardized powerpoint for the test coordinators to use, rather, a list of topics. Using the same training PowerPoint or webex in all districts could increase the standardized presentation of the content to all staff.</p> <p>Questions          -What’s a HSEP? High School Equivalency program? Who are these students? (court ordered)-how can these students qualify to be excused from taking the test?          -What’s a substitute assessment? See p. S-41 in District Coordinator Test Administration Manual</p> <p>-What is TAKS assessment? See 2.3.19 Assessments for SWD 2015 fall update, slide 22</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>standardized procedures for technology-based test administration and student use of online tools</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.1.</u> District and Campus Coordinator Manual, “Ensure that testing infrastructure is in place and that the test delivery system is configured; conduct test on online testing system”, pp. S-32-33.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.6</u> Preparation Activities for Administration of STAAR Online Testing, a graphic calendar of tasks to complete prior to testing.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.6</u> STAAR Online Testing Platform Technology Guide; explains all network and internet and hardware requirements, installing secure browser, configuring text-to-speech, local caching software, and configuring test computers to connect to LCS, URLs, Technology Staff Checklist</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.12</u> Online Testing Training for school district staff-technology oriented (appears to follow Online Testing Platform Technology Guide)</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b>  <u>Communicates to educators standardized procedures to administer assessments, including accommodations</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.16</u> 2016 Test Administrator Manual STAAR Alternate 2</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.17</u> District and Campus Coordinator Manual</p> <p><u>Accommodations</u></p>	<p>The 2016 Manuals presented in the exhibits include manuals and sections in manuals for technology-based test administration. However, based on later evidence submitted, only the STAAR L and STAAR A were online administrations in 2015.</p> <p>Contingency plans are not provided</p> <p>Note: 2016 Test Administration Manuals (TAM) were submitted. The assessments being reviewed were administered in 2014-2015. Is the information in the 2016 TAM the same as the 2014-'15 TAM? Was there consistency in test administration such that the 2016 TAM is the same as previous test years?</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Exhibit 2.3.16</u> 2016 Test Administrator Manual STAAR Alternate 2, pp. 23-26</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.23</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Accommodations</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.24</u> Accommodations for STAAR Alternate 2</p> <p><u>Training on procedures for administration of assessments</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.16</u> 2016 Test Administrator Manual STAAR Alternate 2, pp. 27-28. Training requirement to administer STAAR Alternate2.</p> <p><u>Technology-based assessments: defined requirements, procedures for test administration, established contingency plans to address possible technology challenge</u></p> <p>Texas peer review notes state: “STAAR Alternate 2 is not a technology-based assessment. However, student responses are entered into an online transcription form by the test administrator.”</p> <p>Contingency plans for technology issues are not provided.</p>	<p>Does the STAAR Alternate 2 Training include a module on preventing assessment irregularities and ensuring integrity of test results?</p> <p>Reviewers did not find evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 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 Texas has contingency plans to address possible technology challenges.</li> <li>2016 Test Administration Manuals (TAM) were submitted. The assessments being reviewed were administered in 2014-2015. Is the information in the 2016 TAM the same as the 2014-2015 TAM? Was there consistency in test administration such that the 2016 TAM is the same as previous test years? The 2016 Manuals include sections for technology-based test administration.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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><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>_____ policies and procedures apply to all grade-level and AA-AAAS in all subjects</p>	<p>evidence addresses critical element</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence needed.</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>STAAR</b>  <u>Policies and Procedures to prevent assessment irregularities and ensure integrity of test results Exhibit 2.54</u> TAC 101.3031, p. 8-9</p> <p><u>Prevention of assessment irregularities Exhibit 2.5.3</u> 2016 Test Security Supplement. Describes a range of categories of violations as well as how to avoid these violations, pp. 20-26.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.5.4.d</u> Training Module 3: Proper Handling of Secure Materials, <u>Exhibit 2.5.5</u> Training PowerPoint</p> <p><u>Detection of test irregularities Exhibit 2.5.3</u> 2016 Test Security Supplement. Describes a range of categories of violations as well as how to avoid these violations, pp. 20-26.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.5.2</u> Statistical Irregularity Analysis. Powerpoint presented to TAC</p> <p><u>Remediation following test security incidents Exhibit 2.5.3</u> 2016 Test Security Supplement, pp. 27 – 35.</p> <p><u>Investigation of alleged/factual test irregularities Exhibit 2.5.3</u> 2016 Test Security Supplement, pp. 27 – 35.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.5.6.a.</u> Policies Related to Breach of Test Content through Electronic Media</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.5.6.b.</u> Procedures for Addressing Content</p>	<p>Texas provided evidence of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities, including procedures to investigate alleged or factual irregularities.</p> <p>TEA has a mechanism to detect irregularities and an online report form. This includes what districts are required to do. It appears that the TEA review is only a bench review. It is not clear what triggers a test security audit by TEA.</p> <p>The LEA is responsible for investigating and remediating test irregularities. The responsibilities of the LEA are carefully delineated; however, the TEA role is unclear.</p> <p>How does a statistical analysis inform the TEA’s actions when a potential test security incident is identified? It appears that TEA only conducts bench audits of LEAs. Does the state perform on-site random audits of LEA administration to identify test security implementation?</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Breaches</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.5.4.b.</u> Test Security Supplement, p.35, 29</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b>  <u>Policies and Procedures to prevent assessment irregularities and ensure integrity of test results</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.16</u> 2016 Test Administrator Manual STAAR Alternate 2, pp. 7-12</p> <p><u>Prevention of assessment irregularities</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.58</u> Webpage for STAAR Alternate 2 Training Modules                      Reviewers do not see a training module for STAAR Alternate 2 test administrators that pertains to preventing assessment irregularities and ensuring integrity of test results. Although policies are stated in the Test Administrator Manual for STAAR Alternate 2, there is no evidence that test administrators receive such training.</p> <p><u>Detection of test irregularities</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.16</u> 2016 Test Administrator Manual STAAR Alternate 2, pp. 10-12; p. 12 – Reporting of Testing Irregularities</p>	<p>Does the STAAR Alternate 2 Training include a module on preventing assessment irregularities and ensuring integrity of test results?</p>
<b>Section 2.5 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>Define the TEA role and responsibilities to detect and investigate test irregularities.</li> <li>Evidence that the STAAR Alternate 2 Training includes information about preventing assessment irregularities and ensuring integrity of test results.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for both grade-level and AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>STAAR</b> Policies and procedures to</p> <p><u>Protect integrity of test materials, data in test development, administration, storage and use of results</u> <u>Exhibits 2.6.3, 2.6.4</u> District and Campus Coordinator Manual, 2016 Test Security Supplement. Documentation focuses on integrity and security of test materials.</p> <p><u>Secure student-level assessment data, student privacy and confidentiality, guidelines for districts and schools</u> <u>Exhibit 2.6.6.a.</u> Texas Education Code, TEC Section 1.005</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.6.6.c.</u> The University of Texas at Austin Education Research Center Policies and Procedures, General Information <u>Exhibit 2.6.6.d</u> Example of Researcher Confidentiality Agreement</p> <p><u>Protect PII in reporting, including minimum number of students</u> <u>Exhibit 2.6.5.a and b.</u> Explanation of Masking Rule for STAAR and for Texas Academic performance Reports. Minimum n=4</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate</b> Texas states in its submission notes that “STAAR Alternate 2 follows the same data security policies and procedures as outlined for STAAR.”</p>	<p>Appropriate documentation was provided to address this critical element.</p>

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>Adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.1.1.a</u> Technical Digest 2014-2015 Chapter 3 Standard Technical Processes describes technical details and procedures for performance standards, item analyses, scaling, equating, reliability, validity, measures of student progress, sampling</p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.1.1.d, 3.1.1.e</u> Content validity maps test content to TEKS-the test development process and judgment of content experts about relationship between items and test construct, content validation materials, pp. 67-68</p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.1.1.b</u> Evidence of alignment -Study of the Alignment between STAAR-Categorical Concurrence and Depth-of-Knowledge.</p> <p><b>STAAR L</b> TX 4/28/16 evidence submission, “test construction forms” folder “2012 STAAR EOC biology.pdf”, and “2016 STAAR L EOC biology.pdf” files. Also, the “STAAR A and L clarification.docx” file is provided as evidence.</p>	<p>Evidence shows that the items on the test are generally aligned to the content standards; however, it is not clear if there are sufficient items in each reporting category. For example, in a Webb alignment study, the criteria for categorical concurrence is 6 or more items/strand, or in Texas’ case, reporting categories.</p> <p>Peers were not able to locate evidence associating DOK levels of STAAR items with the DOK levels of the content standards, nor is it clear what Texas’ expectations are for the relationship between STAAR and TEKS DOK levels.</p> <p>The DOK levels presented appear inadequate in Math and science and reading-grades 3, 6, 7. What are Texas’ plans to address this finding? (3.1.1.b. , p. 5)</p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.1.1.i</u> Equating Procedures, 2015 STAAR 3-8 English and Spanish Test Analysis Specifications. Validity studies to evaluate comparability between transadapted tests were conducted in 2007, prior to the implementation of the new TEKS. Does Texas have evidence that the Spanish Test and STAAR assessments aligned with TEKS are comparable?</p> <p>STAAR L It is unclear from the submitted evidence how the STAAR EOC Biology and STAAR L EOC Biology are aligned by reporting category. From the Test Summary Reports, we see each test has 5 reporting categories, but the item count is missing for the STAAR EOC Biology file. Is the coverage of items by reporting category for the STAAR L EOC Biology</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>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.</u></p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b>  <u>Exhibit 3.1.8</u> Technical Digest STAAR Alternate 2, Chapter 3—p. 2708</p> <p><b>Exhibit. 3.1.2.5</b> A study of the alignment between STAAR Alternate 2 and the TEKS</p> <p>This alignment study concludes that the 2016 STAAR Alternate 2 items and Essence Statements demonstrated strong linkage across all grades and content areas; all items and Essence Statements were found to have an academic foundation and content connections to the grade level Student Expectations. (p. 33)</p>	<p>test the same as that of the STAAR EOC Biology test? It would be helpful to have the item count for the 2012 STAAR EOC Biology test as well.</p> <p>For the STAAR Alternate 2, appropriate documentation was provided to address this critical element.</p>
<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>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> <li>• Evidence that there are sufficient items in each reporting category.</li> <li>• Evidence associating DOK levels of STAAR items with the DOK levels of the content standards</li> <li>• Texas’ expectations for the relationship between STAAR and TEKS DOK levels.</li> <li>• Texas’ plan to address the finding that the DOK levels appear inadequate in Math and science; and in reading-grades 3, 6, 7.</li> <li>• Evidence that the current Spanish STAAR and STAAR assessments are comparable.</li> <li>• Evidence that the STAAR A and the STAAR assessments are comparable.</li> <li>• Evidence that STAAR L EOC Biology’s item count per reporting category is similar to STAAR EOC Biology.</li> </ul>		



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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><u>Exhibit 3.2.9</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Item Content Committee Review Reports. Reports for reading, mathematics, science, and EOC indicating teachers provided judgments on each item, evaluating the match to the knowledge and skills (or essence) statement and the appropriateness of the item for the student population.</p>	
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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>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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>Analyses of internal structure of assessments (item correlations)</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.3.2</u> Technical Digest, Appendix B</p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.3.1</u> Technical Digest Chapter 4, p. 122. <u>Appendix B</u> Evidence based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The evidence above was submitted for STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR L, Spanish, and STAAR Alternate 2.</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b> <u>Exhibit 3.3.5</u> Technical Digest, STAAR Alternate 2, Chapter 5, p. 157. Texas conducts annual internal consistency studies to gather evidence based on internal structure.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.3.6.a, b, c, d, e</u> Technical Digest, Appendix C, STAAR Alternate 2 Classification Accuracy Tables, Correlation Estimates, RSSS Conversion Tables and CSEM, Mean P-Values and Internal Consistency Values by Reporting Category and Content Area, and Score Distributions and Statistics by Content Area and Grade.</p>	<p>We were not able to locate factor analysis, IRT fit indices, or item correlations that would support the internal consistency of STAAR assessments (Exhibit 4.1.2.c). However, the evidence that was submitted for the overall test reliability and subtest reliability supports that the internal structure of the test is appropriate.</p> <p>Submitted evidence for STAAR Alternate 2 meets the requirement of the critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>Reports of analyses that demonstrate positive correlations between state assessment results and external measures</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.2.6.a.</u> External validity studies (hs mathematics; hs English, hs Biology)</p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.2.7.a.</u> External validity study to establish empirical links between performance on STAAR Algebra II and performance on the THEA mathematics test</p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.2.7.b.</u> External validity studies to establish empirical links between performance on English III reading and SAT reading performance, THEA, etc.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.2.7.c.</u> Empirical links between performance on STAAR biology and ACT science test</p> <p><u>Exhibit 3.2.7.d.</u> Performance on EOC STAAR assessments and NAEP</p> <p>Conducted linking studies, comparison studies, grade correlation studies, external validity studies, NAEP and PISA comparisons, college students taking STAAR which link performance to college course grades, vertical scale studies p. 22, 3.4.1</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b> Exhibit 3.4.6 Technical Digest STAAR Alternate 2, Chapter 5, pp. 157-8. 2015 STAAR Alternate 2 3-8 Assessments Scale Score Correlations Within Grade, and EOC Assessments Scale Score Correlations</p>	<p>The evidence submitted meets requirements.</p> <p>The STAAR Alternate 2 evidence submitted meets requirements for this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  x  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>STAAR</b>  <u>Chapter on Reliability in Technical Report</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.1.1</u> Technical Digest Chapter 4, p. 115</p> <p><u>Documentation of reliability evidence:</u>  <u>Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.1.2.c</u> STAAR 2015 Mean P-Values and Internal Consistency Values by Reporting Category and Content</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.1.1</u> Technical Digest Appendix B  <u>Exhibit 4.1.1</u> Technical Digest Chapter 4</p> <p><u>Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results:</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.1.2.a.</u> STAAR 2015 Classification Accuracy Tables</p> <p><u>Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments:</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.1.2.b.</u> STAAR 2015 RSSS Conversion Tables and CSEM</p>	<p>The evidence submitted meets requirements.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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>STAAR Alternate</b>  <u>Chapter on Reliability in Technical Report</u>                      Exhibit 4.1.5 Technical Digest, Chapter 5, STAAR Alternate 2, Reliability, pp. 153 – 155.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.1.6</u> STAAR Alternate 2 2015 MEAN P-Values and Internal Consistency Values by Reporting Category and Content Area</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.1.10</u> Technical Digest for 2014, Appendix C, STAAR Alternate 2 2015 Correlation Estimates</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.1.11</u> 2015 STAAR Alternate 2 Test Administrator Survey Report  <u>Exhibit 4.1.12</u> 2015 STAAR Alternate 2 Post-Administration Survey Report</p> <p>These survey allowed TEA to collect evidence of the fidelity of the initial STAAR Alternate 2 administration; usefulness of resource materials, accommodations, and administration procedures. (Texas peer review notes)</p>	<p>The evidence submitted for STAAR Alternate 2 meets requirements of this critical element.</p>
<b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>STAAR</b>  <u>Universal design, language simplification, accessibility tools and features; Approaches used for developing items; Procedures used for maximum accessibility of items during development process-guidelines for accessibility</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.1</u> Series of evidence; item writing specifications; however, none include specific mention of universal design and accessibility</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.6</u> STAAR Development process, Powerpoint, p. 6. Internal item review committee roles-“accessibility staff-assist in ensuring . . .” but no definition or operationalization of accessibility or how to make items accessible or how accessibility staff assist, only that they do so.</p> <p><u>Instructions provided to item writers and reviewers re: writing accessible items</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 2 Technical Digest, p. 18</u> asserts that guidelines for bias and sensitivity, accessibility and accommodations were provided to item writers and item reviewers, but these guidelines were not located in the evidence submitted.</p> <p><u>Procedures for developing and reviewing items in alternative formats or substitute items and ensuring items conform to specifications</u></p> <p>Evidence not located for STAAR A</p> <p><u>Bias and sensitivity training for writers and reviewers; Description of processes used to write, review, evaluate items for bias and sensitivity</u></p>	<p>Reviewers could not locate evidence for the general STAAR assessment (i.e., <u>not</u> STAAR A, L, or Alternate 2) supporting that the development and review of items used universal design principles; could not locate training materials for item writers and reviewers that define accessibility or universal design and how to incorporate these principles during item development. Evidence about universal design and accessibility for STAAR was not located in this section.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.6</u> STAAR Development Process – no content related to 4.2</p> <p>Peers did not locate evidence pertaining to procedures for developing and reviewing items in alternative formats or substitute items and ensuring items conform to specifications</p> <p>Peers did not locate evidence that experts in students with disabilities or English learners were involved in item development and review</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Although the word “accessibility” is mentioned, no specifics are provided; no information about what accessibility is or practices to make items accessible. Evidence is not located.</p> <p><u>Documentation that experts in students with disabilities and English learners were involved in item development and review</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.7</u> Section on Reviewer Information is from July 2011 Grade 8 mathematics item review. The information collected does not include expertise in, or if the reviewer is a special educator or EL educator.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.6</u> Powerpoint, slide 19 states that “Rosters should . . . include educators with ELL, bilingual and special education backgrounds” However, peers did not locate evidence that rosters included staff with these areas of expertise.</p> <p><u>Process to evaluate items for bias during pilot and field testing</u> Evidence not located</p> <p><u>Documentation of analyses to identify bias or inconsistent interpretation of results (DIF)</u></p> <p><b>STAAR L</b> “2016_Lingustic Accommodations for STAAR.pdf” provides a description of the variety of supports and accommodations available for ELLs on STAAR, STAAR L, and STAAR A.</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b></p>	<p><b>STAAR L</b> In the provided evidences (submitted 4/28/16), the state describes the types of accommodations and embedded support on STAAR L. What determines when a test item has a provided support? Evidence of guidelines determining whether words and/or phrases in a test items have supports was not found. For example, are there word lists? What determines which item stem and/or answer selections are provided supports?</p> <p>Evidence needed that guidelines for applying universal design principles and linguistic simplification were provided to item writers.</p> <p><u>Procedures for developing and reviewing items in alternative formats or substitute items and ensuring items conform to specifications</u></p> <p>Evidence not located for STAAR A</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Universal design, language simplification, accessibility tools and features</u></p> <p><u>Approaches used for developing items; Instructions provided to item writers and reviewers re: writing accessible items; Procedures used for maximum accessibility of items during development process- guidelines for accessibility</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.8 (labeled as 4.2.9 in the online index)</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Item Specifications Guide. The general guidelines state that universal design principles and linguistic simplification guidelines are to be applied; however, these guidelines are not provided.</p> <p>Directions are provided to item writers that pertain to levels of complexity of items and response modes that students may use to respond to the items, pp. 5-7.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.9</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Cognitive Lab Results.</p> <p><u>Bias and sensitivity training for writers and reviewers</u> TEA indicates in peer notes, page 6, that “During these item reviews . . . Prior to the review, facilitators led a training that included a discussion of issues related to bias and accessibility.”</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.13</u> Item Judgment Form Sample <u>Exhibit 4.2.14</u> 2014 Item Review Judgment Reports</p> <p>On the Item Judgment form question 3 relates to the “Fairness of Item: Is this item free from bias on the basis of students’ personal characteristics such as gender, ethnicity or disability?”</p>	<p><b>STAAR A</b></p> <p>STAAR A documentation describes accessibility, and technology features/accommodations that promote access to items.</p> <p>It’s unclear why the accommodations embedded in the STAAR A could not be part of the general assessment consistent with principles of universal design. Are such accessibility features ones that only students with disabilities use? What is the rationale for having a separate test (STAAR A) vs making the technology features available for all students?</p> <p>Evidence is provided that STAAR Alternate 2 was developed using universal design principals.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Documentation that experts in students with disabilities and English learners were involved in item development and review</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.12</u> 2014 Item Review Demographic Tables. Educator Reviews – Special Education teachers were included in all panels; some panels had ESL teachers.</p> <p><u>Description of processes used to write, review, evaluate items for bias and sensitivity</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.15</u> Technical Digest for 2014-2015, Chapter 5 STAAR Alternate 2, p. 139. 1 question asks: “Fairness of item: Is this item free from bias on the basis of students’ personal characteristics such as gender, ethnicity or disability?”</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.12</u> 2014 Item Review Demographic Tables. Educator Reviews. Item Judgment form: 1 question asks: “Fairness of item: Is this item free from bias on the basis of students’ personal characteristics such as gender, ethnicity or disability?” Refer to above exhibits related to this topic.</p> <p><u>Process to evaluate items for bias during pilot and field testing</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.10</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Pilot Test Technical Report. This Technical Report does not present evidence related to a process to evaluate items for bias during pilot and field testing.</p> <p><u>Documentation of analyses to identify bias or</u></p>	

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>inconsistent interpretation of results (DIF)</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.2.16</u> Spring 2015 Scale Score Results by Disability Category. TEA, in the notes, p. 7, states “DIF analyses of all operational items resulted in only a single item being flagged for DIF. The item was reviewed by content experts and determined to show no bias.”</p>	
<b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u><u>  </u><u>  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale]</li> <li>• Evidence that universal design and accessibility principles are applied to item development and item reviews for STAAR.</li> <li>• Evidence that criteria for determining and guidelines for developing accessible items were provided to item writers and reviewers.</li> <li>• Evidence that universal design and accessibility principles are applied to item development and item reviews for STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR L Spanish, STAAR Alternate 2 assessments.</li> <li>• Evidence that STAAR item reviewers have expertise in, or are special educators or English learner educators.</li> <li>• Evidence of a process to evaluate items for bias during pilot and field testing.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>Distribution of cognitive complexity and item difficulty indices that demonstrate items adequately cover the full performance continuum</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.3.d</u> Internal consistency and mean p-values for items and reporting categories</p> <p><u>Analysis of TIF and ability estimates for students at different performance levels across full performance continuum</u></p> <p>No TIF evidence provided; Provided distribution of scores, descriptive statistics of distribution</p> <p><u>4.3.3.a Classification Accuracy</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.3.3.h</u> Distribution of scores</p> <p><u>Table of CSEM at various points along score range</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.3.3.b</u> Raw score scale score table for reading</p> <p>The above evidence was submitted for STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR L, Spanish, and STAAR Alternate.</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b>  <u>Provided distribution of scores, descriptive statistics of distribution</u>  <u>Exhibit 4.3.10</u> Technical Digest, STAAR Alternate 2 Frequency Distribution-Scale Scores for all tested grades and subjects</p>	<p>Evidence that items cover full performance; for total group, subgroups</p> <p>Classification accuracy suggests that students are meaningfully identified at state proficiency level cut points.</p> <p>Submitted evidence meets requirement</p> <p>Submitted evidence for STAAR Alternate 2 meets requirement</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>STAAR</b>  <u>Chapter on scoring in technical report that describes scoring procedures</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.1.a.</u> Technical Digest Chapter 2, pp. 32-36.</p> <p><u>Procedures for constructing scales used for reporting scores and rationale for these procedures; scale, measurement error, descriptions of test scores.</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.1.b</u> Quality Control Systems, pp. 41-43. Description of scaling and equating.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.2</u> Technical Digest Chapter 3, 51 – 55. Evidence and procedures used to create a score scale.</p> <p><u>Scoring involving human judgment</u>  <u>Spanish</u>                      Reviewers did not locate scorer requirements for the scorers for grade 4 Spanish writing. Are these scorers Spanish speakers?</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.1.a</u> Technical Digest, chapter 2, pp. 30-35. STAAR, STAAR A written compositions scored on adjacent agreement scoring model, STAAR and STAAR A short answer responses scored on exact agreement scoring; TAKS written compositions and short answer responses are scored on an exact agreement scoring model.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.3</u> Technical Digest Chapter 4, pp. 120-121</p>	<p>Submitted evidence meets requirement for this component of the critical element.</p> <p>Scorer requirements for the scorers for grade 4 Spanish writing.</p> <p>Is TAKS the old assessment system? If so, why is it referenced in the evidence?</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.3</u> Technical Digest Chapter 4, pp. 120-121. Do Tables 4.14 and 4.15 provide exact and adjacent evidence of inter rater reliability statistics? It is not clear from the title of the tables or the text.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Documentation of quality control procedures</u>  <u>Exhibit 4.4.1</u> Technical Digest, Chapter 2, pp. 28 – 29 Quality control procedures</p> <p><u>IRR—clear scoring rubrics, adequate training for and qualifying of raters, Results of IRR of scores</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.1.a</u> Technical Digest, chapter 2, p. 32 -36 Description of Reader Training Process</p> <p><u>Documentation that system produces student results in terms of academic achievement standards</u>  <u>Exhibit 4.4.5</u> Understanding Your Child’s Confidential Student Report. Reports indicator of achievement of satisfactory or advanced academic achievement standards.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.6.a</u> Grades 3-8 STAAR Interpreting Assessment Results, p. 2.10 explains satisfactory/advanced/not satisfactory Level II.</p> <p><u>State has rules for invalidating test results when necessary-non-attempt, cheating, unauthorized accommodations; appropriate procedures for implementing these rules.</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.7.a</u> STAAR District and Campus Coordinator Manual. Student’s test is invalidated due to cheating, p. 2932</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.8.a</u> Grades 3-5 Test Administration Manual 2016, p. 23. In cases of student cheating, the test coordinator will invalidate the test by reporting “O”.</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b></p>	<p>Peers did not locate scoring rubrics.</p> <p>Peers did not locate data for inter-rater reliability, inter-rater agreement for all human scored assessments</p> <p>Training appears to be adequate based on the I-RR.</p> <p>Evidence related to invalidating test results for non-attempt and unauthorized accommodations was not located.</p> <p><b>Are the scoring procedures applied to STAAR A and L the same as those for STAAR? What are the qualifications for scorers of STAAR L grade 4 writing?</b></p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Chapter on scoring in technical report that describes scoring procedures</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.15</u> Chapter 5, STAAR Alternate 2, p. 144. STAAR Alternate 2 Assessments are scored polytomously using a standard scoring rubric that follows the same process of item administration across all levels. Each item is scored according to the level of independence with which a student responds to an item. Each item is scored 0, 1, or 2; there are 20 items/test.</p> <p>There are four items in each of five item clusters; each item in a cluster has a different level of complexity and, a unique set of scoring instructions (Exhibit 4.4.21 2016 STAAR Alternate 2 Test Administration Manual). Items are scored using a different rubric depending on the item’s complexity. The description of assigned a score point of 1 in Chapter 5, state, “If the student responds correctly to the second presentation of the item, he or she receives a score point of 1.” However, there is a different level of support, as described in Exhibit 4.4.21 2016 STAAR Alternate 2 Test Administration Manual, associated with score point 1 for the level of complexity of the question. The types of support for each of the four levels of items are: (p. 21-22)</p> <p>For the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First question in a cluster: the test administrator may repeat the initial presentation of instructions for reduced credit</li> <li>• Second question in a cluster: the test administrator is directed to model the desired student action using the most likely way the student might respond, <i>communicate the correct answer as stated in the test administrator action</i>, and repeat the initial presentation instructions</li> </ul>	<p>What evidence does the state have that the STAAR Alternate 2 scoring rubrics, for each of the four items in a cluster, appropriately samples the constructs measured by the rubrics? Specifically, when a rater scores the student as “B”, does this measure the construct of interest? If so, how?</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

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>• Third question in a cluster: the test administrator must select one of the provided allowable teacher assists before repeating the presentation instructions. . .</li> <li>• Fourth question in a cluster: the initial presentation instructions must be repeated (same as for First question in a cluster)</li> </ul> <p>What is the rationale for the “supports” that must be provided for Second and Third questions in a cluster? For the second question in the cluster, the correct response is indicated to the student and the student must then indicate the same response to the item. What is the rationale for applying the indicated supports to the specific question in the cluster?</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.13 Technical Digest, Chapter 2, Building a High-Quality Assessment System, Quality Control Procedures, pp. 28-29.</u></p> <p><u>Evidence of adequate training</u> TEA notes that the following materials are used in training test administrators and provide clear, precise descriptions of the scripted questions teachers administer:</p> <p>Exhibit 4.4.23 Educator Guide to STAAR Alternate 2, pp. 9-18</p> <p>Exhibit 4.4.24 2016 STAAR Alternate 2 Test Administrator Manual, pp. 13-14, 17-26.</p> <p>Exhibit 4.4.25 No Authentic Academic Response designation form for a STAAR Alternate 2 administration</p>	

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Procedures for constructing scales used for reporting scores and rationale for these procedures; scale, measurement error, descriptions of test scores.</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.14</u> Technical Digest, Chapter 5, STAAR Alternate 2, Scaling, pp. 150-151.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.16, 4.4.17, 4.4.18</u> Mean P-Value and Internal Consistency Values by Reporting Category and Content Area; Raw Score to Scale Conversion Tables and CSEM; Classification Accuracy Tables <u>Documentation that system produces student results in terms of academic achievement standards</u></p> <p><u>State has rules for invalidating test results when necessary-non-attempt, cheating, unauthorized accommodations; appropriate procedures for implementing these rules.</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.21</u> 2016 STAAR Alternate 2 Test Administration Manual, pp. 9-12. Reviewers did not find a reference to invalidating test results.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.4.7.b</u> STAAR Alternate 2 District and Campus Coordinator Manual, p. 2996. O=Other Student Not to be Scored. The student experiences a test administration irregularity or illness during testing.</p>	<p>Evidence of the conditions under which test results are invalidated.</p>
<b>Section 4.4 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>• Evidence of the scoring procedures that are applied to STAAR A and STAAR L.</li> <li>• Evidence that the STAAR Alternate 2 scoring rubrics, for each of the four items in a cluster, appropriately samples the constructs measured by the rubrics</li> <li>• Data for inter-rater reliability, inter-rater agreement for all human scored assessments (STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR Alternate 2)</li> <li>• Description of data in Exhibit 4.4.3 Technical Digest Chapter 4, pp. 120-121. Do Tables 4.14 and 4.15 provide exact and adjacent evidence of inter rater reliability statistics?</li> <li>• Evidence of the conditions under which test results are invalidated.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>STAAR</b>  <u>Documentation of technically sound equating procedures and results within an academic year</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.1</u> Technical Digest, chapter 3, Equating, pp. 56-62</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.2</u> Technical Digest, chapter 4, Equating, pp. 112 – 115.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.4</u> STAAR Reading MAR15 equating documentation</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.4</u> STAAR Writing MAR15 equating documentation</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.4.f</u> 2015 STAAR EOC FT Equating Specifications v1.2</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.4.h</u> Equating Summary Table-TX 2015 v1.7</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.4.l</u> TX Equating High-Level Summary 3.2.2015</p> <p><u>Year-to-year equating procedures and results</u>            Evidence not located</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b>  <u>Documentation of technically sound equating procedures and results within an academic year</u></p> <p>Exhibit 4.5.5 Technical Digest, Chapter 5, STAAR Alternate 2, p. 152-153</p> <p>Exhibit 4.5.7 August 2015 TTAC Presentation on</p>	<p>It was unclear if the state spiraled grade level forms for each of the assessment types, and if so, how the forms were equated?</p> <p>The STAAR Alternate 2 evidence submitted meets the requirements for this critical element.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>STAAR Alternate 2 Equating</p> <p>Exhibit 4.5.8 August 2015 TTAC Meeting Minutes on STAAR Alternate 2 Equating</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.9</u> TTAC August 2015 agenda, presentation</p>	
<b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  </u>x_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that if the state spiraled grade level forms, how the forms were equated.</li> <li>• Evidence of year-to-year equating procedures and results.</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>Documentation that state followed design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results across different versions of the assessments; Report of results of a comparability study of different versions of the assessments</u></p> <p><u>General and alternate based on grade-level academic achievement standards: STAAR and STAAR A, STAAR and STAAR L</u></p> <p><u>English and Native language assessment- STAAR Spanish tests, once translated, are equated with reading, math, writing and science English version of STAAR assessments (Exhibit 4.5.4.d). Resulting in them being placed on the same scale.</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.5.4.d. 2015 STAAR 3-8 English and Spanish Test Analysis Specifications – planned for spring 2015</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.6.2 Technical Digest, chapter 3, pp. 84 – 85 (English-Spanish),</u></p> <p><u>Technology and paper-based assessments</u>  <u>Exhibit 4.6.3 Technical Digest, chapter 4, pp. 114</u>            Comparability of paper-pencil and online modes: results suggested an effect and adjustments were made</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.6.2 Technical Digest Chapter 3, p. 69</u>            describes a process to conduct comparability studies, but no evidence is provided that these were conducted.</p>	<p>Peers were unable to locate adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results for STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L, and STAAR EOC assessments.</p> <p>Peers did not locate evidence that technology-based assessments delivered on different types of devices are comparable. Does Texas administer STAAR on different types of devices?</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>For technology-based assessments that are delivered on different types of devices</u>  <u>Test administration hardware and software are standardized across unaccommodated administrations, or reports of research that show variation from different types of delivery devices do not alter interpretation; or a comparability study</u>                      Evidence not provided</p> <p><b>STAAR L</b>                      TX 4/28/16 evidence submission, “test construction forms” folder “2016 STAAR grade 5 math.pdf”, “2016 STAAR L grade 5 math.pdf”, “2012 STAAR EOC biology.pdf”, and “2016 STAAR L EOC biology.pdf” files. Also, the “STAAR A and L clarification.docx” file is provided as evidence.</p>	

**Section 4.6 Summary Statement**

- x\_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- Evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results for STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L, and STAAR EOC assessments.
  - Comparability studies for online and paper pencil assessments.
  - Evidence that test administration hardware and software are standardized across unaccommodated administrations, or reports of research that show variation from different types of delivery devices do not alter interpretation; or a comparability study

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>Documentation that state has implemented clear and technically sound criteria for analyses of its assessment system:</u></p> <p><u>Assessment contracts that specify state’s expectations for analyses of reliability, validity, fairness;</u> <u>Independent studies of alignment and comparability</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.7.10</u> Independent alignment study</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.7.9</u> ETS Proposal: TA and Production of a Technical Digest</p> <p><u>Recent technical reports</u></p> <p>Documentation of alignment</p> <p>Presentation of assessment results</p> <p>Documentation of system for monitoring and improving quality of assessment system, regular internal and external technical review of assessment system-BOE, TAC minutes,</p> <p>Texas TAC</p> <p><u>Exhibits 4.7.2, 4.7.3 4.7.4, 4.7.5, 4.7.6, 4.7.12,</u> TAC Agendas, minutes demonstrate that Texas confers with its TAC</p> <p><u>Exhibit 4.7.13</u> District Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda for August 5, 2015 and Invitation list How often does this committee meet? How many invitees attended? Are there minutes from this meeting?</p>	<p>Texas uses a variety of technical resources to ensure the ongoing maintenance of the STAAR system.</p> <p>A separate link to these documents was not provided; peers located these on pp. 5,829 – 6,875.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b>		
_x_ No additional evidence is required		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —</p> <p><u>Explanation of differences between assessments, any effects of policies on students’ education resulting from taking AA-AAS</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.2 STAAR A Eligibility Requirements</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.10</u> The STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Requirements indicate that there may impact a student’s graduation options when he or she is in high school. What are the implications for graduation for a student taking the STAAR Alternate 2?</p> <p><u>Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by IEP team based on student’s individual needs</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.2, 5.1.7</u> STAAR A Eligibility requirements and STAAR A Eligibility Guide</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.8</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Requirements</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.11</u> Educator Guide, Responsibilities for IEP Team, ARD Re p. 5</p> <p><u>Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on general assessment with/without accommodations or an AA-AAS</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.1</u> 2015-2016 Update, Accommodations STAAR A, STAAR Alternate 2; explains Type 1 and 2 accommodations. Are these procedures the same that were used in 2014 -2015?</p>	<p>The STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Requirements indicate that there may impact a student’s graduation options when he or she is in high school. What are the implications for graduation for a student taking the STAAR Alternate 2?</p> <p>Many exhibits reflect test year 2016. Were the procedures used in 2014-2015 the same? If so, except for question noted above, the evidence submitted for this component of the critical element meets requirements.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> <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><u>Exhibit 5.1.13</u> Critical Information about Accommodations for Students with Disabilities taking State Assessments, pp. 1-4. Provides information about the appropriate use of accommodations for students with disabilities taking STAAR general assessments. It does not include guidelines for decisions to assess students an AA-AAS.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.2</u> STAAR A Eligibility Requirements</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.3</u> Process Document Guiding Districts and Campuses in Requesting Type 2 Accommodations</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.6</u> Accommodations for STAAR Alternate 2, pp. 23-24</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.10</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Requirements</p> <p><u>Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations for students with disabilities</u></p> <p><u>Exhibits 2.3.2, 2.3.4</u> Test Administration Manuals include standardized procedures for technology-based test administration and student use of online tools</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.7</u> Accommodations embedded in STAAR A, p. 4;</p> <p><u>Instructions that students eligible for AA-AAS may be from any disability category</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.8</u> 2015-2016 STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Requirements, p. 2</p>	

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Ensures parents are informed that students' taking AA-AAS, their achievement will be based on AAS and any consequences for taking AA-AAS</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.18</u> 2015-2016 STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Requirements, p. 2. However, it is not stated what the consequences are for taking the STAAR Alternate 2.</p> <p><u>Implementation of AA-AAS promotes student access to general curriculum</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.1.18</u> 2015-2016 STAAR Alternate 2 Participation Requirements, p. 1</p>	
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>x</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of the implications for graduation for a student taking the STAAR Alternate 2.</li> <li>• Evidence that procedures related to this critical element were the same in 2014-2015</li> </ul>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —</p> <p><u>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s)</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.2.6.a</u> 2016 STAAR Decision-Making Guide for LPACs</p> <p><u>Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.2.1</u> Linguistic Accommodations for ELLS Participating in the STAAR Program, p. 3</p> <p><u>Exhibit 2.3.2, 2.3.4</u> Test Administration Manuals include standardized procedures for technology-based test administration and student use of online tools</p> <p><u>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.2.4</u> 2015-2016 STAAR Participation</p> <p><b>STAAR L</b> TX 4/28/16 evidence submission, “2016_Linguistic Accommodations for STAAR.pdf</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b> <u>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s)</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.2.5</u> 2015-2016 STAAR Decision-Making Guide for LPACs, p. 2. STAAR Alternate 2 is “available for students receiving special education services, including those who are ELLS, who meet <b>requirements for an alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards, . . .</b> No specific</p>	<p><b>Submitted evidence meets requirements.</b></p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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>
	list of allowable linguistic accommodations; assessment design allows for any language or other communication method routinely used with the student.”	
<b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b>		
__x_ No additional evidence is required		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —</p> <p>Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS;</p> <p><u>Availability of accommodations for students with disabilities, IDEA and 504</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.3.1</u> Technical Digest, chapter 4, pp. 91-97</p> <p><u>Accommodations for English learners</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.3.1</u> Technical Digest, chapter 4, pp. 95-97</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.3.11</u> 2016 STAAR Decision-Making Guide for LPACs for assessments and accommodations</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.2.1</u> Linguistic Accommodations for ELLS Participating in the STAAR Program, 3</p> <p><u>Determined accommodations are appropriate, effective for meeting student’s needs to participate in the assessments</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.3.8</u> Summary statistics of accommodations used by students in spring 2015- Descriptive statistics only</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.3.16</u> % of Students using specific accommodations on 2015 STAAR Alternate 2. Descriptive statistics only</p> <p><u>Accommodations do not alter construct being assessed</u></p> <p>No evidence provided.</p> <p><u>Allow meaningful interpretations of results and</u></p>	<p>Evidence is not provided for any assessment that accommodations used are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct being assessed, or 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</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>comparisons of scores</u></p> <p>No evidence provided.</p> <p><u>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</u></p> <p>No evidence provided.</p> <p><b><u>STAAR Alternate 2</u></b>                      5.3.18 STAAR Alternate Pilot Test Results-indicated that teachers did not know what the accommodations were until after the test. Was this fixed?</p> <p><u>Exhibit 5.3.19</u> Considerations for STAAR Alternate 2 Accommodations. This table presents Allowable Accommodations and Relevant Guidance/Research for each accommodation.</p> <p>However, no analysis was provided that the accommodations used for STAAR Alternate 2 do not alter construct being assessed, or allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparisons of scores.</p>	

<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>• Evidence that accommodations used, Accommodations 1, Accommodations 2, Accommodations embedded in STAAR A, STAAR L, and accommodations used in STAAR Alternate 2 are appropriate and effective, do not alter the construct being assessed, 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>• Evidence that Texas 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>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —</p> <p><u>State monitors test admin to ensure appropriate assessments/accommodations are selected for students with disabilities, English learners and receive accommodations</u></p> <p>These exhibits, indicated in the State’s notes, do not provide evidence that the State monitors test administration in its district and schools: <u>Exhibits 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 5.4.5, and 5.4.6.</u></p> <p>The Notes Texas submitted, p. 10, state, “Every district is subject to the Performance Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMAS) and student assessment data validation monitoring every year, depending on the results generated from the indicators described in the PBMAS ad Student Assessment Data Validation manuals. The monitoring done by the Performance-Based Monitoring and Program Monitoring and Interventions divisions is conducted after each year’s testing administration cycle. These divisions are not a part of any on-site monitoring that may occur during actual test administration windows.”</p> <p>It is not clear how Exhibit 5.4.7 2015 Student Assessment Data Validation Manual; provides evidence of State monitoring that appropriate assessments and accommodations are selected, administered, consistent with student’s IEP, 504/LPAC team or administered with fidelity.</p> <p><u>Consistent with State’s policies for accommodations</u> No evidence provided</p> <p><u>Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or</u></p>	<p>The evidence provided does not support that the State monitors test administration for special populations as described in this critical element.</p> <p>Information provided in 5.4.7 indicates that monitoring is a function of data validation. Evidence is needed.</p>



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><b>STAAR</b>  <u>Evidence of adoption of State’s academic achievement standards and AA-AAS in all grades and subjects</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.1.2</u> Adoption of performance standards for STAAR grades 3-8 and STAAR Alternate 2, grades 3-8, STAAR EOC performance standards and STAAR Alternate 2 EOC performance standards</p> <p><u>State statutes that achievement standards apply to all; AA-AAS apply to students with significant cognitive disabilities</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.1.2</u> Test Administrative Code, Performance Standards, page 9, paragraph (b): STAAR grades 3-8 Assessments performance standards, 2015 -2022, and STAAR Alternate 2, grades 3-8 performance standards.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.1.3</u> Technical Digest, Chapter 4, STAAR (a) three levels of achievement, p. 102 (b) descriptions and the competencies, pp. 102-103. Policy definitions for each performance level are provided.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.1.2</u> Test Administrative Code, Performance Standards, (c) <u>Exhibit 4.6.6.a</u> provides the classification tables for the scores</p>	<p>Evidence provided meets this critical element</p> <p>Evidence provided meets this critical element</p> <p>Evidence provided for STAAR Alternate 2</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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>Page 9-10, paragraph (c) identifies the STAAR EOC performance standards, 2015-2022 and the STAAR Alternate 2 EOC performance standards.</p> <p>Supplemental evidence submitted by TEA on April 28 clarified that STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L are on the same scale, use the same proficiency cut points, and establish at least three achievement levels.</p>	
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		



**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

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>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column —all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>Achievement standards are aligned with the State’s academic content standards ; 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</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.3.1.a</u> STAAR Standard Setting Report, pp. 27-31. Reports that STAAR EOC were benchmarked to ACT, SAT, THEA Mathematics; ACT, SAT, THEA, Reading; and similarly in science, and pp. 31-33, similar evidence for grade 8 to EXPLORE and READISTEP.</p> <p><b>STAAR L AND STAAR A</b> Adequate evidence was provided in the additional information Texas sent on 4.28.16 about STAAR A and L.</p> <p><b>STAAR Alternate 2</b> <u>Exhibit 6.3.6</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Standard Setting Technical Report, p. 9.</p>	<p>The evidence provided meets the requirements of this critical element.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

<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>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 that parents can understand;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet</p> <p><u>Public reports at each proficiency level and percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.4.5.a</u> The Texas Academic Performance Report, 2014-2015. The State indicates that these reports are the state’s academic accountability reports, publically available at the TEA website.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.4.3.a Grade 3 Assessment Summary Report</u> The state asserts in its notes that these reports exist for all assessed grades and subjects at the state, district, and campus level.</p> <p>Three achievement levels 1, 2, 3 are reported for all students at each achievement level. The percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration is reported, however, it does not appear that reports of not test students for every student group are reported. (p. 2,307)</p> <p>However, in Exhibit 6.4.5.a, pp. 2,345 – 2,351 it does not appear that the assessment results are reported at each proficiency level; they are reported as STAAR percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above and STAAR percent at Advanced Standard.</p> <p>The percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration was located in Exhibit 6.4.5.a p. 2,352.</p> <p><u>Itemized score analyses and interpretive guides</u></p>	<p>It is unclear which reports should be referred to; there is conflicting information between the evidence provided. For what purpose are the Texas Academic Performance Reports used and for what purpose are the Grade level Assessment Summary Reports used?</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

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>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>Peers did not locate itemized score analyses Interpretive Guides were provided for STAAR and, EOC, and STAAR Alternate 2:</p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.4.1.a STAAR Grades 3-8 Interpretive Guide</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.4.1.b STAAR EOC Interpretive Guide</u></p> <p><u>Exhibits 6.4.1.c Interpretive Guide for STAAR Alternate 2</u></p> <p><u>Production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports of its assessments that</u></p> <p><u>Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement</u></p> <p>It appears that a generic example of an individual student report is displayed in both Exhibits 6.4.2 that appear to be general Guides for Parents.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.4.2 STAAR Grades 3-8, Understanding Your Child’s Confidential Student Report (CSR), <i>A Guide for Parents</i></u></p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.4.2 STAAR Alternate 2 Understanding Your Child’s Confidential Student Report, <i>A guide for Parents</i> p. 2300</u></p> <p><u>Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</u></p> <p><u>Exhibit -6.4.2</u></p>	

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Performance Level Descriptors are not included in these reports to parents.</p> <p><u>Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</u></p> <p>Brochures to help parents/guardians understand Confidential Student Report (CSR) are available at the TEA website: STAAR Grades 3-8 and STAAR Alternate 2.</p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.4.2</u> STAAR Alternate 2 Understanding Your Child’s Confidential Student Report (CSR) <i>A Guide for Parents</i></p> <p><u>Exhibit 6.4.2</u> Understanding Your Child’s Confidential Student Report (CSR) <i>A Guide for Parents</i>, STAAR 3-8 Assessments (including STAAR Spanish, STAAR L, and STAAR A)</p> <p>What brochures/information are provided to parents/guardians who have students taking EOC tests?</p> <p><u>Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</u></p> <p><u>Exhibits 6.4.1.a, b, c</u> Unclear what are “optional services for the report format”; does not specify availability in Braille, or a native language</p> <p><u>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</u></p>	<p>Reviewers did not locate evidence that Performance level descriptors are included with student score reports or evidence for an itemized score analysis in submitted evidence.</p> <p>Is the only way for parents/guardians to access the brochures for their child on the TEA website? Do all Texas parents/guardians have ready access to the internet?</p> <p>Evidence that brochures/information are provided to parents/guardians who have students taking EOC tests.</p> <p>Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats.</p> <p>Evidence provided meets this component of the critical element.</p>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR TEXAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<u>Exhibit 6.4.4</u> Testing calendars indicate that reports are provided in 30 days.	

**Section 6.4 Summary Statement**

The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- Evidence that performance level descriptors are included with individual student reports
- Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats
- Evidence that brochures/information are provided to parents/guardians who have students taking EOC tests.
- Evidence of itemized score analyses