

Minnesota Final Peer Review Notes

**Mathematics MCA-III grades 3-8 (General Ed), Mathematics and Reading MCA – Modified, and Mathematics MTAS (alternate) EVIDENCE REQUIRED FOR PEER REVIEWS OF ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS**

**UNDER TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT**

**United States Department of Education NCLB Assessment System Review**

Peer Reviewer Notes – Revised January 12, 2009 NCLB Assessment System Review

July 27, 2011

## OVERVIEW OF THE STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

**Critical Element 3.1.** In the chart below indicate your State's current assessment system in reading /language arts and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and for the 10-12 grade range using the abbreviations to show what type of assessments the State's assessment system is composed of: (a) criterion-referenced assessments (**CRT**); or (b) augmented norm-referenced assessments (**ANRT**) (augmented as necessary to measure accurately the depth and breadth of the State's academic content standards and yield criterion-referenced scores); or (c) a combination of both across grade levels and/or content areas. Also indicate your current assessment system in science<sup>1</sup> that is aligned with the State's challenging academic content and achievement standards at least once in each of the grade spans 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12. A State may have assessments in reading or language arts depending on the alignment to the State's content standards; both are not required. Please indicate, using the abbreviations shown, the grades and subject areas with availability of native language assessment (**NLA**) or various alternate assessments (**AA-GLAS** for an alternate assessment for students with disabilities based on grade-level standards; **AA-LEP** for an alternate assessment for students with limited English proficiency based on grade-level standards, **AA-MAS** for an alternate assessment for eligible students with disabilities based on modified academic achievement standards; and/or **AA-AAS** for an alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities based on alternate achievement standards).

**This Review is based on the following assessments charted:**

**Chart of State Assessment System Aligned to Content Standards for school year 2010 \_\_\_\_\_ by Subject, Grade, and Type of Assessment**

Grades	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<b>Math</b>	CRT	CRT	CRT	CRT	CRT	CRT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate	AA-AAS	AA-AAS	AA-AAS; AA-MAS	AA-AAS; AA-MAS	AA-AAS; AA-MAS	AA-AAS; AA-MAS	AA-MAS	n/a	n/a	n/a
Native Lang.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Reading</b>	AA-MAS	AA-MAS	AA-MAS	AA-MAS	AA-MAS	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Native Lang.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Language Arts</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Native Lang.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Science</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Alternate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Native Lang.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

<sup>1</sup> Science assessments were not due until the 2007-08 school year.

**Section 1: Content Standards**

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
<p>1.1                      (a) Has the State formally approved/adopted, by May 2003, challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cover each of grades 3-8 and the 10-12 grade range, or</li> <li>• if the academic content standards relate to grade ranges, include specific content expectations for each grade level?</li> </ul> <p>AND</p>	<p>Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified, and Mathematics MTAS (alternate):</p> <p>(a) MN provided the statutes relating to requirements to adopt in rule statewide academic standards (Document 1.1a.1) and revise mathematics academic standards in 2006-07 to be implemented by 2010-2011 (Document 1.1a.2). The revised standards for mathematics are included which were posted in December 2009 with statutory authority (Document 1.1b.1).</p> <p>The Mathematics Standards are provided on the web site:                      (<a href="http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/Academic_Excellence/Academic_Standards/Mathematics/index.html">http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/Academic_Excellence/Academic_Standards/Mathematics/index.html</a>) and note that they were adopted on September 22, 2008.</p> <p>Document 1.3.4, Page 6, Proposed Permanent Rules relating to academic standards indicates that the Commissioner has the authority to approve rules for the development and implementation of the standards. Page 30 is a sign off page to be completed by the commissioner. However, there is no signature.</p> <p>MN indicated that the Reading Standards have not changed since 2003.</p>	<p>(a) MN must submit signed approval of the Commissioner.</p>
<p>(b) Are these academic content standards applied to all public schools and students in the State?</p>	<p>(b) MN Statute 120B.021 includes the requirement that the academic standards in mathematics apply to all public school students except for the very few students with extreme cognitive or physical impairments for whom an individualized education plan has determined that the required academic standards are inappropriate (Document 1.1b.2).</p>	<p>(b) This documentation (1.1b.2) appears to exclude certain students from the academic content standards. This conflicts with ESEA regulations.</p>
<p>1.2 Has the State formally approved/adopted, academic content standards in science for elementary</p>	<p>N/A for this review.</p>	<p>N/A for this review.</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
(grades 3-5), middle (grades 6-9), and high school (grades 10-12)? This must be completed by school year 2005-2006.		
<b>1.3</b> Are these academic content standards challenging? Do they contain coherent and rigorous content and encourage the teaching of advanced skills?	MN provided documentation to show their revision process to develop mathematics academic standards to reflect an increased level of rigor (Document 1.3.4). MN provided the summary of the external review by Achieve, Inc. Other documentation submitted: Document 1.3.2Mathematics Standards 2007 Revision Process; Document 1.3.3-Guide to Math Standards Revision Process; Document 1.3.4-Mathematics SONAR Justification of Rulemaking including standards revision process	MN submitted documentation to meet this requirement.
<b>1.4</b> Did the State involve education stakeholders in the development of its academic content standards?	MN involved education stakeholders in the development of the mathematics academic standards (Document 1.3.4- Mathematics SONAR Justification for Rulemaking) includes information on committee memberships and involvement of the public.	MN submitted documentation to meet this requirement.

### Summary Statement

Minnesota must submit the following:

- Documentation of formal approval by the Commissioner of the revised mathematics standards.
- Evidence that academic content standards are applied to *all* public schools and students in the State.

### Section 2: Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
2.1 Has the State formally approved/adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics for each of grades 3 through 8 and for the 10-12 grade range? These standards were to be completed by school year 2005-2006. Has the State, through a documented and validated standards-setting process,	Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate): MN indicated that they are in the process of adopting new academic achievement standards for the above listed assessments. Standard setting panels are to be conducted in June and the	MN must submit documentation of their formal adoption of academic achievement standards for the Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate)

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
<p>approved/adopted modified academic achievement standards for eligible students with disabilities? If so, in what subjects and for which grades? Has the State approved/adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities? If so, in what subjects and for which grades? Note: If alternate or modified academic achievement standards in reading/language arts or mathematics have not been develop/adopted and approved, then the alternate assessments for all students with disabilities must be held to grade-level academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Commissioner's review and approval is planned for July 2011.</p>	
<p>2.2 Has the State formally approved/adopted academic achievement descriptors in science for each of the grade spans 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 as required by school year 2005-06? Has the State formally approved/adopted academic achievement cut scores in science for each of the grade spans 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12 as required by school year 2007-08? Has the State formally approved/adopted modified academic achievement standards in science? If so, for which grades? Has the State formally approved/adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in science? If so, for which grades? Note: If alternate or modified academic achievement standards in science have not been adopted and approved, then all students with disabilities must be held to grade-level academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>N/A for this review.</p>	<p>N/A for this review.</p>
<p>2.3 1. Do these academic achievement standards (including modified and alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable) include for each content area – (a) at least three levels of achievement, including two levels of high achievement (proficient and advanced) that determine how well students are mastering a State's academic content standards and a third level of achievement (basic) to provide information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the proficient and advanced levels of achievement; and</p>	<p><b>Academic achievement standards? Mathematics MCA-III</b>  (1.a) Levels of Achievement  Grade span 3-5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>  Grade span 6-9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>  Grade span 10-12 <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b></p> <p>(1.b) Descriptors  Grade span 3-5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>  Grade span 6-9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>  Grade span 10-12 <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b></p>	<p>2.3.1-MN must submit documentation of the cut scores and final performance level descriptors for the Mathematics MCA-III, Grades 3-8; Math and Reading MCA –Modified-Grades 5-8 and High School; and Mathematics MTAS Alternate-Grades 3-8.</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
	<p>(1.c) Cut Scores  Grade span 3-5 ___Yes ___x_No  Grade span 6-9 ___Yes ___x_No  Grade span 10-12 ___Yes ___x_No</p> <p>(2) Approved by Board or Other Authority  Grade span 3-5 ___Yes ___x_No  Grade span 6-9 ___Yes ___x_No  Grade span 10-12 ___Yes ___x_No</p> <p>Cite evidence:  Document 2.3.1ab.1-Mathematics MCA-III  Achievement Level Descriptors, Grades 3-8, four levels of achievement included.</p> <p>Modified academic achievement standards?  Math and Reading MCA –Modified-Grades 5-8 and High School</p> <p>(1.a) Levels of Achievement  Grade span 3-5 ___x_Yes ___No  Grade span 6-9 ___x_Yes ___No  Grade span 10-12 ___x_Yes ___No</p> <p>(1.b) Descriptors  Grade span 3-5 x___Yes ___No  Grade span 6-9 ___x_Yes ___No  Grade span 10-12 ___x_Yes ___No</p> <p>(1.c) Cut Scores  Grade span 3-5 ___Yes ___x_No  Grade span 6-9 ___Yes ___x_No  Grade span 10-12 ___Yes ___x_No</p> <p>(2) Approved by Board or Other Authority  Grade span 3-5 ___Yes ___x_No  Grade span 6-9 ___Yes ___x_No  Grade span 10-12 ___Yes ___x_No</p> <p>Cite evidence:  Document 2.3.1ab.2-Math MCA-Modified  Achievement Level Descriptors; Document</p>	

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
	<p>2.3.1ab.3-Reading Achievement Level Descriptors. Four levels of achievement included.</p> <p>Alternate academic achievement standards? Math MTAS Alternate-Grades 3-8</p> <p>(1.a) Levels of Achievement Grade span 3-5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes ___ No Grade span 6-9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes ___ No Grade span 10-12 ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>(1.b) Descriptors Grade span 3-5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes ___ No Grade span 6-9 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes ___ No Grade span 10-12 ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>(1.c) Cut Scores Grade span 3-5 ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Grade span 6-9 ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Grade span 10-12 ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>(2) Approved by Board or Other Authority Grade span 3-5 ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Grade span 6-9 ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Grade span 10-12 ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Cite evidence: Document 2.3.1ab.4-Math MTAS Achievement Level Descriptors. Four levels of achievement included.</p>	
<p>2.3.2 If the State has adopted either modified or alternate achievement standards, has it developed guidelines for IEP teams to use in deciding when an individual student should be assessed on the basis of modified academic achievement standards in one or more subject areas, or assessed on the basis of alternate achievement standards?</p>	<p>2. MN provided the guidelines for IEP teams to use in deciding which assessment is to be administered. Evidence: Document 2.3.2.1-Alternate Assessment Eligibility Requirements (Including MCA-Modified and MTAS alternate); Document 2.3.2.2Alternate Assessment Eligibility Training for IEP Teams.</p>	<p>2. MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p>
<p>2.4 With the exception of students with disabilities to</p>	<p>MN requires that the tests be aligned to the academic</p>	<p>MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
<p>whom modified or alternate academic achievement standards apply, are the grade-level academic achievement standards applied to all public elementary and secondary schools and all public school students in the State? ** [**OSEP guidance and NCLB requirements indicate that a student placed in a private school by a public agency for the purpose of receiving special education services must be included in the State assessment and their results attributed to the public school or LEA responsible for the placement.]</p>	<p>content standards and be administered annually to all students. Evidence: Document 2.4.1-Minnesota Statute 120B.30-Statewide Testing and Reporting System</p>	
<p>2.5 How has the State ensured alignment between challenging academic content standards and the academic achievement standards? If the State has adopted modified academic achievement standards, how has the State ensured alignment between its grade-level academic content standards and the modified academic achievement standards? If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards, how has the State ensured alignment between its academic content standards and the alternate academic achievement standards?</p>	<p>MN provided achievement level descriptors for each of the assessments Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate). These descriptors reflect alignment between the academic content standards and the achievement standards. Evidence: Document 2.3.1ab.1-MCA III Achievement Level Descriptors; Document 2.3.1ab.2 and 2.3.1ab.3-MCA-Modified Achievement Level Descriptors; Document 2.3.1ab.4-MTAS Achievement Level Descriptors. MN provided the Test Specification for each of the assessments Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate). The general assessment, the modified assessment, and the alternate assessment are based on the same standards. Evidence: Documents 2.5.1; 2.5.2; 2.5.3-Test Specifications</p>	<p>MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p>
<p>2.6 For each assessment, including alternate assessments, provide documentation of the standard setting process. Describe the selection of panelists, methodology employed, and final results. How did the State document involvement of diverse stakeholders in the development of its academic achievement standards and its modified and/or alternate achievement standards, if any? If the State has adopted alternate or modified academic achievement</p>	<p>Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate): MN indicated that they are in the process of adopting new academic achievement standards for the above listed assessments. Standard setting panels are to be conducted in June and the Commissioner's review and approval is planned for July 2011. MN provided a copy of their Standard</p>	<p>MN must provide documentation of the standard setting process that includes the selection of final panelists, methodology employed, and final results for the Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate).</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
standards, did the State's standards-setting process include persons knowledgeable about the State's academic content standards and special educators who are knowledgeable about students with disabilities?	<p>Setting Plan for the Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate). The plan includes conducting the standard setting with the Bookmark Method for the MCA III and MCA Modified. The Modified Angoff with some components of Reasoned Judgment is to be used for the MTAS. Evidence: Document 2.6.2 Standard Setting Plan for Minnesota Assessments, June 2011.</p> <p>MN submitted Document 2.6.1-Process for 2011 Standard Setting and Alignment Recruitment. This document includes plans for recruitment and involvement of diverse stakeholders and those with expertise with ELLs and Students with Disabilities.</p>	

### Summary Statement

MN must submit the following:

- Documentation of the formal adoption of academic achievement standards including cut scores and final performance level descriptors in Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate).
- Documentation of the standard setting process that includes the selection of final panelists, methodology employed, and final results for the Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate).

### Section 3: Statewide Assessment System

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
3.2 If the State's assessment system includes assessments developed or adopted at both the local and State level, how has the State ensured that these local assessments meet the same technical requirements as the statewide assessments? (a) How has the State ensured that all local assessments are	NOTE: This item applies only to a state that employs local assessments. This includes alternate assessments. State's assessment system includes local assessments in science? ___Yes ___x_No If NO, skip to 3.3. If YES, cite evidence:	n/a

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
<p>aligned with the State's academic content and achievement standards? (b) How has the State ensured that all local assessments are equivalent to one another in terms of content coverage, difficulty, and quality? (c) How has the State ensured that all local assessments yield comparable results for all subgroups? (d) How has the State ensured that all local assessments yield results that can be aggregated with those from other local assessments and with any statewide assessments? (e) How has the State ensured that all local assessments provide unbiased, rational, and consistent determinations of the annual progress of schools and LEAs within the State?</p>		
<p>3.3 If the State's assessment system employs a matrix design—that is, multiple forms within a content area and grade level--how has the State ensured that:</p> <p>(a) All forms are aligned with the State's academic content and achievement standards and yield comparable results?</p> <p>b) All forms are equivalent to one another in terms of content coverage, difficulty, and quality?</p> <p>(c) All assessments yield comparable results for all subgroups?</p>	<p>NOTE: This item applies only to a state system that employs multiple test forms. State system employs multiple test forms? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If NO, skip to 3.5.</p> <p>If YES, cite evidence: MN noted that the Mathematics MCA-III administered in spring 2011 had 20 online forms and one paper form per grade in grades 3-8. All other tests administered a single operational form. (MN Peer Review Summary of Evidence, Page 9) (a) The assessments use the test specifications which show alignment to the academic content and achievement standards. (Test Specifications for each of the assessments Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate). (Documents 2.5.1; 2.5.2; 2.5.3)</p> <p>The forms were first administered in 2011. Standard setting and results have yet to be completed to determine if the forms yield comparable results.</p> <p>(b) MN provided their Spring 2011 Psychometric Plan (Document 3.3.1) which included a discussion of the</p>	<p>MN does not employ a matrix design.</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
	<p>calibration of the multiple online forms for the MCA III. This plan was reviewed by the TAC in June 2011 and the minutes from that meeting will be provided at a later date (MN Peer Review Summary of Evidence, Page 10; Document 3.3.2Agenda for TAC). No information was provided on the equivalency of the online form and the paper form of the MCA-III.</p> <p>(c) The forms were first administered in 2011. Standard setting and results have yet to be completed to determine if the forms yield comparable results for subgroups.</p>	
<p>3.4 How has the State ensured that its assessment system will provide coherent information for students across grades and subjects?</p> <p>(a) Has it indicated the relative contribution of each assessment to ensure alignment to the content standards and determining adequate yearly progress?</p> <p>(b) Has the State provided a rational and coherent design that identifies all assessments, including those based on alternate achievement standards and modified achievement standards if any, to be used for AYP?</p> <p>c) If the State assessment system includes alternate assessments based on alternate or modified achievement standards, has the State provided IEP Teams with a clear description of the differences between assessments based on grade-level achievement standards, assessments based on modified academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate achievement standards, if applicable, including any effects of State and local policies on the student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate or modified academic achievement standards?</p>	<p>(a) MN provided documentation to show alignment to the content standards in terms of test specifications and achievement level descriptors. (Documents 2.2.1ab.1, 2, 3, and 4; Documents 2.5.1, 2, and 3). MN also provided a copy of the 2011 Alignment Study Plans: Mathematics MCAIII, Mathematics and Reading MCA-Modified, and Mathematics MTAS (Document 3.4.1).</p> <p>(b) MN provided the Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessments 2010-2011 (Document 3.4.3) which includes a description of the Minnesota assessments and which are included in determining AYP.</p> <p>(c) MN provided the guidelines for IEP teams to use in deciding which assessment is to be administered. Evidence: Document 2.3.2.1Alternate Assessment Eligibility Requirements (Including MCA-Modified and MTAS alternate); Document 2.3.2.2-Alternate Assessment Eligibility Training for IEP Teams. MN provided a copy of the FAQ's about the MCAs administered in 2011 (Document 2.1.2, Page 3) This document addresses the impact of the MCA-Modified on the GRAD (graduation required assessment for diploma) and what a student has to do as a result of taking the MCA-modified. MN provided the Procedures Manual for the 20102011 school year (Document 3.4.3). Pages 51-59 include information on eligibility</p>	<p>(a) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p> <p>(b) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement</p> <p>(c) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
	for the MTAS and MCA-Modified.	
3.5 If its assessment system includes various instruments (e.g., the general assessment in English and either a native-language version or simplified English version of the assessment), how does the State demonstrate comparable results and alignment with the academic content and achievement standards?	State employs different versions of the test within grade spans? ___Yes ___x_No If NO, skip to 3.6. If YES, cite evidence:	n/a
3.6 How does the State's assessment system involve multiple measures, that is, measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content?	MN provided their Test Specifications documents (2.5.1-2.5.3) which include a discussion on cognitive complexity and cognitive level target distribution of items in the MCA and MCA Modified (Page 11-12). MN also provided a copy of the 2011 Alignment Study Plans: Mathematics MCA-III, Mathematics and Reading MCA-Modified, and Mathematics MTAS (Document 3.4.1). The plans include comparing cognitive complexity ratings of the items with the complexity ratings of each of the content standards.	MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.
3.7 Has the State included alternate assessment(s) for students whose disabilities do not permit them to participate in the general assessment even with accommodations?	MN's assessment system includes the Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS alternate. Documentation 3.71 (3.4.3-Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessment)	MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.

### Summary Statement

MN provided documentation to meet the requirements of Section 3: Statewide Assessment System.

### Section Four: Technical Quality

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
4.1 For each assessment, including all alternate assessments, has the State documented the issue of validity (in addition to the alignment of the assessment with the content standards), as described in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA/APA/NCME, 1999), with respect to all of the	Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate):  (a) MN submitted the Minnesota Statute 120B.30	MN must submit a completed Technical Manual for the 20102011 test administration for Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate) to include evidence which addresses 4.1 (b)-(g).

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
<p>following categories:</p> <p>(a) Has the State specified the purposes of the assessments, delineating the types of uses and decisions most appropriate to each? And</p> <p>(b) Has the State ascertained that the assessments, including alternate assessments, are measuring the knowledge and skills described in its academic content standards and not knowledge, skills, or other characteristics that are not specified in the academic content standards or grade-level expectations? And</p> <p>(c) Has the State ascertained that its assessment items are tapping the intended cognitive processes and that the items and tasks are at the appropriate grade level? and</p> <p>(d) Has the State ascertained that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of its academic content standards (i.e., are item interrelationships consistent with the framework from which the test arises)? and</p> <p>(e) Has the State ascertained that test and item scores are related to outside variables as intended (e.g., scores are correlated strongly with relevant measures of academic achievement and are weakly correlated, if at all, with irrelevant characteristics, such as demographics)? And</p> <p>(f) Has the State ascertained that the decisions based on the results of its assessments are consistent with the purposes for which the assessments were designed? And</p> <p>(g) Has the State ascertained whether the</p>	<p>Statewide Testing and Reporting (Document 4.12.1) which includes the purposes of the assessments and desired outcomes. Purposes are also included in the Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessments (Document 3.4.3), Page 5.</p> <p>(b) MN submitted their Guidelines for Test Construction (Document 4.3.2) which includes the requirement of linkage to the content standards (Page 22) and Item Writer Checklists. Chapter 3 includes the Test Form Construction Process and includes a review by the MDE test development staff and the New Item Review Advisory Panel (Page 42). MN submitted a copy of their Vendor Guide to Advisory Panels which includes detailed information about the types of advisory panels for reviews (Document 4.3.3) MN provided a copy of the 2011 Alignment Study Plans: Mathematics MCA-III, Mathematics and Reading MCA-Modified, and Mathematics MTAS (Document 3.4.1).</p> <p>(c) The Guidelines for Test Construction include information to item writers that "when critical thinking is specified in the standard and/or the cognitive level of the test specifications, items should not measure simple recall facts (Page 22). The Technical Manual for 2009-2010 includes information about MN's item committee reviews including a checklist for review (Pages 47-48).</p> <p>(d) MN noted that they are in the process of conducting statistical analyses on the new assessments and will provide the actual data for the spring 2011 administration when available. (MN Peer Review Summary of Evidence, Page 13)</p> <p>(e) MN noted that they are in the process of</p>	<p>(a) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p> <p>(b) MN must provide additional documentation such as confirmation that the operational test meets the blueprint; the results of the alignment study planned: 2011 Alignment Study Plans: Mathematics MCA-III, Mathematics and Reading MCA-Modified, and Mathematics MTAS (Document 3.4.1)</p> <p>(c) MN must submit evidence that its assessment items are tapping the intended cognitive processes and that the items and tasks are at the appropriate grade level.</p> <p>(d) MN must submit documentation that they have ascertained that the scoring and reporting structures are consistent with the sub-domain structures of its academic content standards.</p> <p>(e) MN must submit documentation that they have ascertained that test and item scores are related to outside variables as intended.</p> <p>(f) MN must submit documentation that the decisions based on the results of its assessments are consistent with the purposes for which the assessments were designed.</p> <p>(g) MN must submit evidence that they have ascertained whether the assessment produces intended and unintended consequences.</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
assessment produces intended and unintended consequences?	conducting statistical analyses on the new assessments and will provide the actual data for the spring 2011 administration when available. (MN Peer Review Summary of Evidence, Page 13)	
<p>4.2 For each assessment, including all alternate assessments, has the State considered the issue of reliability, as described in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA/APA/NCME, 1999), with respect to all of the following categories:</p> <p>(a) Has the State determined the reliability of the scores it reports, based on data for its own student population and each reported subpopulation? And</p> <p>(b) Has the State quantified and reported within the technical documentation for its assessments the conditional standard error of measurement and student classification that are consistent at each cut score specified in its academic achievement standards? And</p> <p>(c) Has the State reported evidence of generalizability for all relevant sources, such as variability of groups, internal consistency of item responses, variability among schools, consistency from form to form of the test, and inter-rater consistency in scoring?</p>	<p>Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate):</p> <p>MN indicated that they are in the process of adopting new academic achievement standards for the above listed assessments. Standard setting panels are to be conducted in June and the Commissioner's review and approval is planned for July 2011.</p> <p>MN noted that they are in the process of conducting statistical analyses on the new assessments and will provide the actual data for the spring 2011 administration when available. (MN Peer Review Summary of Evidence, Page 13)</p>	<p>MN must submit a completed Technical Manual for the 20102011test administration for Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate) to include evidence which addresses 4.2 (a)-(c).</p> <p>Peer reviewers note that the Technical Manual as proposed will address these required elements.</p>
<p>4.3</p> <p>Has the State ensured that its assessment system is fair and accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency, with respect to each of the following issues:</p> <p>(a) Has the State ensured that the assessments provide an appropriate variety of accommodations for students with disabilities? and</p> <p>(b) Has the State ensured that the assessments</p>	<p>Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate):</p> <p>(a) MN provided their Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessments 2010-2011 (Document 4.3.1) which includes details on the accommodations for students with disabilities. (See Pages 41-55). Test development requires adherence to the principles of universal design and accessibility. (Document 4.3.2-Guidelines to Test Construction, Pages 145, 222,</p>	<p>(a) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement. The Procedures Manual (3.4.3, Page 83) states that the Grades 5-8 Mathematics MCA Modified assessments are offered online only. Peers question if these assessments are available in a paper and pencil format for students who may benefit from this accommodation.</p> <p>(b) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p> <p>(c) MN must document steps taken to ensure fairness</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
<p>provide an appropriate variety of linguistic accommodations for students with limited English proficiency? And</p> <p>(c) Has the State taken steps to ensure fairness in the development of the assessments? And</p> <p>(d) Does the use of accommodations and/or alternate assessments yield meaningful scores?</p>	<p>248.)</p> <p>(b) MN provided their Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessments 2010-2011 (Document 4.3.1) which includes details on the accommodations for English Learners. (See Pages 61-69)</p> <p>(c) MN provided the Vendor Guide to Advisory Panels (Document 4.3.3) which includes requirements for wide representation from stakeholders. Bias Review Panels are included in the test development process (Page 2).</p> <p>(d) MN provided a rationale and research results for the accommodations permitted in 2009-2010, 4.1.2.2-Technical Manual.</p>	<p>such as DIF analyses.</p> <p>(d) MN must submit evidence of whether the uses of accommodations and/or alternate assessments yield meaningful scores when administered online.</p>
<p>4.4 When different test forms or formats are used, the State must ensure that the meaning and interpretation of results are consistent.</p> <p>(a) Has the State taken steps to ensure consistency of test forms over time?</p> <p>(b) If the State administers both an online and paper and pencil test, has the State documented the comparability of the electronic and paper forms of the test?</p>	<p>Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate):</p> <p>(a) The 2010-2011 year is the first year these assessments have been administered. MN noted that they are currently completing scaling and equating on the assessments listed above. MN submitted equating specifications: Document 4.4.1: Mathematics MCA-III 2011 Equating Specifications; Document 4.4.2: MCA-Modified 2011 Equating Specifications; and Document 4.4.3: MTAS 2011 Equating Specifications.</p> <p>(b) MN submitted the Online versus Paper Comparability Study Proposal (Document 4.4.4) which describes their plans for documenting the comparability of the electronic and paper forms of the MCA-III.</p> <p>MN provided their Spring 2011 Psychometric Plan (Document 3.3.1) which included a discussion of the calibration of the multiple online forms for the MCA III. This plan was reviewed by the TAC in June 2011 and the minutes from that meeting will be provided at a</p>	<p>(a) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p> <p>(b) MN must document the comparability of the electronic and paper forms of the MCA-III.</p> <p>Peers note that the issue of impact of technology enhanced items on comparability was raised by the TAC (5.4-5.3, Page 11) and should be addressed in the upcoming comparability study.</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
	later date (MN Peer Review Summary of Evidence, Page 10; Document 3.3.2Agenda for TAC).	
<p>4.5 Has the State established clear criteria for the administration, scoring, analysis, and reporting components of its assessment system, including all alternate assessments, and does the State have a system for monitoring and improving the on-going quality of its assessment system?</p>	<p>Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate):</p> <p>MN provided documentation regarding detailed standards for administration, scoring, analysis and reporting. Evidence: Document 4.5.1: 2010-11 Scope of Work; Document 4.5.2: Multi-way Check Process 2011; Document 3.4.3: Procedures Manual for the Minnesota Assessment 2010-2011; Document 4.5.4: Agenda for Pretest Workshop 2010-2011; Document 4.5.5: 2010 Annual Assessment Conference Program; 4.1.2.2-Technical Manual for MN Title I and Title III Assessments for 2009-2010.</p>	<p>While it is clear the MN employs a variety of quality assurance strategies in the development and implementation of their assessment system, the Peers recommend the MN take a more systemic approach to improvement of the statewide assessment system. Peers recommend that MN conduct an annual review of the Assessment System as a whole to identify strengths and weaknesses to be addressed in an ongoing action plan.</p>
<p>4.6 Has the State evaluated its use of accommodations? (a) How has the State ensured that appropriate accommodations are available to students with disabilities and students covered by Section 504, and that these accommodations are used in a manner that is consistent with instructional approaches for each student, as determined by a student's IEP or 504 plan?</p> <p>(b) How has the State determined that scores for students with disabilities that are based on accommodated administration conditions will allow for valid inferences about these students' knowledge and skills and can be combined meaningfully with scores from non-accommodated administration conditions?</p> <p>(c) How has the State ensured that appropriate accommodations are available to limited English proficient students and that these accommodations are used as necessary to yield accurate and reliable information about what limited English proficient students know and can do?</p> <p>(d) How has the State determined that scores for</p>	<p>(a) MN provided documentation on how they monitor the use of accommodations including data audits and selected field audits. In field audits, IEPs are reviewed to verify that accommodations used in the state assessments are documented in the IEP. In addition, provisions of accommodations used during testing are monitored. (Document 4.12.2: Technical Manual for 2009-2010, Page 76).</p> <p>(b) Included in the Technical Manual are the available accommodations and the rationale for their use, including research references. (Pages 6375)</p> <p>(c) Document 4.1-2.2: Technical Manual for 20092010, Page 76).</p> <p>(d) Included in the Technical Manual are the available accommodations for English Learners and the rationale for their use, including research references. For example, use of the bilingual wordto-word dictionary includes a research rational for its use. (Page 64)</p>	<p>(a) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p> <p>(b) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p> <p>(c) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p> <p>(d) MN provided documentation to meet this requirement.</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
limited English proficiency students that are based on accommodated administration circumstances will allow for valid inferences about these students' knowledge and skills and can be combined meaningfully with scores from non-accommodated administration circumstances?		

### Summary Statement

MN must submit evidence of the following:

- Technical Manual for the 2010-2011 test administration for Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate) to include evidence which addresses 4.1 (b) through (g); 4.2 (a) through (c).
- Documentation of steps taken to ensure fairness, such as DIF analyses.
- Documentation that the uses of accommodations and/or alternate assessments yield meaningful scores when administered online.
- Comparability of the electronic and paper forms of the MCA-III.

## Section 5: Alignment

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
<p>5.1 Has the State outlined a coherent approach to ensuring alignment between each of its assessments, or combination of assessments, based on grade-level achievement standards, and the academic content standards and academic achievement standards the assessment is designed to measure?</p> <p>Has the State outlined a coherent approach to ensuring alignment between each of its assessments, or combination of assessments, based on modified achievement standards and the academic content standards and academic achievement standards the assessment is designed to measure?</p> <p>Has the State outlined a coherent approach to ensuring alignment between each of its assessments, or combination of assessments, based on alternate</p>	<p>Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate):</p> <p>MN provided Guidelines for Test Construction (4.3.2) which includes directions for item writers to write items to the academic standards both for content as well as for cognitive level. Reviews are conducted by panels as listed in Vendors Guide to Advisory Panels (Document 5.1.2)</p> <p>MN provided a copy of the 2011 Alignment Study Plans: Mathematics MCA-III, Mathematics and Reading MCA-Modified, and Mathematics MTAS (Document 3.4.1). This study is scheduled for July 2010. The plans were reviewed by the TAC and</p>	<p>MN must submit the results of the planned alignment study and any planned response.</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
<p>achievement standards and the academic content standards and academic achievement standards the assessment is designed to measure?</p>	<p>approved on in June 2011. MDE plans to use the results to define actions necessary to strengthen the alignment of the assessments including review by TAC. (MN Peer Review Summary of Evidence, Page 20)</p>	
<p>5.2 Are the assessments and the standards aligned comprehensively, meaning that the assessments reflect the full range of the State's academic content standards? Are the assessments as cognitively challenging as the standards? Are the assessments and standards aligned to measure the depth of the standards? Does the assessment reflect the degree of cognitive complexity and level of difficulty of the concepts and processes described in the standards?</p> <p>If the State has implemented an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards, does the assessment reflect the full range of the State's academic content standards for the grade(s) tested? What changes in cognitive complexity or difficulty, if any, have been made for assessments based on modified academic achievement standards?</p> <p>If the State has implemented an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards, does the assessment show a clear link to the content standards for the grade in which the students tested are enrolled although the grade-level content may be reduced in depth, breadth or complexity or modified to reflect pre-requisite academic skills?</p>	<p>The alignment study planned by MN includes application of a modified version of the Webb Alignment Method for review of the MCA-III and MCA-Modified test forms. Indicators will include categorical concurrence, range-of-knowledge, balance-of-representation, and depth-of knowledge. (Document 3.4.1, Page 5)</p> <p>For the MTAS, procedures will parallel the alignment procedures used for MCA-III and MCA-Modified, but will include additional steps pertinent to the LAL alignment method. (Page 7)</p> <p>Test specifications were submitted for MCA-III, MCA-Modified, and MTAS which include items across all standards. (2.5.1-2.5.3)</p>	<p>MN must submit evidence that the assessments and standards are aligned as designated in 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.</p>
<p>5.3 Are the assessments and the standards aligned in terms of both content (knowledge) and process (how to do it), as necessary, meaning that the assessments measure what the standards state students should both know and be able to do?</p> <p>What changes in test structure or format, if any, have been made for assessments based on modified academic achievement standards?</p>	<p>For the Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, MN reduced the number of response options, used only multiple choice, provided only on-line options, did not have items from the GRAD, did not have grid or technology enhanced items, and reduced the number of items.</p>	<p>MN must submit evidence that the assessments and standards are aligned as designated in 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.</p>
<p>5.4 Do the general assessments and alternate assessments based on modified achievement</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>MN must submit evidence that the assessments and standards are aligned as designated in 5.2, 5.3, and</p>

Critical Element	Description of State policy and practice (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Questions Regarding State Materials
standards if any, reflect the same degree and pattern of emphasis as are reflected in the State's academic content standards?		5.4.
5.5 Do the assessments yield scores that reflect the full range of achievement implied by the State's academic achievement standards?	<p>Mathematics MCA-III Grades 3-8, Mathematics MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and MTAS Grades 38 (alternate):</p> <p>MN provided 2.5.1 Mathematics Test Specifications for MCA-III Grades 3-8 and MA-Modified Grades 5-8; 2.5.2 Reading MCA-Modified Test Specifications Grades 5-8; 2.53 MTAS Test Specifications for Mathematics Grades 3-8.</p> <p>MN provided a copy of the 2011 Alignment Study Plans: Mathematics MCA-III, Mathematics and Reading MCA-Modified, and Mathematics MTAS (Document 3.4.1).</p> <p>MN administered the assessments in 2010-2011 and plan standard setting, final approval of standards, and production of data in July 2011.</p>	MN must submit documentation that confirms that the scores reflect the full range of achievement implied by the State's academic achievement standards.
5.6 Assessment results must be expressed in terms of the achievement standards, not just scale scores or percentiles.	MN provided a copy of the Interpretive Guide for 2009-2010 (5.6.2). The individual student report (Pages 16-17) includes information about the achievement standards and not just scale scores for the MCA.	MN provided a mockup of the student report for the MCA and the 2009-2010 Interpretive Guide, however, MN must submit assessment reports for the 20102011 assessments for the MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 58 and 11, and Mathematics MCA-III and MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate) to show how they are expressed in terms of achievement standards.
5.7 What ongoing procedures does the State use to maintain and improve alignment between the assessments and standards over time?	MN indicated that the state plans to use the results of the planned alignment study to improve alignment. (MN Peer Review Summary of Evidence, Page 23)	MN must submit a description of how they will maintain and improve alignment over time.

### Summary Statement

MN must submit the following:

- MN must submit the results of the planned alignment study and any planned response.
- Evidence that the assessments and standards are aligned as designated in 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.
- Documentation that confirms that the scores reflect the full range of achievement implied by the State's academic achievement standards

- Assessment reports for the 2010-2011 assessments for the MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 10, Reading MCA Modified-Grades 5-8 and 11, and Mathematics MA-III and MTAS Grades 3-8 (alternate) to show how they are expressed in terms of achievement standards.
- MN must submit a description of how they will maintain and improve alignment over time.