



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

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

October 30, 2018

Dear Commissioner Morath:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated TEA's submission, which included several assessments. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following in regards to the submitted assessments:

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts (R/LA) for grades 3-8 (State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) 3-8)). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- General assessments in mathematics and R/LA for high school (STAAR Algebra I and English I and II). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- General assessments in science for grades 5 and 8 (STAAR 5/8 Science). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202
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.

- General assessments in science for high school (STAAR Biology). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA and mathematics (STAAR Alternate 2). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- AA-AAAS for grades 5, 8 and high school in science (STAAR Alternate 2). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

Substantially meets requirements means that that component meets most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The specific list of items required for TEA to submit is enclosed with this letter. TEA must submit a plan within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. Resubmission should occur once all necessary evidence is complete (rather than in multiple submissions). The Department expects to conduct at least one peer review session yearly for new assessments and resubmissions; these will generally be held in February and August each year, with resubmissions due around December and June. TEA's plan and timeline should propose resubmission according to this schedule (e.g. TEA will resubmit evidence in December 2019).

The Department placed a condition on TEA's Title I, Part A grant award beginning July 1, 2018. This condition will remain in place until such time as TEA presents evidence that the State assessments meet all of the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. The condition also stipulates that the Department may take further action if the condition is not resolved in a timely manner.

Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. In particular, OSERS will monitor progress against critical elements 1.4, 1.5, 5.1, and 6.3. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on TEA's federal fiscal year 2019 IDEA Part B grant award.

Because section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA as amended by ESSA is new and requires that States provide evidence that their alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, the Department asks that Texas provide data that shows it is in compliance with this requirement by December 15, 2020. This item is included in the enclosed list under critical element 6.3.

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

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. I wish you well in your continued efforts to improve student achievement in Texas. If you have any questions, please contact Erin Shackel and Dan Behrend of my staff at: OSS.Texas@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary, Office of
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Penny Schwinn, Deputy Commissioner of Academics

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

| Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed |
|---|---|
| 1.3 – Required Assessments | <p>For the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) assessments in all subjects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that demonstrates that 8th-graders take the required 8th-grade assessments in R/LA and science; and that students in all other middle school grades take the State's grade-level assessments. • Evidence that the more advanced high school assessments offered to students who take Algebra I in 8th grade meet the ESEA requirements (e.g., the State must submit for peer review information related to all advanced high school assessments used for this purpose after the 2018-19 school year). |
| 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments | <p>For the STAAR assessments in all subjects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policies and procedures that ensure that all students are appropriately included in required high school tests, specifically those students who take a high school test in lieu of the required grade level assessment; and ensures that these students take an advanced assessment in high school for that subject. • Evidence as described in Critical Element 1.3 can also be used to meet the requirements for this critical element. |
| 1.5 – Participation Data | <p>For the STAAR assessments in all subjects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that demonstrates that all students are appropriately included in required high school tests and are accounted for in the calculation of assessment participation rates (e.g., results of the monitoring of test participation of students who are required to take the advanced tests in high school). |
| 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities | <p>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general assessments and STAAR Alternate 2 in high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the procedures for informing parents of the implications for graduation for students taking the STAAR Alternate 2 (AA-AAAS) (e.g., evidence that directly links participation in the AA-AAAS to the possible consequences regarding high school graduation). |
| 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (STAAR) | <p>For the STAAR assessments in grades 3-8 and high school in R/LA and mathematics and grades 5, 8, and high school in science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the academic achievement standards are aligned with the State's academic content standards based upon the revised performance level descriptors (PLDs). |
| 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (STAAR Alternate 2) | <p>For the STAAR Alternate 2 tests in R/LA, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. TEA should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020. |

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes Resubmission



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3
1.3 – Required Assessments 3
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments 4
1.5 – Participation Data 5

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS 6
2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 7
2.2 – Item Development..... 11
2.3 – Test Administration 14
2.5 – Test Security 17

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 19
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 23
4.4 – Scoring 26
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 28
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 30

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 32
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 32
5.3 – Accommodations..... 34
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 37

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 39
6.4 – Reporting..... 40

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

| Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY |
|--|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>For the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) <u>mathematics general test in high school</u>, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). | <p>.3:</p> <p>01. Letter Regarding Middle School Students Taking Algebra I (see highlights on pages 1 and 2)</p> <p>02. Texas Education Code 39.023 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 2 and 5)</p> <p>03. Texas Administrative Code 101.5 and 101.1005 (see highlights on pages 1 and 2)</p> <p>04. Study – High School Outcomes for Algebra I EOC in Grade 8 (see highlights on page 4)</p> | <p>evidence regarding inclusion of all students in high school tests, specifically those students who take required state tests in middle school, demonstrates that the State does not ensure that all students participate in required high school tests as required by Federal statute. Evidence indicates that only 85% of such students participate in the required advanced test in high school.</p> |
| Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | | |
| <p><u> </u>x The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence that all middle school students who take the State high school test in middle school take an advanced State administered test in high school. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY |
|--|--|---|
| <p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments <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"> ○ 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. ○ 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. | <p>.4.a: 01. Texas Administrative Code 89.1001, 89.1055, and 89.1075 (see highlights on pages 1, 2, and 6) 02. TEA Nonpublic Assurance Checklist (see highlights on page 2) 03. TEA Nonpublic District Compliance Review (see highlights on page 3)</p> <p>4.b: Refer to the evidence submitted for 1.3. 1.3: 01. Letter Regarding Middle School Students Taking Algebra I (see highlights on pages 1 and 2) 02. Texas Education Code 39.023 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 2 and 5) 03. Texas Administrative Code 101.5 and 101.1005 (see highlights on pages 1 and 2) 04. Study – High School Outcomes for Algebra I EOC in Grade 8 (see highlights on page 4)</p> | <p>evidence regarding non public schools and inclusion of students with disabilities is sufficient.</p> <p>evidence regarding inclusion of all students in high school tests, specifically those students who take required state tests in middle school, demonstrates that the State does not ensure that all students participate in required high school tests as required by Federal statute. Evidence indicates that only 85% of such students participate in the required advanced test in high school.</p> |
| Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | | |
| <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● evidence that all middle school students who take the State high school test in middle school take an advanced State administered test in high school. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY |
|--|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>TEA must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional documentation that clarifies how the participation of students in each grade level is reported for the tests that apply to that grade level. | <p>01. 2016 Accountability Manual Excerpt (see highlights on page 141)</p> <p>02. Link to the Full 2016 Accountability Manual: http://tea.texas.gov/2016accountabilitymanual.aspx</p> <p>03. March 2016 STAAR Grade 8 CSR Example</p> <p>04. Spring 2016 STAAR Algebra I CSR Example</p> | <p>as noted above in critical elements 1.3 and 1.4, evidence regarding inclusion of all students in high school tests, specifically those students who take required state tests in middle school, demonstrates that the State does not ensure that all students participate in required high school tests as required by Federal statute. Evidence indicates that only 85% of such students participate in the required advanced test in high school.</p> |
| Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence that the State has procedures to ensure that all middle school students who take the State high school test in middle school participate in an advanced State administered test in high school. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|---|
| <p>2.1 – Test Design and Development <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"> 1. 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. 2. 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. 3. Evidence that the 2016 STAAR-L EOC Biology matched the blueprint of the 2012 STAAR EOC Biology test to support the exchange of items. 4. Evidence of how Texas will assess the State’s writing component of the R/LA content standards at grades 3, 5, 6 and 8. | <p>2.1.a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01. STAAR Depth of Knowledge Plan 02. DOK Alignment of 2016 STAAR and TEKS 03. Depth of Knowledge Training Presentation <p>2.1. b: Refer to the evidence submitted for 2.1.a.</p> <p>2.1.c:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01. TEKS Curriculum Framework for STAAR Alternate 2 Grade 4 Writing (see highlights on pages 1–3) 02. TEKS Curriculum Framework for STAAR Alternate 2 Grade 7 Writing (see highlights on pages 1 and 5) 03. TEKS Curriculum Framework for STAAR Alternate 2 English I (see highlights on pages 62 and 68) 04. TEKS Curriculum Framework for STAAR Alternate 2 English II (see highlights on pages 63 and 69) | <p>1. & 2. Evidence is not sufficient. WestEd’s DOK alignment evidence (2.1.a01 & 02) lacks summary data and does not include a recommendation to inform a detailed scope of work or item development plan to address future item development. Peers do not have evidence to know how the state will use the WestEd alignment report to inform item development.</p> <p>What follows is an example of an alignment summary. The Webb alignment methodology establishes DOK criteria by either strand, objective and/or reporting category. Thus, reporting overall that the alignment is 53%, e.g., grade 3 reading (2.1.a02, p.2), doesn’t communicate how the STAAR is covering the cognitive complexity of specific strands or objectives from state standards. From 2.1a.02 and using the grade 3 reading test as an example, the state claims to have 53% (19/40) of items meeting DOK criteria. Assuming a 50% DOK criteria, this would meet DOK for this grade. However, summary findings are slightly different. Below are the state’s and Webb’s** criteria for DOK reporting categories. The state’s evidence should identify where the depth of knowledge deficits are by strand and reporting category and communicate the need to develop items to address these deficits.</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-----------|-----------|----------|---|------|------|---|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-------|-----|-----|
| <p>For the STAAR 2 R/LA AA-AAAS, TEA must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. 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. | <p>05. STAAR Alternate 2 Grade 4 Writing Blueprint 06. STAAR Alternate 2 Grade 7 Writing Blueprint 07. STAAR Alternate 2 English I Blueprint 08. STAAR Alternate 2 English II Blueprint</p> <p>2.1.d: 01. 2012 STAAR Biology Test Summary 02. 2016 STAAR L Biology Test Summary</p> <p>2.1.e: ELAR Redesign for STAAR and STAAR Alternate 2</p> | <p>Grade 3 Reading Summary Analysis Example by Peers</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1255 331 1906 597"> <thead> <tr> <th>ReportCat</th> <th>DOK State</th> <th>DOK Webb</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>50%</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>38%</td> <td>38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>53%</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Using the State’s criteria, reporting category 3 did not meet Webb’s 50% at or above DOK criteria and reporting category 2 just met the criteria. Using Webb’s criteria, neither reporting category 2 or 3 are met. Regardless of method, the state should organize DOK findings as mentioned above and describe how item writers are going to meet the reporting categories or understand DOK requirements.</p> <p>Additionally, peers recommend conducting a follow-up alignment study once new items have been developed and administered.</p> <p>3. Evidence is sufficient. 4. Evidence is sufficient 5. Evidence is sufficient</p> <p>** Webb’s DOK criteria typically uses the highest DOK in a standard’s strand. This is not always the</p> | ReportCat | DOK State | DOK Webb | 1 | 100% | 100% | 2 | 50% | 22% | 3 | 38% | 38% | Total | 53% | 40% |
| ReportCat | DOK State | DOK Webb | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 100% | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | 50% | 22% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | 38% | 38% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 53% | 40% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| | | case. The average DOK in a strand has been used as well. The highest DOK is the method illustrated here. |
| Section 2.1 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 & 2. More evidence of the scope of work or an item development plan (item specs) from the WestEd alignment study is required. Peers do not have evidence to know how the state will use the WestEd alignment report to inform item development. For example, using the example grade 3 reading summary table above, how many items does the state plan on developing in reporting category 3? How many items are in the plan, what's the scope of work and timeline for delivery, etc.? | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">2.2 – Item Development</p> <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"> 1. Evidence that all items used for STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L are the same. <p><u>For the STAAR 2 mathematics AA-AAAS, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Evidence of item specifications for mathematics for STAAR Alternate 2. | <p>2.2.a:</p> <p>01. STAAR Alternate 2 Item Writer Specifications (Mathematics guidelines are on pages 20 and 21; reading guidelines are on pages 22–24.)</p> <p>2.2.b:</p> <p>01. 2016 STAAR Grade 5 Math Test Summary</p> <p>02. 2016 STAAR A Grade 5 Math Test Summary</p> <p>03. 2016 STAAR L Grade 5 Math Test Summary</p> <p>04. 2016 STAAR Algebra I Test Summary</p> <p>05. 2016 STAAR A Algebra I Test Summary</p> <p>06. 2016 STAAR L Algebra I Test Summary</p> <p>07. 2016 STAAR A Biology Test Summary</p> <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 2.1.d.</p> <p>2.1.d:</p> | <p>1. Evidence was only submitted for grade 5 mathematics, Algebra 1 and high school science. The state must also submit evidence for other grades and subjects.</p> <p>Note: STAAR A was discontinued, thus peers have omitted it from review. The TEA confirmed that STAAR L is no longer used. STAAR A website: “STAAR A will be administered for the last time in December 2016; therefore, this webpage will be deleted at that time.” Also, STAAR L on the state webpage says it has been discontinued, therefore peers eliminated STAAR L from the review. If this was discontinued should it be deleted from the website?</p> <p>2. Evidence is sufficient.</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| | <p align="center">01. 2012 STAAR Biology Test Summary</p> <p align="center">02. 2016 STAAR L Biology Test Summary</p> | |
| Section 2.2 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Need to provide evidence for missing grades and subjects for STAAR. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <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"> 1. Evidence that Texas has contingency plans to address possible technology challenges for all levels of the general assessment system. | <p>2.3.a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01. 2017 Technology Contingency Plans 02. ETS Contract 3317 Amendment 3 Excerpt (see pages 4 and 5) 03. Pearson Contract 3316 Excerpt (see page 5) <p>2.3.b:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01. 2015 STAAR Grades 3–5 Test Administrator Manual 02. 2015 STAAR Grades 6–8 Test Administrator Manual 03. 2015 STAAR EOC Test Administrator Manual 04. 2015 STAAR Alternate 2 Test Administrator Manual | <p>1. The evidence is not sufficient. The evidence identifies excerpts that provide system requirements and financial consequences, but not what action is required of the contractor to complete test administration in the event of a system-wide issue.</p> <p>Peers were unable to locate contingency plans provided to local test administrators. Evidence is needed as to what procedures have been communicated to districts, schools, and classroom test administrators. Such evidence could be explicit instructions as to what classroom, school, and district should do in the event of a local or system-wide outage. Instructions should include how to escalate issues, and what students and test administrators should do in the event of technical issues that occur during initial login, during testing, intermittent failures, etc.</p> <p>The TAMs do not address what test administrators, schools, or districts should do in the event of an interruption.</p> <p>The contingency plan mentions a paper-based option, but it’s not mentioned in the contract excerpt. There needs to be more</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| | | information as to how this would be implemented. |
| Section 2.3 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. More evidence is needed in the contingency plan to address outages, interruptions, paper options, etc. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| <p>2.5 – Test Security <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"> 1. Evidence that defines the TEA role and responsibilities to detect and investigate test irregularities. <p><u>For STAAR-2 R/LA, mathematics, science AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Evidence that the STAAR Alternate 2 training for test administrators includes information about preventing assessment irregularities and ensuring integrity of test results. | <p>2.5.a:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 01. 2016 On-Site Review Procedures Manual (see highlights on page 1) 02. Texas Education Code 39.056 and 39.057 (see highlights on pages 1–3) 03. Division Coordination for Student Assessment Monitoring 04. Investigation of Testing Irregularities Flowchart 05. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 2 Excerpts (see highlights on pages 24 and 26–28) 06. 2016 Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System Manual Excerpts (see highlights on pages 3, 16, 43, and 44) 07. 2016 Student Assessment Data Validation Manual Excerpts (see highlights on pages 3, 4, and 8) <p>2.5.b:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 01. Link to STAAR Test Administrator Training Modules: https://www.texasassessment.com/administrators/training/ 02. 2015 Test Administrator Oath <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 2.3.b.</p> <p>2.3.b:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 04. 2015 STAAR Alternate 2 Test Administrator Manual (see highlights on pages 31 and 32) | <p>1- Evidence is sufficient 2.-Evidence is sufficient</p> |
| <p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p> | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general at all grades, TEA must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Evidence that there are sufficient items in each reporting category to support alignment evidence (same concern as noted in 2.1 above). • 2. Evidence associating DOK levels of STAAR items with the DOK levels of the content standards (related to concern noted in 2.1 above) • 3. Texas’ expectations for the relationship between STAAR and TEKS DOK levels (related to concern in 2.1 above). • 4. 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). • 5. Evidence that the current Spanish STAAR-L and STAAR assessments are comparable. | <p>3.1.a:</p> <p>01. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 2 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 23 and 24)</p> <p>02. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 4 Excerpt (see highlights on page 100)</p> <p>03. Link to STAAR Blueprints: https://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/staar/</p> <p>3.1.b, 3.1.c, and 3.1.d: Refer to the evidence submitted for 2.1.a.</p> <p>2.1.a</p> <p>01. STAAR Depth of Knowledge Plan</p> <p>02. DOK Alignment of 2016 STAAR and TEKS</p> <p>03. Depth of Knowledge Training Presentation</p> <p>3.1.e:</p> <p>01. STAAR Spanish Comparability</p> <p>02. Test Development Process</p> <p>3.1.f: Refer to the evidence submitted for 2.2.b and 2.1.d.</p> <p>01. 2016 STAAR Grade 5 Math Test Summary</p> <p>02. 2016 STAAR A Grade 5 Math Test Summary</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence is sufficient. 2. Evidence is not sufficient, see 2.1 for comments 3. Evidence is not sufficient, see 2.1 for comments 4. Evidence is not sufficient, see 2.1 for comments 5. Evidence is sufficient. 6. Evidence is sufficient. 7. Evidence is sufficient. |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility <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"> • 1. Evidence that item writers and reviewers for each grade, subject, and component of the assessment system received criteria for determining and guidelines for developing accessible items. • 2. 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. • 3. Evidence that STAAR item reviewers have expertise in, or are special educators or English learner educators (all grades and subjects). • 4. Evidence of a process to evaluate items for bias during pilot and field testing (both STAAR and STAAR 2, all grades and subjects). | <p>4.2.a</p> <p>01. ETS Guidelines for Test Accessibility (see highlights on page 3)</p> <p>02. ETS Guidelines for Fair Tests and Communications (see highlights on pages 1 and 2)</p> <p>03. Accessibility Review Checklist</p> <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 2.2.a.</p> <p>2.2.a:</p> <p>01. STAAR Alternate 2 Item Writer Specifications</p> <p>4.2.b and 4.2.c: Refer to the evidence submitted for 4.2.a.</p> <p>4.2.d:</p> <p>01. Demographic Tables 2016 STAAR Educator Reviews (see highlights in tables on each page)</p> <p>02. Demographic Tables 2017 STAAR Educator Reviews (see highlights in tables on each page)</p> | <p>1. Evidence is sufficient. Note to SEA: it would be helpful if there were documentation of the process by which test developers received and were trained on materials.</p> <p>2. Evidence is not sufficient. Peers were unable to locate evidence for item reviews for STAAR and STAAR Spanish.</p> <p>3. Evidence is sufficient.</p> <p>4. Evidence is sufficient.</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| | 4.2.e: 01. 2016 STAAR Data Review Process (see highlights on page 1) 02. STAAR Alternate 2 Data Review Training Presentation (see slide 18) | |
| Section 4.2 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is needed for STAAR and STAAR Spanish item reviews | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">4.4 – Scoring</p> <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"> • 1. Evidence of the scoring procedures that are applied to STAAR A and STAAR L. • 2. 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. • 3. Data for inter-rater reliability and inter-rater agreement for all human-scored assessments (STAAR, STAAR A, STAAR L, STAAR Alternate 2) • 4. Clarification of evidence related to inter-rater reliability statistics in the State’s technical digest for STAAR (Chapter 4). • 5. Evidence of the conditions under which test results are invalidated. | <p>4.4.a:</p> <p>01. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 2 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 28 and 29)</p> <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 3.1.a.</p> <p>3.1.a:</p> <p>02. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 4 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 113, 116, and 119)</p> <p>4.4.b:</p> <p>01. STAAR Alternate 2 Alignment Report (see highlights on pages 3–5, 28, and 30–32)</p> <p>02. STAAR Alternate Pilot Test Technical Report (see highlights on pages 3, 11, and 12)</p> <p>4.4.c:</p> <p>01. 2015–2016 Technical Digest Ch. 4 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 43–45)</p> | <p>1. These tests are no longer being used. Peer reviewers reviewed the evidence, and no further action is required.</p> <p>2. Provided evidence did not support the request. However, peers found the STAAR Alternate 2 Educator Guide online outlining how the constructs were measured and how the rubrics were used. This additional evidence satisfies the request.</p> <p>3. The STAAR A and STAAR L tests are no longer being used. Peer reviewers reviewed the evidence, and no further action is required. The evidence for STAAR and STAAR 2 Alternate is sufficient.</p> <p>4. Evidence is sufficient.</p> <p>5. Evidence is sufficient.</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>4.4.d: Refer to the evidence submitted for 4.4.c.</p> <p>4.4.e:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01. Invalidating Test Results 02. Test Security Supplement (see highlights on pages 8, 23–25, and 30–32) | |
| Section 4.4 Summary Statement | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Confirmation of whether the state spiraled grade-level forms and, if so, how the forms were equated (STAAR). • 2. Evidence of year-to-year equating procedures and results (STAAR). | <p>4.5.a:</p> <p>01. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 3 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 56, 58, and 59)</p> <p>02. Link to Statewide Summary Reports: http://tea.texas.gov/staar/rpt/sum/</p> <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 3.1.a.</p> <p>3.1.a:</p> <p>02. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 4 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 112 and 113)</p> <p>4.5.b: Refer to the evidence submitted for 4.5.a.</p> | <p>1. Evidence is sufficient.</p> <p>2. Evidence is sufficient.</p> |
| <p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general at all grades, TEA must provide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results for STAAR, STAAR A, and STAAR L, and STAAR EOC assessments. 2. Comparability studies for online and paper pencil assessments (STAAR). | <p>4.6.a:</p> <p>01. Interpreting Assessment Reports, STAAR Grades 3–8 Assessments (see highlights on pages 1, 3, 8, 14, 17, 22, 26, 29, 31, 35, 38, and 41)</p> <p>02. Interpreting Assessment Reports, STAAR EOC Assessments (see highlights on pages 1, 2, 3, 7, 13, 16, 20, 25, 28, 30, 33, and 36)</p> <p>03. Interpreting Assessment Reports, STAAR Alternate 2 Assessments (see highlights on pages 1, 2, 6, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20, and 23)</p> <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 3.1.a, 4.4.a, and 4.5.a.</p> <p>3.1.a:</p> <p>02. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 4 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 100, 102, 117, and 124)</p> <p>4.4.a:</p> <p>01. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 2 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 28 and 29)</p> <p>4.5.a:</p> <p>01. 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 3 Excerpt (see highlights on pages 56–59)</p> <p>4.6.b:</p> <p>01. Link to Conversion Tables: http://tea.texas.gov/STAAR_Raw_Score_Conversion_Tables</p> | <p>1. Evidence is sufficient.</p> <p>2. Evidence is sufficient.</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 4.5.a.</p> <p>4.5.a: 2014–2015 Technical Digest Ch. 3 Excerpt (see highlights on page 62)</p> <p>4.6.c:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01. Unified Minimum System Requirements 02. 2016–2017 STAAR Operating System Trends 03. March 2017 Content Readiness Report 04. STAAR 2017 Online Testing Platform Functional Testing Report | |
| Section 4.6 Summary Statement | | |
| _x_ No additional evidence is required | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|---|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <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"> 1. Evidence of the procedures for informing parents of the implications for graduation for students taking the STAAR 2 (AA-AAAS). | <p>5.1.a:</p> <p>01. Texas Education Code 28.025 (see highlights on pages 1, 2, 5, and 6)</p> <p>02. Texas Administrative Code 89.1070 (see highlights on pages 1 and 2)</p> <p>5.1.b: Refer to the evidence submitted for 5.1.a.</p> | <p>1. Evidence is not sufficient. No evidence of procedures for informing parents was provided.</p> <p>Students who take STAAR 2 may not be eligible for a regular HS diploma, and evidence is needed that parents are clearly informed about this fact as early in the process as possible, preferably at the beginning of HS, and at the beginning of each HS year.</p> <p>Examples of possible evidence are: a copy of a parent letter, brochure, or an IEP statement provided to parents, procedures or documents that demonstrate all parents are provided notice of implications for graduation for students taking alternate assessment.</p> |
| <p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p> | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence for informing parents regarding implications for graduation for students who take an alternate assessment must be provided. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <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"> • 1. 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. • 2. Evidence that Texas has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those expressly permitted by the State. | <p>5.3.a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01. Review of Accommodations Research for STAAR A 02. STAAR A Cognitive Lab Report (see highlights on pages 20 and 21) 03. TTAC Meeting Notes Excerpt 09.25.14 (see highlights on page 7) 04. ELL Focus Group WebEx Notes 06.09.10 (see highlights on pages 2 and 3) 05. Linguistic Accommodation Plans for STAAR EOC Program 03.09.11 (see highlights on pages 3–7 and 9) 06. Accommodations Research for STAAR Alternate 2 <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 4.4.b and 4.5.a.</p> <p>4.4.b:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 02. STAAR Alternate Pilot Test Technical Report (see highlights on page 4) <p>4.5.a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 02. Link to Statewide Summary Reports: http://tea.texas.gov/staar/rpt/sum/ <p>5.3.b:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01. 2016 Other Accommodation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence is not sufficient. Peers did not find any evidence to support the recommendations from the TAC (5.3.a: 03). Is there evidence that any of these suggestions have been implemented or are planned? Such activities would have supported this request. 2. Evidence is sufficient. |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>02. 2015–2016 Acknowledgement of Implications of Using Nonstandard Testing Accommodations</p> <p>03. Approval for STAAR Nonstandard Testing Accommodation</p> | |
| Section 5.3 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is needed, for example, of studies of accommodated and unaccommodated form effects on STAAR, to support that accommodations 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. | | |
| | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p><u>For STAAR R/LA, mathematics, science general and STAAR 2 AA-AAAS at all grades, TEA must provide:</u> Evidence that the State monitors test administration for special populations as required in this critical element (see below). 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"> • 1. Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • 2. Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • 3. Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • 4. Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for | <p>5.4:</p> <p>01. Bilingual Education/English as a Second Language Monitoring System (see highlights on pages 8 and 10)</p> <p>02. Special Education Monitoring (see highlights in table)</p> <p>03. 2015 Test Monitoring Contract ESC Region 4 (see highlights on page 4)</p> <p>04. 2016 Test Monitoring Contract ESC Region 11 (see highlights on page 1)</p> <p>Also, refer to the evidence submitted for 2.5.a and 4.4.e.</p> <p>2.5.a:</p> <p>01. 2016 On-Site Review Procedures Manual (see highlights on page 1)</p> <p>02. Texas Education Code 39.056 and 39.057 (see highlights on pages 1–3)</p> <p>06. 2016 Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System Manual Excerpts (see highlights on pages 3, 16, 21, 22, 25, 53, 55, and 56)</p> <p>07. 2016 Student Assessment Data Validation Manual Excerpts (see</p> | <p>1. Evidence is sufficient.</p> <p>2. Evidence is missing. No evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the appropriateness of accommodations addresses disability or language needs. In the state notes, it is stated that “communication and guidance from the state and its regional service agencies are provided locally.” The state should submit a sample of training materials, agendas, etc.</p> <p>3. Evidence is sufficient.</p> <p>4. Evidence was not provided to demonstrate that assessment accommodations are consistent with those identified on student plans. The state should provide evidence of monitoring the provision of accommodations and assure accommodations are consistent with those identified and required by the student IEPs. An example of this might be evidence collected from special education monitoring visits, documentation of the IEPs relationship to specific accommodations provided on the state’s assessment and/or guidance and process in</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|---|--|
| students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • 5. Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. | highlights on pages 3, 4, 11–13, 16–18, 21, and 23) 4.4.e: 02. Test Security Supplement (see highlights on page 41) | the participation guidelines. 5. Evidence is sufficient. |
| Section 5.4 Summary Statement | | |
| __X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2. Evidence is required to address how a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered is appropriate. For example, the state could provide a sample of training materials, agenda, etc. • 4. Evidence is required to show how the state monitors that accommodations for assessments are consistent with those accommodations identified and required by the students’ IEPs. For example, evidence collected from special education monitoring visits. | | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|---|--|--|
| <p>6.4 – Reporting <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"> • 1. Evidence that performance or achievement level descriptors are included with individual student reports (all assessments). • 2. Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (all assessments). • 3. Evidence that brochures/information are provided to parents/guardians who have students taking STAAR EOC tests. • 4. Evidence of itemized score analyses and/or educator level reports for all assessments. | <p>6.4.a: 01. Link to STAAR Assessment Management System for Families: https://www.texasassessment.com/</p> <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 6.3.</p> <p>6.3: 01. Sample STAAR Report Card, English 02. Sample STAAR Report Card, Spanish 03. 2017 Parent Resource Tool 04. 2018 Parent Resource Tool, Reading 05. 2018 Parent Resource Tool, Math 06. Roadmap to College and Career</p> <p>6.4.b: Refer to the evidence submitted for 6.3. and 6.4.a:</p> <p>6.3: 01. Sample STAAR Report Card, English 02. Sample STAAR Report Card, Spanish</p> <p>6.4.a: 01. Link to STAAR Assessment Management System for Families: https://www.texasassessment.com/</p> <p>6.4.c: 01. 2016 STAAR Grades 3–8 Parent Brochure, English 02. 2016 STAAR Grades 3–8 Parent Brochure, Spanish</p> <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 1.5.</p> | <p>1. Evidence is not sufficient. No evidence was provided for science and End of Course (EOC) assessments.</p> <p>The STAAR Alternate 2 score report was not provided in the evidence. Peers located the evidence online and no further action is required.</p> <p>2. Evidence is sufficient. 3. Evidence is sufficient. 4. Evidence is sufficient.</p> |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|------------------|--|--|
| | <p>1.5:</p> <p>04. Spring 2016 STAAR Algebra I CSR Example</p> <p>6.4.d:</p> <p>01. Itemized Score Analysis Sample</p> <p>02. Reporting Student Data File Format, STAAR Grades 3–8 Assessments (see highlights on pages 2, 17, 21, and 33)</p> <p>03. Reporting Student Data File Format, STAAR EOC Assessments (see highlights on pages 2, 21, and 22)</p> <p>04. Reporting Student Data File Format, STAAR Alternate 2 Grades 3–8 Assessments (see highlights on pages 11, 14, and 22)</p> <p>05. Reporting Student Data File Format, STAAR Alternate 2 EOC Assessments (see highlights on pages 7 and 8)</p> <p>06. Link to STAAR Assessment Management System for Educators: http://texasassessment.com/educators/</p> <p>07. Link to STAAR Statewide Item Analysis Reports: http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/staar/rpt/item/</p> <p>Also refer to the evidence submitted for 4.6.a.</p> <p>4.6.a:</p> <p>01. Interpreting Assessment Reports, STAAR Grades 3–8 Assessments (see highlights on pages 38, 41, and 43)</p> <p>02. Interpreting Assessment Reports, STAAR</p> | |

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR Texas Resubmission

| Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>EOC Assessments (see highlights on pages 33, 36, and 38)</p> <p>03. Interpreting Assessment Reports, STAAR Alternate 2 Assessment(see highlights on pages 19, 20, and 23)</p> | |
| Section 6.4 Summary Statement | | |
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is needed that the performance or achievement level descriptors are included with individual student reports for science and EOC. | | |

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