

Technical Report # 2607

State of State Accountability Programs with a Focus on Alternate Assessments

Brock Rowley
Gerald Tindal
Dan Farley

University of Oregon



behavioral research & teaching

Published by

Behavioral Research and Teaching
University of Oregon • 175 Education
5262 University of Oregon • Eugene, OR 97403-5262
Phone: 541-346-3535 • Fax: 541-346-5689
<http://brt.uoregon.edu>

Copyright© 2026. Behavioral Research and Teaching. All rights reserved. This publication or parts thereof, may not be used or reproduced in any manner without written permission.

APA Reference: Rowley, B., Tindal, G., & Farley, D. (2026). *The State of State Accountability Programs with a Focus on Alternate Assessments (Technical Report # 2607)*. Eugene, OR: Behavioral Research and Teaching, University of Oregon.

The University of Oregon is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation. This document is available in alternative formats upon request.

Abstract

We have compiled information from a range of sources, both web-based documents and statewide websites, to summarize the current landscape of state accountability programs. This information is documented to support funding for a National Assessment Center to serve states in improving their accountability programs. We include multiple lens (from state repositories, federal reviews, and national organizations) to document patterns of practice and performance on inclusion of students with disabilities, including those with the most significant disabilities (SWSCD), in state testing programs. The issues range from participation and inclusion rates (with attention to the 1% cap for SWSCD), administration of evidence-based accessible assessments, universal design and the use of assessment accommodations, technical analyses, and reporting to ensure parent understanding. In the end, this information should facilitate “development, implementation, and scaling of improved alternate assessments, including those that use adaptive technologies, that provide timely and useful information to educators, students, and families to address the learning needs of students with disabilities, including those with the most significant cognitive disabilities, and assist states in meeting the 1 percent threshold.”

We finish this Technical Report by adding a BRT lens so test developers and state educational agencies (SEAs) can take a more functional approach to serving students with disabilities and those learning English. For many students on the achievement margin, taking a test is essentially a negative reinforcement, in which they escape to terminate an aversive stimulus. For students with the most significant disabilities, testing academic achievement becomes fraught with confounds and can only be accomplished with attention to interactions with different modes of communication and use adaptive accommodations. In any of these student groups, a more considerate and deliberate efforts must be made to increase participation and achievement, as well as communicate meaningful information to teachers and families.

The State of State Accountability Programs with a Focus on Alternate Assessments

Standards-based educational reform transformed public education over the past four decades. Although statewide testing systems initially focused almost exclusively on general education students, federal legislation and subsequent regulations progressively expanded accountability expectations to include all students, including those with disabilities. This paper reviews the historical development of statewide assessment systems, the emergence of alternate assessments, and the resulting federal policies that continue to shape educational accountability.

Early State Accountability Systems

During the 1980s and 1990s, states increasingly adopted curriculum standards and statewide testing programs in response to concerns regarding educational quality. These systems emphasized school improvement but often excluded students with disabilities from accountability calculations. Consequently, little information existed concerning the academic performance of these students.

The No Child Left Behind Era

The No Child Left Behind Act (2001) fundamentally altered educational accountability by requiring annual assessments in reading and mathematics and requiring participation of all students. The legislation introduced Adequate Yearly Progress and disaggregated reporting for student subgroups, including students with disabilities. This shift established educational equity as a central accountability principle.

Development of Alternate Assessments

Federal regulations issued beginning in 2003 recognized that a very small population of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities required alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards. States subsequently developed assessment systems addressing participation guidelines, accessibility, accommodations, scoring, reporting, and technical quality. The regulations also established the expectation that approximately one percent of tested students would participate in these assessments.

The 2005 White Paper

The publication 'Including Students with Disabilities in Large-Scale Assessments: A White Paper for Establishing Federal Policy' represented one of the first comprehensive national syntheses of policy and technical issues surrounding alternate assessments. The authors addressed participation criteria, alternate achievement standards, technical validity, accessibility, accommodations, comparability, and accountability reporting. Many recommendations anticipated federal guidance that emerged over the following decade (Tindal, et.al., 2005).

ESSA and Contemporary Accountability

The Every Student Succeeds Act retained universal participation requirements while providing states greater flexibility in accountability design. ESSA formalized the one percent statewide participation cap for alternate assessments and strengthened monitoring of participation decisions while preserving high expectations for all students.

Continuing Challenges

Current challenges include improving instructional alignment, enhancing accessibility through universal design, integrating evidence-centered assessment design, supporting growth measurement, strengthening validity evidence, and ensuring appropriate participation decisions. Advances in technology and psychometrics continue to improve alternate assessment systems while maintaining rigorous accountability expectations.

Implications for a National Assessment Center

The historical evolution of alternate assessments demonstrates the continuing need for a national center devoted to assessment research, technical assistance, policy development, and innovation. Such a center could support states in improving technical quality, accessibility, instructional relevance, and equitable educational opportunities for students with disabilities while facilitating collaboration among researchers, practitioners, policymakers, and families. This next section of the technical report provides an extensive array of evidence justifying a variety of support systems to ensure states not only increase participation of students with disabilities, including those with the most significant cognitive disabilities, but more importantly provide accessible, evidence-based assessments that lead to improved performance. We first present evidence of needs from our independent review of each state website. We then take a broad view from the perspective of federal oversight.

STATE LENS

In this section, we present results from our review of all 50 states and needs with three tables (a) Composite Scores, Intervention Levels, and Technical Assistance Needs, (b) Rubric-Domain Issues and Recommended Technical Assistance Directions, and (c) differentiating need with service using Intervention Packages by Input Type and Technical Assistance Tier.

We reviewed each state's website for critical components relevant to the inclusion of students with disabilities, focusing on participation and performance, and paying particular attention to students with the most significant disabilities. We used a three-point scale (1=minimal/missing, 2=partially present, 3=substantially present) on the following 14 dimensions. Easy to Find, Participation Criteria, IEP Guidance, Family Resources, Training Materials, Administration Manuals, Accessibility Guidance, AAAS/ALD/PLD, Practice Tests, Score Reporting, Technical Documentation, Contact Information, Current Materials, Site Organization. In effect, we created a 42-point scale.

For determining state need, we first had five reviewers independently review three states (Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia) before completing assigned reviews. Scores were compared and discrepancies were used to calibrate review expectations. When the scores were compared, the totals were within 2, 3, and 5 points of each other, respectively, with only one pair not totaling 37-40 points). After ensuring reliability, we summarized their total score and placed them into categories as a function of their rank and priority domains: Universal (28 states), Targeted (15), Intensive (8), and Foundational Build / Rapid Response states (6). We then analyzed three areas: (a) signal strength in Priority Domains (**Table 1**), Targeted Topics (**Table 2**), and finally, by potential Intervention Packages (**Table 3**).

First, we organized the following potential responses according to the level of state need (see **Table 1**) that reflects *Priority Domains* by Intervention Level (1-4). **Note.** Each domain carries a parenthetical signal that grades severity: (0) the resource is essentially absent (most acute), (1) a significant gap, and (2) present but needing refinement. Lower numbers mark more urgent needs, and they deepen as the intervention level rises. Across all four levels, the same domains recur: Family Resources, Technical Documentation, and Administration Manuals. However, but signal sinks from (2) toward (0) as needs intensify.

- Level 1 – Universal / Peer Learning: Higher-scoring states reflect lightest needs, almost entirely at signal level (2). Flags cluster around Technical Documentation and Site Organization, followed by Family Resources and Score Reporting—refinement work such as improving findability, posting technical reports publicly, and strengthening family-facing materials.
- Level 2 – Targeted Cohort: Needs broaden toward operational currency. Family Resources and Administration Manuals dominate, alongside Current Materials, Contact Information, and Practice Tests, with the first signal (1). Technical Documentation gaps point to outdated or fragmented materials.
- Level 3 – Intensive Site / Navigation Review: This level is more acute, with many domains at signal level (1) Family Resources, Administration Manuals, Accessibility Guidance, AAAS/ALD/PLD, and Technical Documentation recur most often. The District of Columbia and the U.S. Virgin Islands flag all four domains at (1), signaling systemic gaps.
- Level 4 – Foundational Build / Rapid Response: The lowest-scoring jurisdictions, where core resources are largely absent with many flags at signal level (0). Family Resources dominates, with Practice Tests, AAAS/ALD/PLD, and Accessibility Guidance close behind. Puerto Rico, the Bureau of Indian Education, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and Georgia need foundational hubs built and rapid-response support rather than refinement.

Second, we considered areas of support in 14 *Targeted Topics* (below are the five areas with the lowest scores (see **Table 2**):

- Technical Documentation (1.93): Need to create public technical-documentation templates and state supplement coaching. Targeted cohort + intensive consults.
- Family Resources (2.09): Need to develop family-facing explainer, score report guide, and translation-ready templates. Universal toolkit + targeted cohort.
- Site Organization (2.21): Need to run resource-map/site-navigation reviews and build model landing pages. Intensive site audits + targeted cohort.
- Practice Tests (2.37): Need to set sample item expectations and link practice resources from state hubs (all without log in requirements). Targeted improvement sprint.
- Score Reporting (2.44): Need to publish ISR glossary, PLD explainer, parent-session decks, and reporting timeline template. Universal toolkit + targeted support.

Third, we translated our assessment review into 19 ready-to-deploy *Intervention Products* (see **Table 3**). Five *Universal* products would offer templates available to all states—public resource architecture, family communication and score-report interpretation, technical-documentation visibility, participation/IEP decision-making tools, and practice-item access—prioritized for states scoring below 3 in those domains. Five *Targeted* products would address specific cohorts: navigation audits for high-resource but fragmented states, transition communication, 1% monitoring support, technical-report publication, and multilingual family resources. Four *Intensive* products would concentrate on jurisdictions with limited infrastructure (BIE, the

territories, and low-scoring states) through foundational resource hubs, implementation coaching, documentation buildout, and 12-month modernization partnerships. Finally, *five cross-tier 90-Day Action Agenda items* supply immediate national moves: a family explainer, a technical-documentation cohort, rapid site scans for Level 3–4 states, an exemplar repository, and a foundational-hub sprint. Together they scale support from universal resources to intensive, jurisdiction-specific partnerships.

In summary, the 28 Universal states can provide national products, peer learning, exemplar repository, optional office hours in our model. States can adapt national templates without intensive state-specific build-out. The 15 Targeted states could work in cohorts for family communication, technical documentation, score interpretation, and site navigation. Each state would leave with a resource map and at least one improved public product. The 8 Intensive states need state-specific diagnostic review in co-designed sessions, with rapid remediation plans. Each state would be provided a core alternate assessment pathway that is visible, current, and role based. For 6 Foundational Build / Rapid Response states, a 12-week portal starter sprint would be helpful with (a) governance/resource inventory and (b) family and educator core templates. These states would end up with dedicated public alternate assessment hubs that include participation, family, training, reporting, and contacts.

Federal lens

In this section, we synthesize all federal evidence streams related to national assessment needs, federal monitoring, 1% AA-AAAS participation, peer review findings, and emerging Center functions. We used the following input documents:

- National_Assessment_Center_1Percent_Letters_Complete_Archive.xlsx;
- National_Assessment_Peer_Review_Database_2022_2026.xlsx;
- State Assessment Peer Review Status Version 2.pdf;
- Peer Review Schedule Su25 thru Su26.xlsx

We also considered the following companion documents:

- AA-AAAS_National_Needs_Review.docx;
- Emerging Center Functions from Federal Review.docx;
- National Assessment Peer Review Findings (2022-2026).docx;
- Emerging Center Functions from Federal Peer Review Findings.docx

Note that in the four sections of the Fed Lens, the last one (PR26_* tabs) provides a current federal peer-review status/schedule overlay. Existing 1P_, PR_, and FED_ tabs were preserved. In summary, the information from these documents covers the 1% cap correspondence archive (2018-2023), the peer review determinations database (2022-2026), and supporting white-paper documents.

1% Participation Documents and Findings

This introduction to the federal 1% AA-AAAS letter review explains how the workbook converts federal correspondence on the 1.0 percent alternate-assessment participation cap into a coded national evidence base for the National Assessment Center proposal.

Scoring Domains and Rubric

In our analysis, we used a **rubric** to codify the broad array of information using a structured, eight-domain scoring rubric used to evaluate federal correspondence concerning state assessment systems, with particular focus on alternate assessment (AA-AAAS) participation measured against the federal 1.0% cap. Each domain is documented in a consistent five-part structure: a defined purpose, an explicit numeric scoring rule with stated thresholds, a bounded score range, interpretation notes explaining what higher scores signify, and a description of how the domain is used in review. This uniform structure makes the rubric reproducible and auditable, allowing different reviewers to apply the same criteria to disparate letters. The overarching aim is to convert qualitative, narrative federal correspondence into comparable, quantified indicators that support national ranking, heat-mapping, and technical assistance (TA) prioritization across states. The specific Scoring Domains included the following:

- **Participation Severity (0–4)** grades the magnitude of the highest reported AA-AAAS participation rate in escalating bands, from at or below 1.00% (0) to above 1.50% (4), flagging the degree of departure from the federal cap and sorting states into mild through critical concern levels.
- **Subject Breadth (0–3)** counts the number of subjects with a numeric rate above 1.0%, distinguishing isolated (e.g., science-only or RLA-only) issues from systemic, cross-content problems. Text values such as “waiver” or “>1.0” are documented but not counted unless an exact rate is available.
- **Federal Intervention Level (0–4)** captures the intensity of federal action, ranging from no further action or a removed condition (0), through a requested plan, a grant condition, and condition plus joint monitoring calls, up to formal high-risk status (4). It supports ranking state need and documenting escalation.
- **State Response Capacity (0–4)** rates the state’s improvement trajectory across available correspondence, from a return to compliance (0) to no progress or worsening (4). This serves as the core capacity metric for National Assessment Center TA need.
- **Escalation Risk (0–4)** estimates the likelihood that federal action will intensify, scaling from none (0) through a condition, threatened additional action, and joint monitoring calls, to imposed high-risk status (4), highlighting states needing intensive support.
- **Transparency / Accountability (0–1)** is a binary flag for whether the federal letter explicitly requires a public plan, timeline, or comparable accountability mechanism, informing TA around public reporting and stakeholder communication.
- **Overall Assessment Participation Concern (0–2)** records whether the letter separately flags low overall assessment participation (none, concern, or significant concern), capturing issues beyond the AA-AAAS cap where alternate and general participation systems intersect.
- **Composite Risk Score** reflects individual domain scores summed into a Composite Risk Score spanning 0–22. Suggested prioritization categories are Low (0–4), Moderate (5–8), High (9–12), and Critical (13 or above). This aggregate is the principal prioritization metric, enabling consistent national ranking, heat maps, and allocation of technical assistance across states.

Overall, the methodology emphasizes transparent, reproducible scoring rules and clear documentation conventions, ensuring that subjective federal narratives are translated into a defensible, comparable evidence base for oversight and resource targeting.

Spoiler Alert: Across the archive, the letters document a persistent national implementation challenge rather than a narrow assessment-design issue. States vary substantially in their ability to translate federal participation criteria into local IEP-team decision making, LEA justification review, public transparency, data monitoring, and sustained improvement. Early letters emphasized plan submission and grant conditions; later correspondence increasingly differentiated states by improvement trajectory, waiver management, monitoring requirements, and formal high-risk status. This pattern supports a National Assessment Center role focused on technical assistance, implementation infrastructure, data-use routines, stakeholder communication, and continuous improvement for alternate assessment participation systems. The federal archive shows a progression from compliance notification to capacity-based oversight: plan required → grant condition → continued condition → joint monitoring → high-risk designation. This progression provides a defensible rubric for identifying state need, federal concern, and TA intensity.

State Specific Findings from Reviewing the 1% Participation Documents

In our review of federal letters and summarized in a technical report, we found ‘**Overall Participation Concern**’ as ‘Significant’ for 4 states and ‘Concern’ for 15 states, with 30 states having ‘None’. Nearly 40% of the states have ‘Concerns’ or ‘Significant Concerns’ (see **Table 4**). **Note:** State-level data are reported with both numeric scores and categorical labels, appearing as rows (49 records across 25 jurisdictions) with the rubric domain scores, the numeric Composite Risk Score, and categorical Risk Category and State Archetype. Narrative fields are stripped to focus on quantified risk coding for ranking and heat-mapping. Contains

When these data from 1% letters from school years 2017-18 through 2021-22 (with letters dated roughly 2018-2023) are converted to Risk, a similar pattern emerges highlighting states needing assistance. Even after re-reviews from 2017 through 2023, the following outcomes were reported: Considered as a **Risk Category**, only 5 states were ‘Low’ with 20 states ‘Moderate’, 18 states ‘High’, and 6 states ‘Critical’ (see **Table 5**).

In the end with Federal Action Summary, of the 49 **total letters/actions coded** for 25 unique states, 39 had a grant condition (18 of which were continued and 2 removed); 3 required monitoring calls, 3 with public plan required to be posed, 7 with science only condition action, and 2 near compliance. And the State Archetype included the following topical issues (with counts of states in parentheses): Monitoring / Plan Required (20), Improving / Not Yet Compliant (7), Waiver Managed (7), Persistent / Worsening (5), Compliance Success (4), Near Compliance (2), Escalated Monitoring (2), Content-Specific Concern (1), and High Risk (1).

The main themes raising concerns included Data Monitoring & Use, LEA Justification Review, IEP Team Decision-Making, Waiver & Corrective Action Planning, Federal Escalation Prevention, Overall Assessment Participation, and Public Transparency & Communication. All but the last two reflect High Priorities, which were Moderate.

Summary of 1% Findings. Federal correspondence from 2019 through 2024 documents that many states continue to exceed the ESEA 1.0 percent cap for alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards. The letters show that this issue persists across content areas and across years, and that federal oversight has evolved from plan requests and grant conditions to joint monitoring requirements and, in at least one case, formal high-risk status. The archive suggests that state need is not limited to assessment design. Rather, states vary in their capacity to monitor participation decisions, support LEA justifications, train IEP teams, engage families, maintain public transparency, and use data to reduce inappropriate AA-AAAS participation over time. Finally, and most importantly, states can be grouped into support tiers such as Compliance Success, Near Compliance, Improving but Not Yet Compliant, Persistent/Content-Specific Concern, Escalated Monitoring, and High Risk. These tiers allow the Center to match supports to state needs rather than treating all exceedances as equivalent.

Peer Review Documents and Findings

At this point in our review process, we culled the letters and peer review notes reviewed from 2022–2026, including a search with key terms: academic, alternate academic, ELP, Alternate ELP, monitoring, and enforcement documents. We coded results as 0 = Not Identified; 1 = Mentioned/Moderate Finding; 2 = Significant Finding or repeated evidence need. We also coded states into three categories: **Universal** = general resources/exemplars; **Targeted** = focused consultation and workgroups; **Intensive** = sustained TA plan with recurring technical support.

We also pivoted into categorizing states on need: Universal, Targeted, and Intensive with reference to the most recent peer review (2022-2026). We found 11 states needed ‘universal’ support, 61 needed ‘targeted’ support, and 15 states needed ‘intensive’ support. The reason for this total being more than the number of states is due to decisions based on multiple years and/or subject areas (see **Table 6**). We further analyzed states as to whether the peer *Partially Meets*, *Substantially Meets*, or *Meets*, specified by state and vendor (assessment) (see **Table 7**).

Culling this information of themes by category of Technical Assistance (*Universal*, *Targeted*, *Intensive*) for states, we report the suggested supports needed (see **Table 8**). *Universal* (n = 11) — positive exemplars and low-need systems included Early DLM Science blueprint pattern, Positive exemplar for mature ELP/Alt ELP system, corrective action improvement example, Positive contrast for stakeholder engagement systems, and Policy/accountability example, lower TA-needs value. *Targeted* (n = 61) — focused, domain-specific concerns included Math alignment, TAC, postsecondary readiness, Alignment and monitoring, AT alignment, item pool, Alternate ACCESS, ELP and alignment concerns, Science and ELP in otherwise strong system. *Intensive* (n = 15) — broad, multi-domain deficiencies, security lifecycle, privacy, DIF, Prototype intensive TA system, Science and alignment redesign, Alt ELP and alternate assessment broad needs, and multiple assessment systems with strong alignment/design need. Basically, as the tier escalates from *Universal* to *Targeted* to *Intensive*, both the Total Domain Score and Significant Findings range shift upward (*Universal* tops out at 15 and 3; *Intensive* reaches 32 and 16), and the rationales move from positive exemplars to focused concerns to broad, systemic needs. *Targeted* and *Intensive* overlap in score (both begin at 9), so tier assignment is not driven by score alone — the breadth of findings in the rationale also matters.

Finally, we extend this information to confirm many of the major findings and connects them with critical center functions and foci (see **Table 9**). We confine this section to one table that provides a Current per-state risk rollup (51 states or systems), reflecting June 2026 status. States appear as rows in column A with counts of components by determination (*Meets, Substantially Meets, Partially Meets, Does Not Meet, No Current Determination*), pending reviews, alternate components with concern, highest severity, overall TA tier signal, primary risk pattern, and a proposal or TA story.

We summarize relevant issues from the most recent peer review (see **Table 10**). This information adds a current June 2026 federal peer-review status and schedule layer to all previous analyses without deleting or replacing existing worksheets. This information identifies the primary source (State Assessment Peer Review Status Version 2 PDF, OESE; status as of 6/5/2026; determinations current to May 1, 2026) and notes that Version 2 added active hyperlinks to federal decision letters.

We consolidated state-level categories culled from six source tables into one row per state, covering 53 jurisdictions (see **Table 11**). From the federal 1% letter tables it reports School Year with Overall Participation Concern (Table 1) and Risk Category (Table 2); from the peer review tables it reports review periods with recommended TA tiers (Tables 3 and 5), federal determinations (Table 4), and current risk-tier signals (Table 6). Only 25 states carry 1% data, so those columns are often blank, while peer review coverage is broader. States appearing multiple times show their distinct values per field, and blanks indicate absence from that source table. When we cross-tabulated the states' Tier from our *internal analysis* of state sites with the *1% participation* from the federal documents and the *federal peer review*, we found five tiers among the 57 states and territories:

- **Universal with targeted qualifications** (n=8): Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Kansas, Montana, Oregon, and Pennsylvania).
- **Universal with intensive qualifications** (n = 21): California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.
- **Targeted – Intensive** (n = 15): Colorado, Iowa, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin.
- **Specialized – Intensive** (n = 9): Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Nevada, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming.
- **Unranked but In Need** (n = 4): U.S. Territories including American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and U.S. Virgin Islands.

Data Analyses and Results by Domain. We began with a topical review organized by domain rather than by state, mixing categorical labels with numeric counts and percentages. The outcome reflects determinations from the 2022-2026 review window. Of the total reviews (87) and, by assessment domain, counts of reviews where the domain was mentioned versus flagged significant, the percent significant, and the associated Center function. Universal TA included 11 domains, Targeted TA showed up with 61 references, and Intensive TA resulted in 15 domains. The top domain was *Validity* (see **Table 12**).

This follow up describes themes supporting our analysis, in which we determined the 87 federal assessment reviews could be ranked into 16 technical domains by the share of reviews in which each was flagged as a significant finding, producing a priority map of the most pervasive assessment-quality concerns and the order in which technical assistance should be directed across the system.

Ordered from the highest rank to the lowest, the issues and their significance rates are as follows. The single most prevalent concern is Validity Research & Peer Review Evidence (72.4%), followed closely by Assessment Design & Blueprint Support (70.1%) and Assessment Alignment & Validation (69.0%), which together identify the core of test construction as the dominant national weakness. Next come Reporting & Family Communication (56.3%), Accessibility Systems Design (55.2%), and Reliability, Precision & Classification Analytics (51.7%). A two-way tie at rank seven covers Accommodation Policy & Implementation Monitoring (49.4%) and ELP Assessment Technical Assistance (49.4%). These are followed by Monitoring & Administration Fidelity Systems (46.0%), Alternate Science Assessment Technical Assistance (39.1%), Science Assessment Development & Validation (32.2%), and Alternate ELP Technical Assistance (31.0%). A second tie, at rank thirteen, encompasses Postsecondary Readiness & Outcomes Validation (29.9%) and TAC Facilitation & Continuous Improvement (29.9%). The two least frequently significant domains are Test Security & Incident Management (25.3%) and, last, Assessment Governance & Federal Compliance (20.7%). Although governance ranks lowest in significance frequency, its low rate reflects comparatively strong compliance rather than unimportance.

The overall pattern concentrates the greatest risk in the technical core of assessment systems, namely validity, design, alignment, reporting, accessibility, and reliability, where more than half of all reviewed systems received significant findings. Specialized and population-specific domains, including science, English language proficiency, alternate assessments, and postsecondary readiness, show lower but still meaningful significance rates, signaling targeted rather than universal technical-assistance needs across the reviewed states and systems.

Clearly, the Center functions need to serve several functions in several domains to develop and deliver a variety of products and services (see **Table 13**): Each row names a federal theme (participation decision-making, monitoring fidelity, data systems, and others) and aligns the 1% monitoring evidence with the peer review evidence, a combined interpretation, and a TA tier implication. The table integrates the 1% and peer review findings into unified themes, spanning both the 2018-2023 and 2022-2026 evidence windows. The following address: Participation decision-making, Monitoring & implementation fidelity, Data systems & reporting integrity, Accessibility & accommodations, Alignment & assessment design, Validity, reliability & technical quality, Science and alternate science, ELP and Alternate ELP, Family/stakeholder engagement, Peer review readiness & evidence management.

Our interpretation of the combined of the 12 cross-cutting federal themes by combined evidence strength across two federal streams—the 1% AA-AAAS monitoring letters and the assessment peer review database—with why each issue matters and its map to National Assessment Center function. In rank order, the following list is the focus of our work using the information embedded in the previous tables. We consolidate our focus to the following topics and dimensions with personnel associated as part of their duties as described in the Management Plan to focus on Products and Services (See **Table 14**).

- **Rank 1 — Monitoring & implementation fidelity.** Assurance that assessments are administered, monitored, and secured as intended, with strong incident management. Both federal streams stress evidence that policies are implemented, monitored, and improved, not merely adopted. The 1% evidence is very strong and peer review strong, with monitoring a frequent peer review domain. Mapped to Monitoring, Security & Assessment Operations.
- **Rank 2 — Accessibility & accommodations.** Designing accessible assessment systems and sound accommodation policy, decision-making, and implementation monitoring. Mapped to Accessibility recurs across participation, validity, reporting, accommodations, and digital assessment systems. Peer review evidence is very strong and 1% evidence strong, reflecting high-frequency accessibility and accommodations findings. Mapped to the Accessibility & Accommodation Systems function.
- **Rank 3 — Participation decision-making / 1% threshold.** Support eligibility criteria, IEP-team decisions, LEA justification review, and 1% cap compliance: The central federal monitoring issue for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The 1% evidence is extremely strong and peer review moderate, linked to AA-AAAS participation and monitoring. Mapped to Participation Decision-Making & Eligibility.
- **Rank 4 — Alignment & assessment design.** Federal peer review repeatedly requires alignment evidence, blueprint logic, and achievement standards to content standards with sound, documented design logic. Peer review evidence is extremely strong while 1% evidence is moderate, with alignment and design among the top peer review domains. Mapped to Assessment Alignment & Validation.
- **Rank 5 — Validity, reliability & technical quality.** States need defensible technical evidence and documentation across all assessment programs for building, organizing, and documenting validity evidence, which is the single most frequent national peer-review finding. Peer review evidence is extremely strong, with validity ranked highest in frequency, while 1% evidence is moderate. Mapped to Psychometrics, Scaling & Technical Quality.
- **Rank 6 — Reporting & family communication.** Producing clear, accessible, and multilingual score reports and family-facing interpretation materials. States must communicate results and participation information clearly to families and stakeholders. Both streams rate strong, with reporting a high-frequency peer review domain. Mapped to Reporting, Accountability & Decision Support.
- **Rank 7 — Data systems & evidence management.** Establishing defensible governance structures and helping states meet ESEA peer-review expectations and required-element conditions Data governance and evidence repositories reduce state burden and improve federal readiness. The 1% evidence is very strong and peer review strong, drawing on reporting, monitoring, and technical-documentation patterns. Mapped to Technology, Data Systems & Infrastructure.
- **Rank 8 — Science assessment systems.** Resolving persistent science and alternate-science development needs that remain unresolved after other subjects are approved. Science repeatedly remains unresolved after other subjects are approved. Peer review evidence is strong and 1% evidence moderate, reflecting the science and alternate-science domains. Mapped to Science Assessment Development & Validation.
- **Rank 9 — ELP & Alternate ELP systems.** Addressing the emerging national capacity gap in ELP and Alternate ELP assessment systems. Alternate ELP findings suggest a national capacity gap rather than isolated state problems. Peer review evidence is strong

and 1% evidence moderate, across the ELP and Alternate ELP domains. Mapped to the ELP & Alternate ELP Support function.

- **Rank 10 — Stakeholder engagement & transparency.** Public communication, parent involvement, stakeholder feedback, and multilingual access. Federal expectations increasingly include public transparency, parent involvement, and stakeholder feedback. The 1% evidence is very strong and peer review moderate, from family-engagement monitoring and reporting findings. Mapped to Family, Community & Stakeholder Engagement.
- **Rank 11 — Postsecondary readiness.** Links to standards, proficiency, and alternate achievement to meaningful postsecondary and employment outcomes Federal reviewers increasingly expect evidence linking standards and proficiency to future outcomes. Both streams are emerging rather than established, signaling a growing technical assistance need. Mapped to Postsecondary Readiness & Outcome Validation.
- **Rank 12 — Continuous improvement & TAC.** Sustaining technical advisory committees and ongoing, measurable system-improvement structures rather than one-time fixes. Mature assessment systems require ongoing review, maintenance, and improvement structures. The 1% evidence is strong and peer review moderate, tied to the TAC and continuous-improvement domain. Mapped to Continuous Improvement & TAC Infrastructure.

Summary from Federal 1% and Peer Review Documents. It is not surprising that the conclusions are varied, given the purpose of the data collection has focused on both monitoring 1% participation and conducting peer reviews of state accountability programs. Therefore, one of the first tasks of the National Center is to consolidate the status of both 1% participation and the latest peer review. For each state, we plan to present a summary of these results and request them to edit and update. We ask for self-nomination of intervention level of Universal, Targeted, and Intensive.

Summary of State and Federal Lens. Using all three data sets (analysis of states, 1% participation letter, and Peer Review), we found five tiers among the states and territories (see **Table 15**):

- *Universal with Targeted* qualifications (n=8): Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Kansas, Montana, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.
- *Universal with Intensive* qualifications (n = 21): California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.
- *Targeted – Intensive* (n = 15): Colorado, Iowa, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin.
- *Specialized – Intensive* (n = 9): Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, Georgia, Illinois, Nevada, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming.
- *Not Ranked but In Need* (n = 4): U.S. Territories including American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and U.S. Virgin Islands.

Professional Knowledge Lens an Evidence-Based Project Component

We also conducted a thorough review of important external sources providing guidance to states for participation and performance of students with disabilities in large-scale assessments, while attending to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

- National_Assessment_Leadership_Needs_Review_Initial_Harvest.xlsx,
- National_Assessment_Leadership_Needs_Review_NCSA_NCEO_Deep_Dive.xlsx,
- NCEO_Survey_of_States_Deep_Extraction.xlsx,
- NCSA_Session_Deep_Coding_Workbook_2023_2026.xlsx,
- AIR_and_Public_TAC_Deep_Dive_Coding_Workbook.xlsx,
- KU_ATLAS_DLM_Deep_Dive_Coding_Workbook.xlsx,
- Kindergarten_Entry_Assessment_Inclusion_Review_Initial_Harvest.xlsx

In particular we addressed full participation of children with disabilities, including those with the most significant cognitive disabilities in accountability systems (alternate assessments) including ELP and alternate ELP, full participation of children with disabilities in kindergarten entry, family and parent engagement, universal design of assessments and assessment accommodations, digitally based assessments, technical documentation with reporting and data use with continuous improvement, and responsible use of technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI) systems, to develop products and services and maximize project efficiencies. We used these documents to code states into the three main categories of ‘Universal’, ‘Targeted’, and ‘Intensive’ (see **Table 16**).

We cross-walked the number times these sources highlighted the themes and list their rankings: State Governance / Policy (459), Reporting & Data Use (265), Accessibility & Accommodations (211), Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (211), Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (210), Human Capacity / Staffing (184), ELP / Alternate ELP (182), Assessment Modernization (146), KEA / Early Learning (131), Family / Parent Engagement (108), TAC / Continuous Improvement (86), Science Assessment (70), and Procurement / Vendor Management (39).

When we reviewed available technical advisory committee notes and posts from various states (where available), this list above is confirmed: The top 10 ranking of issues noted from various TACs is as follows. 1. Governance & TAC Process (Most frequent TAC concern) • 2. Reporting & Data Use (Recurring technical review topic) • 3. Assessment Design & Development (Blueprints, item pools, design) • 4. Validity & Validation (Core psychometric evidence) • 5. Monitoring & Implementation Fidelity (Operational quality assurance) • 6. Technology & Delivery Systems (Platform and delivery concerns) • 7. Reliability & Scoring (Scoring consistency and classification) • 8. Alignment & Standards (Alignment studies and standards linkage) • 9. Accessibility & Accommodations (Accessibility as validity evidence) • 10. ELP / Alternate ELP (Specialized assessment support).

Conclusions and Recommendations

The problem with the information collected at this point is the lack of specificity for addressing *Systems Infrastructure* in providing support that could make an *Individual Difference* to students and their families. Solutions are not forthcoming by simply placing states into support tiers (*Universal*, *Targeted*, and *Intensive*) based on participation rates, insufficient evidence, or judgments reflecting concerns and compliance from monitoring results of 1% letters or Peer Reviews. Solutions also cannot be forged simply by knowing topics (like validity) are a problem or that technical documents and administration manuals are insufficient. Even our identification of domains (alignment, assessment design, accommodations, or communication) as being *mentioned* or *flagged* cannot rise to the occasion of specifying an intervention. Finally, our analysis of the recommendations from professional organizations and TACs confirmed but did not extend the issues to a level of specificity sufficient for providing potential solutions. Therefore, we offer the following perspectives to guide product development and support at the state and district level, to counter the wide variation in participation and performance: within several states, AA-AAAS participation ranges from under 0.5% to above 2% across districts, and proficiency gaps track local capacity.

BRT Lens on Including Students with Disabilities in General and Alternate Assessments

At the outset, we view every test as an event that provides an opportunity to learn how students interact with their environment. This event usually occurs in a standardized and somewhat controlled environment, primarily to provide comparability (over time and to other students) as well as to offer somewhat refutable interpretations. For students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, this environment needs to be expanded to accommodate a wide range of behaviors to interact. Not only must the setting and administration be adapted, but the response as well. Ideally, through an individualized assessment that includes both teacher and digital interactions, this environment can provide meaningful and interpretable outcomes.

We build off Sireci's (2020) perspective on standardization: "In educational testing, *students* are the most important part of the measurement process, not the measure itself, or the measurement scale" (p. 100). With this orientation, the primary goal is to better understand testing conditions and how they interact with student characteristics, which may require flexibility. We also build off Tindal's (2025) summary of accommodations research to rethink standardization and consider adaptations in settings, administrations, and responses without compromising interpretations. By analyzing the format of testing, many adaptations can accomplish the same function and allow flexibility. Both perspectives balance standardization and accommodation. For state accountability programs, achievement standards behind these test events are typically used to guide the content in three subject areas: English-language arts, mathematics, and science. Test items are constructed by sampling grade-level content to determine the range (breadth and depth) of student knowledge and skills. Outcomes are then compiled to provide summary statements of students, groups (grade levels), and systems (reported at the state level for Peer Review). The end-to-end components need to afford a similar breadth and depth.

With this BRT lens, we pose a series of questions that can be answered through both state reflection and document review. Then, with both the breadth (the parts and the whole) and the depth (meaningful information), states can be sorted in three tiers of support (*Universal*, *Targeted*, and *Intensive*), with products and supports developed or adopted. This allows the BRT

NAC to improve inclusion of students with disabilities in state accountability programs and their performance, including students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The answers appropriately respond to federal initiatives for SEAs and state initiatives affecting LEAs. Ultimately, they trickle down to influence improvements in classrooms for students.

- Are standards adapted (essentialized) to provide appropriate descriptors, within reach and attainable? If done correctly, teachers can target important functional academic skills.
- Are all students presented opportunities to participate and interact with test events, including: (a) 95% participation in general education assessments, (b) 1% cap in alternate assessments, and (c) Kindergarten through Grade 2 assessments? With inclusive testing programs, students can be assessed in a manner that is sensitive to improvement.
- Do items and tests provide appropriate opportunities for students to interact within an accommodated environment? Each item, when appropriately developed, lets teachers focus on interaction (e.g., attention to appropriate cues and meta-skills of responding).
- Can the data that are collected in subject areas be compiled to allow insightful interpretations based on patterns of performance to ensure discrimination-free result? Reports developed using plain language and easy-to-interpret graphs can improve understanding by administrators, teachers, and parents/guardians.
- Are teachers sufficiently trained so they can provide appropriate accommodations in settings, administration, and responses? In many ways, the teacher is the test with alternate assessments, so professional development can focus on general outcome assessments.
- Can this information also provide diagnostic clues for teachers to use in guiding instruction? With each response to an item, great diagnostic information can be collected, which teachers can use in structuring instruction, practice, and feedback.
- Are reports made available for families with information that can be interpreted and provide guidance for home support, supporting educational interventions? Accountability is improved with the active involvement of families.
- Is the end-to-end system sufficiently seamless so that different components fold into each other? As students move across grade levels, the results can lead to continued improvements.
- Is the technology backbone adequate to provide security and integrity in both the parts and the whole? With a secure assessment platform, SEAs can document trends. With responsible use of technologies such as AI to develop products and services for both Systems and Individuals, accessibility can improve both participation and performance.

The answers to these questions can and should lead to measurable change in classroom teaching.

Self-Reflection to Identify Readiness and Tier of Support.

The breadth and depth of answers to these questions can be first provided by a state self-reflection. Breadth addresses *System Infrastructure*: Are answers lacking with various questions? Depth reflects the meaningfulness for guiding student improvement and making an *Individual Difference*: Do the answers to critical questions focus on teachers and students increasing interactions and performance? These self-reflections can help states and our NAC organize readiness and level of support needed. *Universal* support means that the breadth and depth of the state accountability system is essentially present, but improvements can be made in specific components. *Targeted* support reflects uneven breadth or depth, with individual components missing or poorly represented in the end-to-end enterprise. *Intensive* support reflects several components as missing and minimally represented in breadth and depth for the end-to-end testing program. In addition to this self-reflection and document review, we will disseminate a technical report (TR) summarizing state-by-state results in tabular form that were used for this

application: *Technical Report # 2606 – State of the State on Accountability Programs with a Focus on Alternate Assessments* (Rowley, Tindal, and Farley, 2026). This TR is designed for states to use in self-reflection and is freely available at <https://brtprojects.org>.

Organizing and Spanning Support for Systems and Individuals.

Across the state website review, federal 1% participation correspondence, Peer Review findings, professional guidance, TAC information, and BRT's student-centered lens, we found the same capacity needs recurring in different forms. States differ in readiness and immediate priority, but the recurring needs are consistent: participation decision-making, accessibility and accommodations, technical documentation and evidence management, validity, alignment and design, reporting and family communication, data use, and implementation fidelity. These recurring needs became the organizing functions of the BRT NAC. Therefore, we organized the BRT NAC around the infrastructure states need to build and sustain, addressing *Systems Infrastructure* aimed primarily at SEAs/LEAs and making an *Individual Difference* aimed primarily at teachers, families, and students. The products, technologies, and *Universal*, *Targeted*, and *Intensive* TA described below are the operational response to the evidence presented in the preceding sections.

Addressing *Systems Infrastructure* focuses on procedural and technical information in developing and delivering a secure and functional assessment system, end-to-end. Topics include AA Delivery / Playbook-Monitoring • Data Collection / Reporting • Psychometrics / Test Diagnostics • AA Systems / Integration + Integrated Infrastructure / Technology. In contrast, the content for making an *Individual Difference* focuses on developing and delivering sensible assessments that improve the lives of individuals with disabilities, including those with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Importantly, we highlight both academic skills and attend to the meta skills of successful interactions, attention, response options, and successful shaping of behavior. This focus can respond to the full range of students currently in state accountability programs but also expand the reach to Kindergarten through Grade 2 students. Topics include Test Participation / Screening • Standards / Alignment • Item-Test Development / Training • Family Communication / Kindergarten Readiness + Integrated Infrastructure / Technology.

References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education (2014). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington DC: Author.
- Every Student Succeeds Act, Pub. L. No. 114-95, 129 Stat. 1802 (2015).
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Sireci, S. G. (2020). Standardization and UNDERSTANDARDization in educational assessment. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 39(3), 100–105.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12377>
- Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The Wisdom of Crowds*. New York: Double Day Publishing,
- Tindal, G. (2025). *Rethinking “Standardization” for NAEP to Increase Equity and Access*. (Technical Report 2510). University of Oregon: Behavioral Research and Teaching.
- Tindal, G., Almond, P., Browder, D., Crawford, L., Ferrara, S., Haladyna, T., Huynh, H., & Zigmond, N. (2005). *Including Students with Disabilities in Large-Scale Assessments: A White Paper for Establishing Federal Policy (Technical Report # 0508)*. Eugene, OR: Behavioral Research and Teaching, University of Oregon.
- Rowley, B., Tindal, G., & Farley, D. (2026). *The State of State Accountability Programs with a Focus on Alternate Assessments (Technical Report # 2607)*. Eugene, OR: Behavioral Research and Teaching, University of Oregon.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2003). Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged; Final Rule. Federal Register, 68(236), 68698–68708.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005). Alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Table 1*State Triage Summary: Composite Scores, Intervention Levels, and Technical Assistance Needs*

State / Jurisdiction	Overall Score	Intervention Level	Workbook E Fit	Priority Domains	TA Need Summary
Alabama	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Technical Documentation (1); Family Resources (2); Score Reporting (2)	Document continuous-improvement use of alignment studies; pursue comparability research for alternate assessments.
Alaska	40	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Site Organization (2); Technical Documentation (2)	Role-based, current-year quick-start guides with stronger cross-linking to technical reports and score resources.
Arizona	40	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Administration Manuals (2); Site Organization (2)	Map public versus secure resources and build role-based, current-year user guides.
Arkansas	39	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Family Resources (2); Practice Tests (2); Technical Documentation (2)	Document intellectual/adaptive functioning; clarify the line between instructional placement and eligibility determination.
California	41	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Technical Documentation (2)	Refine LEA monitoring and implement the Decision Confirmation Worksheet to address the 1% cap overage.
Colorado	35	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	AAAS/ALD/PLD (2); Accessibility Guidance (2); Administration Manuals (2); Current Materials (2)	Develop current, state-specific AA-AAAS technical documentation.
Connecticut	41	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Site Organization (2)	Conduct focus groups studying webpage design.
Delaware	40	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Site Organization (2); Technical Documentation (2)	Current AA-AAAS technical documentation plus webpage-design focus groups.
Florida	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Contact Information (2); Family Resources (2); Score Reporting (2); Site Organization (2)	Design digital video explainers detailing Alternate Access Points.
Georgia	28	Level 4: Foundational Build / Rapid Response	Foundational hub build / rapid response	Family Resources (1); Site Organization (1); Technical Documentation (1); Accessibility Guidance (2)	Make core GAA 2.0 documents (handbook/TAM, family guide, score-report guide) publicly accessible without login.
Hawaii	39	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Current Materials (2); Score Reporting (2); Site Organization (2)	Evaluate current website documentation status.
Idaho	40	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Administration Manuals (2); Site Organization (2)	Clarify 2025-26 IDAA versus 2026-27 DLM transition materials through role-based current-year guides.
Illinois	32	Level 3: Intensive Site / Navigation Review	Intensive diagnostic site/navigation review	Family Resources (1); Technical Documentation (1); Current Materials (2); Easy to Find (2)	Remove or redirect archived banners on active DLM and cap-exception pages; refresh current resources.
Indiana	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Administration Manuals (2); Family Resources (2); Site Organization (2); Training Materials (2)	Make current training, TAM, and family-reporting resources easier to locate.
Iowa	35	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Administration Manuals (2); Contact Information (2); Easy to Find (2); Family Resources (2)	Develop unified local early-grade screening logs.
Kansas	36	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Administration Manuals (2); Contact Information (2); Family Resources (2); Practice Tests (2)	Create interactive visual aids helping parents understand MAP progress.
Kentucky	41	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Technical Documentation (2)	Train ARCs to keep eligibility decisions strictly data-driven, avoiding unacceptable considerations.

State / Jurisdiction	Overall Score	Intervention Level	Workbook E Fit	Priority Domains	TA Need Summary
Louisiana	39	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Family Resources (2); Score Reporting (2); Site Organization (2)	Refine individualized LEA support to address 1% cap coverage in ELA and mathematics.
Maine	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Accessibility Guidance (2); Score Reporting (2); Site Organization (2); Technical Documentation (2)	Consortium advocacy support as a small, late-adopter state.
Maryland	37	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Technical Documentation (1); Current Materials (2); Easy to Find (2); Site Organization (2)	Develop current, state-specific AA-AAAS technical documentation.
Massachusetts	41	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Family Resources (2)	Build a family-facing MCAS-Alt guide (eligibility, score reports, supports) in Spanish and other languages.
Michigan	41	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Technical Documentation (2)	Publicly post the recent MI-Access technical report and create a parent-facing explainer video.
Minnesota	39	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Easy to Find (2); Family Resources (2); Site Organization (2)	Build a dedicated MTAS/Alt MCA family landing page consolidating fact sheets, translations, and transition guidance.
Mississippi	37	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Technical Documentation (1); Family Resources (2); IEP Guidance (2); Practice Tests (2)	Embed Significant Cognitive Disability guidance into the digital IEP system to support participation decisions.
Missouri	34	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Administration Manuals (2); Contact Information (2); Current Materials (2); Easy to Find (2)	Modernize document layouts to improve web-accessibility compliance.
Montana	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	IEP Guidance (2); Participation Criteria (2); Site Organization (2); Technical Documentation (2)	Update participation/IEP guidance for DLM and communicate the transition clearly.
Nebraska	36	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Contact Information (2); Family Resources (2); Practice Tests (2); Score Reporting (2)	Structure public-facing portals for accountability justification data.
Nevada	32	Level 3: Intensive Site / Navigation Review	Intensive diagnostic site/navigation review	Practice Tests (1); Technical Documentation (1); Accessibility Guidance (2); Administration Manuals (2)	Build a fuller public NAA resource hub with role-based current-year guides.
New Hampshire	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Site Organization (1); Easy to Find (2); Technical Documentation (2)	Develop current, state-specific technical documentation beyond the student-characteristics report.
New Jersey	40	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Technical Documentation (1)	Post an NJ-specific DLM technical supplement and a short parent-facing explainer.
New Mexico	40	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Site Organization (2); Technical Documentation (2)	Integrate monitoring, training, and resources into a current-year, role-based guide.
New York	36	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Accessibility Guidance (1); Technical Documentation (1); Current Materials (2); Site Organization (2)	Urgently update the NYSAA accessibility sub-page and link the current DLM Accessibility Manual.
North Carolina	37	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Administration Manuals (2); Family Resources (2); Site Organization (2); Technical Documentation (2)	Centralize the NCEXTEND1 pathway with family, TAM, and technical resources.
North Dakota	34	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Family Resources (1); Administration Manuals (2); Contact Information (2); Current Materials (2)	Build bridge curriculum documents for new special-education teachers.
Ohio	39	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Technical Documentation (1); Score Reporting (2)	Help districts move beyond justifying numbers toward rigorous 1% cap compliance.

State / Jurisdiction	Overall Score	Intervention Level	Workbook E Fit	Priority Domains	TA Need Summary
Oklahoma	34	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Administration Manuals (2); Contact Information (2); Current Materials (2); Family Resources (2)	Build state-hosted toolkits to reduce vendor-platform hopping.
Oregon	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Family Resources (2); Score Reporting (2); Site Organization (2); Technical Documentation (2)	Improve findability of family ORExt resources, plain-language score guides, and downloadable technical documentation.
Pennsylvania	39	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Family Resources (2); Score Reporting (2); Site Organization (2)	Consolidate resources split across sites; improve findability, Spanish access, and score-interpretation clarity.
Rhode Island	33	Level 3: Intensive Site / Navigation Review	Intensive diagnostic site/navigation review	AAAS/ALD/PLD (2); Accessibility Guidance (2); Administration Manuals (2); Family Resources (2)	Family-engagement resources, a centralized resource hub, and public score-interpretation supports.
South Carolina	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	AAAS/ALD/PLD (2); Family Resources (2); Practice Tests (2); Score Reporting (2)	Family communication materials, public reporting resources, and cross-state practice sharing.
South Dakota	31	Level 3: Intensive Site / Navigation Review	Intensive diagnostic site/navigation review	Family Resources (1); AAAS/ALD/PLD (2); Accessibility Guidance (2); Current Materials (2)	Professional learning systems, family engagement, and public-facing technical resources.
Tennessee	37	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	AAAS/ALD/PLD (2); Family Resources (2); Practice Tests (2); Score Reporting (2)	Family communication and technical-documentation dissemination.
Texas	41	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Family Resources (2)	Advanced technical assistance and innovation support.
Utah	37	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	AAAS/ALD/PLD (2); Family Resources (2); Practice Tests (2); Score Reporting (2)	Family engagement and public technical communication.
Vermont	29	Level 3: Intensive Site / Navigation Review	Intensive diagnostic site/navigation review	Family Resources (1); Practice Tests (1); AAAS/ALD/PLD (2); Accessibility Guidance (2)	Training systems, family engagement, resource consolidation, and public-facing assessment supports.
Virginia	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Technical Documentation (1); Family Resources (2); Score Reporting (2)	Make VAAP technical reports downloadable and clarify score scales, thresholds, and interpretation.
Washington	36	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Accessibility Guidance (2); Administration Manuals (2); Family Resources (2); Practice Tests (2)	Family score-interpretation guides, accessibility tools, consolidated technical reports, and public alternate-standard examples.
West Virginia	38	Level 1: Universal / Peer Learning	Universal product / exemplar sharing	Technical Documentation (1); Family Resources (2); Score Reporting (2)	Support MIDAS cusp-student transitions and communicative-competence research.
Wisconsin	37	Level 2: Targeted Cohort	Targeted cohort / improvement sprint	Technical Documentation (1); Easy to Find (2); Family Resources (2); Site Organization (2)	Post a Wisconsin-specific DLM technical supplement and feature key DLM resources prominently.
Wyoming	33	Level 3: Intensive Site / Navigation Review	Intensive diagnostic site/navigation review	Administration Manuals (2); Contact Information (2); Current Materials (2); Family Resources (2)	Develop year-round modular certification tracks for coordinators.
District of Columbia	33	Level 3: Intensive Site / Navigation Review	Intensive diagnostic site/navigation review	AAAS/ALD/PLD (1); Administration Manuals (1); Technical Documentation (1); Training Materials (1)	Conduct a website scan to improve public access to information.
Bureau of Indian Education (BIE)	15	Level 4: Foundational Build / Rapid Response	Foundational hub build / rapid response	Family Resources (0); Practice Tests (0); AAAS/ALD/PLD (1); Accessibility Guidance (1)	Centralized resource portal, family guidance, IEP decision tools, assessor training, and accessibility guidance.

State / Jurisdiction	Overall Score	Intervention Level	Workbook E Fit	Priority Domains	TA Need Summary
Puerto Rico	12	Level 4: Foundational Build / Rapid Response	Foundational hub build / rapid response	Family Resources (0); Practice Tests (0); AAAS/ALD/PLD (1); Accessibility Guidance (1)	Centralized hub, bilingual family resources, eligibility guidance, IEP tools, and consolidated manuals and training.
American Samoa	12	Level 4: Foundational Build / Rapid Response	Foundational hub build / rapid response	Family Resources (0); Technical Documentation (0); AAAS/ALD/PLD (1); Accessibility Guidance (1)	Centralized webpage, eligibility guidance, IEP tools, family-literacy materials, and educator training.
Guam	23	Level 4: Foundational Build / Rapid Response	Foundational hub build / rapid response	Administration Manuals (1); Family Resources (1); Practice Tests (1); Technical Documentation (1)	Dedicated resource portal, eligibility guidance, IEP supports, family resources, and consolidated training and accessibility materials.
Northern Mariana Islands	18	Level 4: Foundational Build / Rapid Response	Foundational hub build / rapid response	Family Resources (0); Practice Tests (0); AAAS/ALD/PLD (1); Accessibility Guidance (1)	Centralized portal, eligibility guidance, family resources, educator training, and tailored accessibility guidance.
U.S. Virgin Islands	29	Level 3: Intensive Site / Navigation Review	Intensive diagnostic site/navigation review	Administration Manuals (1); Practice Tests (1); Technical Documentation (1); Training Materials (1)	Dedicated resource center, eligibility guidance, family explanations and score tools, manuals, and accessibility resources.

Note. N = 57 states and jurisdictions. Overall Score is the workbook's composite triage score (higher indicates greater technical-assistance need). Intervention Level is the recommended tier of support, and Workbook E Fit is the suggested next-step product or pathway. Priority Domains lists the flagged domains with their signal level in parentheses. TA Need Summary condenses the source tab's longer narrative into its core technical-assistance needs; full narratives appear in the D2_State_Triage tab of Workbook D.

Table 2*Workbook E Handoff: Intervention Packages by Input Type and Technical Assistance Tier*

Workbook E Input Type	TA Tier	Products / Tools	Workbook E Package / Intervention	Candidate States / Jurisdictions
Universal product	Universal / General TA	National AA-AAAS website map template; role-based checklist; current-year landing page model; public-vs-secure resource map; exemplar repository.	Role-based public resource architecture	All states/jurisdictions
Universal product	Universal / General TA	Parent guide template; annotated ISR template; multilingual score-report letter bank; parent portal one-pager; family FAQ; 'questions to ask the IEP team' resource.	Family communication and score-report interpretation	All states; especially states scoring <3 in Family Resources
Universal product	Universal / General TA	Technical documentation checklist; public technical-report landing page template; plain-language technical brief; standard-setting/alignment/reliability/validity evidence map.	Technical documentation visibility package	All states; especially states scoring <3 in Technical Documentation
Universal product	Universal / General TA	Exemplar decision-making tools; evidence-source checklist; parent notification language; ML/EL and communication-access supplement; diploma implications insert.	Participation/IEP decision-making exemplar set	All states; targeted adaptation for states with outdated or brief forms
Universal product	Universal / General TA	Minimum practice/sample-item resource standard; released-item library examples; sample task directions; scoring guide templates; accessible sample materials.	Practice/sample item access expectations	All states; especially states scoring <3 in Practice Tests
Targeted cohort	Targeted / Specialized TA	Website audit protocol; role-based sitemap; broken/outdated link scan; 'one-page current-year map'; cross-platform locator.	Website and navigation audit	High-resource but fragmented states: California, Florida, Colorado, Georgia, Kentucky, New York, DC, Wisconsin
Targeted cohort	Targeted / Specialized TA	Transition playbook; old-to-new crosswalk; current-year FAQ; family notification template; educator timeline; resource sunset checklist.	Transition communication support	Idaho, Montana, Minnesota, Florida, Hawaii, Wyoming
Targeted cohort	Targeted / Specialized TA	1% monitoring toolkit; LEA self-reflection template; eligibility file-review protocol; participation data discussion guide; action-plan template.	Eligibility and 1% monitoring support	Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, Arkansas, New Mexico, Kentucky, Florida, Nebraska, West Virginia
Targeted cohort	Targeted / Specialized TA	Technical report publishing support; technical brief; report inventory; annual evidence checklist; standard-setting/alignment report locator.	Current technical report publication and plain-language translation	Mississippi, Ohio, Nevada, Wyoming, Louisiana, Minnesota, Massachusetts, North Dakota
Targeted cohort	Targeted / Specialized TA	Family guide template; ISR explainer; parent notification bank; translated glossary; community/family webinar slide deck.	Family resource and multilingual package development	Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Wyoming, territories
Intensive service package	Intensive / Sustained TA	Co-designed resource hub; content inventory; role-based pages; localized family guides; administration/training page; score-report and technical documentation pathway.	Foundational alternate assessment resource hub development	BIE, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, CNMI, Guam, U.S. Virgin Islands

Workbook E Input Type	TA Tier	Products / Tools	Workbook E Package / Intervention	Candidate States / Jurisdictions
Intensive service package	Intensive / Sustained TA	Monthly coaching; calendarized update process; local resource translation/adaptation; staff training plan; implementation checklist; communities of practice.	Implementation coaching for small/remote jurisdictions	BIE, territories, Alaska, Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming, New Mexico
Intensive service package	Intensive / Sustained TA	Technical documentation workplan; vendor evidence request checklist; technical report outline; score-report validity/use guide; public accountability summary.	Technical documentation and assessment quality evidence buildout	Territories and states scoring 0–1 in Technical Documentation
Intensive service package	Intensive / Sustained TA	12-month TA partnership; baseline audit; action plan; resource development sprints; implementation coaching; outcome monitoring.	Comprehensive modernization partnership	BIE, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, CNMI, selected territories or low-scoring jurisdictions
Action agenda item	Cross-tier action	Publish a national family-facing alternate assessment explainer, ISR glossary, and score-report interpretation deck.	90-Day Action Agenda #1	National Assessment Center / all applicable states
Action agenda item	Cross-tier action	Run a technical documentation cohort focused on public summaries, current technical reports, and state-specific supplements.	90-Day Action Agenda #2	National Assessment Center / all applicable states
Action agenda item	Cross-tier action	Conduct rapid site/navigation scans for states in Level 3 and Level 4 and produce role-based resource maps.	90-Day Action Agenda #3	National Assessment Center / all applicable states
Action agenda item	Cross-tier action	Launch an exemplar repository using high-scoring states as models for participation, family, reporting, technical documentation, and training.	90-Day Action Agenda #4	National Assessment Center / all applicable states
Action agenda item	Cross-tier action	Stand up a foundational hub sprint for jurisdictions with limited public alternate assessment infrastructure.	90-Day Action Agenda #5	National Assessment Center / all applicable states

Note. Each row is an intervention package formatted to hand off into the Workbook E framework (N = 19). Workbook E Input Type classifies the deliverable; TA Tier indicates the recommended support intensity (Universal, Targeted, or Intensive); Products / Tools lists the proposed resources; Workbook E Package / Intervention names the package; and Candidate States / Jurisdictions identifies the intended recipients.

Table 3*Rubric-Domain Signals and Recommended Technical Assistance Directions*

Domain	Avg. Score	Fully Evident (3)	Below Full (<3)	Minimal/Absent (0–1)	National Signal	NAC Intervention Level	Action Direction
Easy to Find	2.70	42	15	2	Top-level pages are usually discoverable, but deeper resources and secure/public boundaries are uneven.	Targeted resource mapping	Use public-vs-secure maps and role-based landing page patterns.
Participation Criteria	2.79	49	8	4	Participation criteria are the strongest national area; opportunity is consistency, monitoring, and 1% cap supports.	Universal peer learning + targeted monitoring	Scale eligibility decision tools and 1% cap monitoring playbooks.
IEP Guidance	2.77	48	9	4	IEP guidance is a national strength and a source of reusable models for other domains.	Universal peer learning	Curate high-quality IEP decision tools and companion documents.
Family Resources	2.09	19	38	10	Families are less consistently served than educators; resources often exist but are not prominent, multilingual, or plain-language.	Universal toolkit + targeted cohort	Develop family-facing explainer, score report guide, and translation-ready templates.
Training Materials	2.60	41	16	7	Training is often strong for test administrators but less consistent as role-based, year-round, and family/data-user support.	Targeted training cohort	Create training standards, quick starts, and modular certification path examples.
Administration Manuals	2.47	34	23	7	Operational manuals are generally present but sometimes vendor-hosted, hard to find, or not clearly current.	Targeted operational documentation	Build role-based manual map and current-year document checklist.
Accessibility Guidance	2.65	42	15	5	Accessibility guidance is relatively strong, with advanced needs around ELs, linguistic accommodations, and communication modalities.	Advanced targeted TA	Develop accommodation comparability and EL/accessibility decision guidance.
AAAS/ALD/PLD	2.67	43	14	5	Alternate standards/achievement descriptors are usually present; translation into classroom and family-friendly meaning varies.	Universal exemplar sharing	Package PLD/ALD explanation models and examples of classroom crosswalks.
Practice Tests	2.37	32	25	8	Practice/sample items are unevenly displayed or behind portals; visibility affects teacher preparation and family understanding.	Targeted improvement sprint	Set no-login sample item expectations and link practice resources from state hubs.
Score Reporting	2.44	27	30	2	Student-report interpretation is a recurring plain-language need, especially for families and local leaders.	Universal toolkit + targeted support	Publish ISR glossary, PLD explainer, parent-session deck, and reporting timeline template.

Domain	Avg. Score	Fully Evident (3)	Below Full (<3)	Minimal/Absent (0–1)	National Signal	NAC Intervention Level	Action Direction
Technical Documentation	1.93	16	41	19	Lowest national rubric area; public validity/alignment evidence and state-specific technical reports are often not visible.	Targeted cohort + intensive consults	Create public technical-documentation templates and state supplement coaching.
Contact Information	2.70	43	14	3	Contact information is generally strong and can anchor stronger support pathways.	Universal maintenance	Standardize support contacts, escalation paths, and help-desk routing.
Current Materials	2.67	40	17	2	Most states keep key materials current, but freshness/status tagging varies and creates risk during transitions.	Universal standard + targeted checks	Promote current-year tags, archive rules, and transition communications.
Site Organization	2.21	17	40	5	Many systems have content across SEA, vendor, consortium, and training sites; public users need role-based pathways.	Intensive site audits + targeted cohort	Run resource-map/site-navigation reviews and build model landing pages.

Note. Each row is a rubric domain (N = 14). Avg. Score is the mean domain rating on a 0–3 scale (higher indicates stronger evidence). Fully Evident (3), Below Full (<3), and Minimal/Absent (0–1) report the number of jurisdictions whose evidence fell at each level. National Signal interprets the pattern; NAC Intervention Level indicates the recommended National Assessment Center support tier; and Action Direction states the suggested next step. Data are drawn from the preserved state evidence bank in Workbook D.

Table 4*Letter-Level Risk Scoring of State Alternate Assessment (AA-AAAS) Participation Findings*

State	SY	Letter Date	RLA %	Math %	Sci %	OPC	PSS	SBS	FIS	RCS	ERS	TAS	OPC-S	CRS	Risk Cat.	Archetype
Arizona	2018-19	2020-07-17	Waiver	Waiver	1.14	Concern	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	8	Moderate	Content-Specific Concern
California	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.09	1.09	1.07	Concern	1	3	2	2	1	0	1	10	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
California	2018-19	2020-02-04	>1.0	>1.0	>1.0	None	—	0	2	2	1	0	0	5	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
California	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.11	1.10	0.95	None	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	7	Moderate	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Colorado	2017-18	2019-06-04	<1.0	<1.0	1.05	Concern	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	6	Moderate	Compliance Success
Colorado	2018-19	2020-05-18	<1.0	<1.0	<1.0	None	—	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	Low	Compliance Success
Connecticut	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.50	1.51	1.51	None	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Connecticut	2018-19	2020-02-04	>1.0	>1.0	>1.0	None	—	0	2	1	1	0	0	4	Low	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Connecticut	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.11	1.12	1.03	None	1	3	2	1	1	0	0	8	Moderate	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Delaware	2018-19	2020-07-17	1.45	1.44	1.48	None	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	10	High	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Delaware	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.21	1.21	1.07	Concern	2	3	2	1	1	0	1	10	High	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
District of Columbia	2018-19	2020-07-17	1.06	1.05	1.10	Concern	1	3	2	2	1	0	1	10	High	Waiver Managed
Florida	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.40	1.51	1.44	None	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Georgia	2022-23	2024-05-29	1.35	1.32	1.42	None	3	3	2	4	1	1	0	14	Critical	Monitoring / Plan Required
Hawaii	2017-18	2019-06-04	Waiver	Waiver	1.11	Concern	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	6	Moderate	Compliance Success
Hawaii	2018-19	2020-05-18	Waiver	Waiver	<1.0	None	—	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	Low	Compliance Success
Hawaii	2021-22	2023-10-27	0.97	0.96	1.02	Concern	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	5	Moderate	Near Compliance
Illinois	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.12	1.12	1.09	Concern	1	3	2	2	1	0	1	10	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Illinois	2018-19	2020-07-17	>1.0	>1.0	>1.0	None	—	0	2	2	1	0	0	5	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
Illinois	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.14	1.14	1.04	None	1	3	2	2	1	0	0	9	High	Waiver Managed
Kansas	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.14	1.16	<1.0	None	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	7	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
Maryland	2017-18	2019-06-25	1.10	1.12	—	None	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	6	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
Maryland	2018-19	2020-07-17	>1.0	>1.0	>1.0	None	—	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	Low	Waiver Managed
Minnesota	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.36	1.38	2.00	None	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Minnesota	2018-19	2020-02-04	>1.0	>1.0	>1.0	None	—	0	2	4	2	0	0	8	Moderate	Persistent / Worsening
Minnesota	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.30	1.33	1.28	Significant Concern	3	3	3	2	3	0	2	16	Critical	Escalated Monitoring
Montana	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.07	1.07	0.91	Concern	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	6	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
New Jersey	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.23	1.26	1.46	Concern	3	3	2	2	1	0	1	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
New Jersey	2018-19	2020-02-04	>1.0	>1.0	>1.0	None	—	0	2	4	2	0	0	8	Moderate	Persistent / Worsening
New Jersey	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.62	1.59	1.51	None	4	3	3	4	3	0	0	17	Critical	Escalated Monitoring
New Mexico	2018-19	2020-07-17	1.01	1.02	1.17	None	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	8	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
New Mexico	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.07	1.07	1.08	Significant Concern	1	3	2	2	1	0	2	11	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
New York	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.75	1.74	1.56	None	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
New York	2018-19	2020-02-04	>1.0	>1.0	>1.0	Concern	—	0	2	2	1	0	1	6	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required

State	SY	Letter Date	RLA %	Math %	Sci %	OPC	PSS	SBS	FIS	RCS	ERS	TAS	OPC-S	CRS	Risk Cat.	Archetype
New York	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.47	1.37	1.11	Significant Concern	3	3	2	1	1	0	2	12	High	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Oregon	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.20	1.21	1.16	Concern	2	3	2	2	1	0	1	11	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Oregon	2018-19	2020-02-04	>1.0	>1.0	>1.0	Concern	—	0	2	1	1	0	1	5	Moderate	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Oregon	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.02	1.01	0.93	Significant Concern	1	2	2	1	1	0	2	9	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Pennsylvania	2017-18	2019-06-04	2.02	2.01	1.97	None	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Pennsylvania	2018-19	2020-02-04	>1.0	>1.0	>1.0	None	—	0	2	4	2	0	0	8	Moderate	Persistent / Worsening
Pennsylvania	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.97	2.06	2.19	None	4	3	4	4	4	0	0	19	Critical	High Risk
Rhode Island	2018-19	2020-07-17	1.26	1.25	1.31	Concern	3	3	2	2	1	0	1	12	High	Waiver Managed
Rhode Island	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.29	1.30	1.37	None	3	3	2	2	1	0	0	11	High	Waiver Managed
Tennessee	2022-23	2024-06-17	1.19	1.09	1.40	None	3	3	2	4	1	1	0	14	Critical	Persistent / Worsening
Texas	2022-23	2024-05-29	1.54	1.59	1.44	None	4	3	2	4	1	1	0	15	Critical	Persistent / Worsening
Vermont	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.01	1.00	0.88	Concern	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	5	Moderate	Near Compliance
Virginia	2017-18	2019-06-04	1.16	<1.0	<1.0	None	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	6	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
Virginia	2018-19	2020-07-17	>1.0	<1.0	<1.0	None	—	0	1	2	0	0	0	3	Low	Waiver Managed
Wyoming	2021-22	2023-10-27	1.07	1.07	1.10	None	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	6	Moderate	Waiver Managed

Note. SY = school year; Letter Date is the date of the federal letter (YYYY-MM-DD). RLA = reading/language arts; Sci = science; OPC = overall participation concern (categorical rating); PSS = participation severity score; SBS = subject breadth score; FIS = federal intervention score; RCS = response capacity score; ERS = escalation risk score; TAS = transparency/accountability score; OPC-S = overall participation concern score; CRS = composite risk score; Risk Cat. = risk category. Percentage values are reported as they appear in the source federal letters; “Waiver” and “>1.0” denote non-numeric entries in the original dataset, and em dashes (—) indicate that no value was recorded.

Table 5*Federal 1% AA-AAAS Letter Risk Scoring by State and School Year*

State	SY	HNR	Subj	FA	CS	PSS	SBS	FIS	RCS	ERS	TAS	OPC	CRS	RC	Arch
Arizona	2018-19	1.14	1	Science Condition	New condition	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	8	Moderate	Content-Specific Concern
California	2017-18	1.09	3	Grant Condition	New condition	1	3	2	2	1	0	1	10	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
California	2018-19		0	Grant Condition	Continued condition		0	2	2	1	0	0	5	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
California	2021-22	1.11	2	Grant Condition	Continued condition	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	7	Moderate	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Colorado	2017-18	1.05	1	Grant Condition	New condition	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	6	Moderate	Compliance Success
Colorado	2018-19		0	Condition Removed	Removed		0	2	0	1	0	0	3	Low	Compliance Success
Connecticut	2017-18	1.51	3	Grant Condition	New condition	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Connecticut	2018-19		0	Grant Condition	Continued condition		0	2	1	1	0	0	4	Low	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Connecticut	2021-22	1.12	3	Grant Condition	Continued condition	1	3	2	1	1	0	0	8	Moderate	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Delaware	2018-19	1.48	3	Science Condition	New/continued condition	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	10	High	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Delaware	2021-22	1.21	3	Science Condition	Continued condition	2	3	2	1	1	0	1	10	High	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
District of Columbia	2018-19	1.10	3	Science Condition	New condition	1	3	2	2	1	0	1	10	High	Waiver Managed
Florida	2017-18	1.51	3	Grant Condition	New condition	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Georgia	2022-23	1.42	3	Grant Condition	New condition	3	3	2	4	1	1	0	14	Critical	Monitoring / Plan Required
Hawaii	2017-18	1.11	1	Grant Condition	New condition	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	6	Moderate	Compliance Success
Hawaii	2018-19		0	Condition Removed	Removed		0	2	0	1	0	0	3	Low	Compliance Success
Hawaii	2021-22	1.02	1	Plan Requested	Plan required	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	5	Moderate	Near Compliance
Illinois	2017-18	1.12	3	Grant Condition	New condition	1	3	2	2	1	0	1	10	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Illinois	2018-19		0	Grant Condition	Continued condition		0	2	2	1	0	0	5	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
Illinois	2021-22	1.14	3	Science Condition	Continued condition	1	3	2	2	1	0	0	9	High	Waiver Managed
Kansas	2017-18	1.16	2	Plan Required	Plan required	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	7	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
Maryland	2017-18	1.12	2	Plan Required	Plan required	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	6	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
Maryland	2018-19		0	Waiver Path / Plan Acknowledged	Waiver path		0	1	2	0	0	0	3	Low	Waiver Managed
Minnesota	2017-18	2.00	3	Grant Condition	New condition	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Minnesota	2018-19		0	Grant Condition	Continued condition		0	2	4	2	0	0	8	Moderate	Persistent / Worsening
Minnesota	2021-22	1.33	3	Grant Condition + Monitoring Calls	Continued condition	3	3	3	2	3	0	2	16	Critical	Escalated Monitoring
Montana	2021-22	1.07	2	Plan Requested	Plan required	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	6	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
New Jersey	2017-18	1.46	3	Grant Condition	New condition	3	3	2	2	1	0	1	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
New Jersey	2018-19		0	Grant Condition	Continued condition		0	2	4	2	0	0	8	Moderate	Persistent / Worsening
New Jersey	2021-22	1.62	3	Grant Condition + Monitoring Calls	Continued condition	4	3	3	4	3	0	0	17	Critical	Escalated Monitoring
New Mexico	2018-19	1.17	3	Corrective Plan Required	Plan required	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	8	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
New Mexico	2021-22	1.08	3	Grant Condition	New condition	1	3	2	2	1	0	2	11	High	Monitoring / Plan Required

State	SY	HNR	Subj	FA	CS	PSS	SBS	FIS	RCS	ERS	TAS	OPC	CRS	RC	Arch
New York	2017-18	1.75	3	Grant Condition	New condition	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
New York	2018-19		0	Grant Condition	Continued condition		0	2	2	1	0	1	6	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
New York	2021-22	1.47	3	Grant Condition	Continued condition	3	3	2	1	1	0	2	12	High	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Oregon	2017-18	1.21	3	Grant Condition	New condition	2	3	2	2	1	0	1	11	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Oregon	2018-19		0	Grant Condition	Continued condition		0	2	1	1	0	1	5	Moderate	Improving / Not Yet Compliant
Oregon	2021-22	1.02	2	Grant Condition	Continued condition	1	2	2	1	1	0	2	9	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Pennsylvania	2017-18	2.02	3	Grant Condition	New condition	4	3	2	2	1	0	0	12	High	Monitoring / Plan Required
Pennsylvania	2018-19		0	Grant Condition	Continued condition		0	2	4	2	0	0	8	Moderate	Persistent / Worsening
Pennsylvania	2021-22	2.19	3	High-Risk Status + Grant Condition + Monitoring Calls	High-risk imposed	4	3	4	4	4	0	0	19	Critical	High Risk
Rhode Island	2018-19	1.31	3	Science Condition	New condition	3	3	2	2	1	0	1	12	High	Waiver Managed
Rhode Island	2021-22	1.37	3	Science Condition	Continued condition	3	3	2	2	1	0	0	11	High	Waiver Managed
Tennessee	2022-23	1.40	3	Grant Condition	New condition	3	3	2	4	1	1	0	14	Critical	Persistent / Worsening
Texas	2022-23	1.59	3	Grant Condition	New condition	4	3	2	4	1	1	0	15	Critical	Persistent / Worsening
Vermont	2021-22	1.01	1	Plan Requested	Plan required	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	5	Moderate	Near Compliance
Virginia	2017-18	1.16	1	Plan Required	Plan required	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	6	Moderate	Monitoring / Plan Required
Virginia	2018-19		0	Waiver Path / Plan Acknowledged	Waiver path		0	1	2	0	0	0	3	Low	Waiver Managed
Wyoming	2021-22	1.10	3	No Further Action	Waiver accepted	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	6	Moderate	Waiver Managed

Note. N = 49 state-year letter records coded from federal 1% AA-AAAS correspondence (letters dated 2019–2024; school years 2017-18 through 2022-23), sorted alphabetically by State and then by school year. Column abbreviations: SY = School Year; HNR = Highest Numeric Rate; Subj = Subjects >1%; FA = Federal Action; CS = Condition Status; PSS = Participation Severity Score; SBS = Subject Breadth Score; FIS = Federal Intervention Score; RCS = Response Capacity Score; ERS = Escalation Risk Score; TAS = Transparency/Accountability Score; OPC = Overall Participation Concern Score; CRS = Composite Risk Score; RC = Risk Category; Arch = State Archetype. Domain scores (PSS–OPC) are ordinal; CRS is their sum (range 0–22), with higher values indicating greater federal-oversight risk. HNR is the highest reported participation rate (percent); non-numeric source entries (e.g., “Waiver,” “>1.0”) are shown as recorded.

Table 6*State-Level Federal Assessment Peer Review Summary*

State / System	Review Period	Assessment / Component	Review Type	Federal Determination	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Primary Source File	Proposal Relevance
Alabama	2025	ACAP / ACAP Alternate	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	24	alabama-2025 peer review	Math alignment, TAC, postsecondary readiness.
Alabama	2024	Peer review letter	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	20	alabama-9-109006.pdf	Alignment and monitoring.
Alaska	2025	AK STAR / DLM / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	24	alaska-2025 peer review	CAT alignment, item pool, Alternate ACCESS.
Arizona	2026	Family engagement monitoring / required actions	Monitoring/Compliance	Required Actions	Targeted	9	Family engagement monitoring letter	Required action monitoring evidence useful for TA tiering.
Arizona	2025	AzSCI / MSAA Science	Assessment Peer Review	Partially Meets	Intensive	30	arizona-2025 peer review	Science alignment, security lifecycle, privacy, DIF.
Arkansas	2024	Posting + peer review	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	17	arkansas 2024 files	ELP and alignment concerns.
Arkansas	2022-23	ACT Aspire / DLM Science	Assessment Peer Review	Meets / Substantially Meets	Universal	8	Arkansas 2022-23 letter	Early DLM Science blueprint pattern.
BIE	2022-23	Assessment system	Assessment Peer Review	Broad findings	Intensive	31	BIE 2022-23 letter	Prototype intensive TA system.
California	2025	ELPAC / Alternate ELPAC	Assessment Peer Review	Meets	Universal	3	california-2025 peer review	Positive exemplar for mature ELP/Alt ELP system.
California	2022-23	CAST / CAA / ELPAC	Assessment Peer Review	Mixed	Targeted	24	California 2022-23 letter	Science and ELP in otherwise strong system.
Connecticut	2025	CAAELP / Alternate ELP	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	21	ct-2025 peer review	Monitoring, reliability, validity, scoring, accommodations.
Connecticut	2024	SAT / Science / AA-AAAS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	24	ct-9.pdf	Science/alt science and postsecondary.
Delaware	2025	DLM / ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets	Targeted	16	delaware-2025 peer review	DLM strong; ELP systems weaker.
Delaware	2024	SAT / ELP / DLM	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	18	de12-1.pdf	SAT alignment/ELP.
Delaware	2022-23	Science / DLM Science	Assessment Peer Review	Improved to Meets / Substantial	Universal	12	Delaware 2022-23 letters	Corrective action improvement example.
District of Columbia	2022-23	Science / PARCC / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Partial / Substantial	Intensive	26	DC 2022-23 letters	Science and alignment redesign.
Florida	2025	FAST / AA-AAAS / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	24	florida-2025 peer review	Technical adequacy, alignment, validity, TAC.

State / System	Review Period	Assessment / Component	Review Type	Federal Determination	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Primary Source File	Proposal Relevance
Florida	2022-23	FSAA / ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	25	Florida 2022-23 letter	Sophisticated system with substantial evidence needs.
Georgia	2026	Family engagement monitoring	Monitoring/Compliance	Commendation / no required actions	Universal	5	Family engagement monitoring letter	Positive contrast for stakeholder engagement systems.
Georgia	2026	Alternate ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	17	Georgia Alternate ACCESS letter	Alternate ELP technical quality and scoring evidence.
Georgia	2022-23	GAA 2.0 / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	23	Georgia 2022-23 letters	Alignment and accessibility studies.
Hawaii	2026	Family engagement monitoring / required actions	Monitoring/Compliance	Required Actions	Targeted	9	Family engagement monitoring letter	Required action profile for family/stakeholder TA.
Hawaii	2022-23	ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS / HSA-Alt	Assessment Peer Review	Partial / Substantial	Intensive	30	Hawaii 2022-23 letters	Alt ELP and alternate assessment broad needs.
Illinois	2025	SAT High School RLA/Math	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	17	illinois-2025 peer review	Alignment, validity, maintenance, monitoring.
Indiana	2024	SAT / ILEARN / I AM / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	22	indiana-10-109007.pdf	Alignment, reporting, accessibility.
Indiana	2022-23	ILEARN	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	15	Indiana 2022-23 letter	Alignment/DOK deficiencies.
Iowa	2026	ELPA21 / Alternate ELPA21	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	23	Iowa ELPA21 / Alternate ELPA21 letter	Strong ELP/Alt ELP evidence needs across critical elements.
Iowa	2025	ELPA21	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	22	iowa-elpa21-2025	ELP blueprint, alignment, monitoring, reporting.
Iowa	2025	General + DLM Science	Assessment Peer Review	Meets / Substantially Meets	Universal	7	iowa-dlm-science-2025	DLM Science Essential Element sampling only.
Iowa	2022-23	ISASP / DLM Science	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	17	Iowa 2022-23 letter	ISASP alignment and DLM Science.
Kansas	2024	Math / Science	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	21	ks10-108886.pdf	Science, reliability, accessibility.
Kansas	2022-23	KELPA	Assessment Peer Review	Partially Meets	Intensive	22	Kansas 2022-23 letter	Alternate ELP absence/conditions.
Kentucky	2024	KSA / AKSA	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	20	kentucky-9-108787.pdf	Alignment, reporting, postsecondary.
Louisiana	2025	LEAP / LEAP Connect	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	26	louisiana-2025 peer review	Alternate validity, alignment studies, parent accessibility.
Louisiana	2024	ELP	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	17	louisiana-8-109151.pdf	ELP alignment/reporting.
Maine	2024	MTYA / MSA / MSAA Science	Assessment Peer Review	Partial / Substantial	Intensive	30	maine15-108816.pdf	Multiple assessment systems, strong alignment/design need.

State / System	Review Period	Assessment / Component	Review Type	Federal Determination	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Primary Source File	Proposal Relevance
Maine	2022-23	Achievement standards enforcement	Enforcement	High Risk / Corrective Action	Intensive	9	Maine enforcement letters	Governance/achievement standards compliance.
Maryland	2022-23	MISA / SAT	Assessment Peer Review	Partial / Substantial	Targeted	22	Maryland 2022-23 letter	Science and SAT compliance.
Massachusetts	2024	Peer review letter	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	18	ma-9-24-108528.pdf	Alignment/validity profile.
Michigan	2025	MI-Access AA-AAAS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	20	michigan-miaccess-2025	AA-AAAS alignment, precision, postsecondary outcomes.
Michigan	2025	General assessments / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	20	michigan-general-2025	SAT alignment, disability DIF, parent reporting.
Minnesota	2025	ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	17	minnesota-access-2025	ELP standards alignment and accommodations monitoring.
Minnesota	2025	Alternate ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	22	minnesota-alt-access-2025	Alternate ELP alignment, reliability, TAC.
Mississippi	2025	LAS Links / Alternate ELP	Assessment Peer Review	Partially Meets	Intensive	25	mississippi-las-links-2025	No/weak Alternate ELP evidence; public technical reporting.
Mississippi	2022-23	Cambridge IGCSE	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	19	Mississippi IGCSE letter	Nationally recognized high school assessment compliance.
Mississippi	2022-23	MAAP / MAAP-A	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	26	Mississippi MAAP letter	Alignment, data privacy, accommodations, postsecondary.
Missouri	2022-23	MAP Science / DLM Science	Assessment Peer Review	General Science Partially Meets	Intensive	30	Missouri 2022-23 letter	Comprehensive science deficiency profile.
Nebraska	2024	ELPA21	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	22	nebraska-11-108525.pdf	ELP alignment and monitoring.
Nebraska	2024	Science / Alternate Science	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	27	nebraska-12-108883.pdf	Science/alt science broad requirements.
Nevada	2022-23	ACT / NAA	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	24	Nevada 2022-23 letter	NAA alignment, scoring, TAC, postsecondary.
New Hampshire	2026	ESEA amendment approval	ESEA Amendment	Approved	Universal	3	NH ESEA amendment letter	Policy/accountability example, lower TA-needs value.
New Hampshire	2024	SAT / DLM Science	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	20	new-hampshire-13-108817.pdf	SAT alignment/DLM Science/TAC.
New Jersey	2022-23	Science / DLM Science / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	28	New Jersey 2022-23 letter	Science, ACCESS, monitoring, TAC.
New Mexico	2022-23	ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantial / Partial	Targeted	24	New Mexico 2022-23 letter	ELP/Alt ELP alignment, scoring, reporting.
North Carolina	2024	NCEXTEND1	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	15	nc-8-108530.pdf	Security/comparability/postsecondary.

State / System	Review Period	Assessment / Component	Review Type	Federal Determination	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Primary Source File	Proposal Relevance
North Dakota	2026	ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS / DLM	Assessment Peer Review	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets	Targeted	24	North Dakota peer review letter	Alternate ACCESS and implementation infrastructure concerns.
North Dakota	2025	DLM Science	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	18	north-dakota-dlm-science-2025	Science EE coverage and monitoring/security documentation.
North Dakota	2024	General / DLM	Assessment Peer Review	Meets / Substantially Meets	Universal	3	north-dakota-12-108818.pdf	Positive contrast, mature system.
Ohio	2024	General / AA-AAAS	Assessment Peer Review	Partial / Substantial	Intensive	28	ohio-6-108531.pdf	AA-AAAS broad findings.
Ohio	2024	ELPA21	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	22	ohio-7-108526.pdf	ELP evidence needs.
Oklahoma	2025	OSTP / DLM / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets	Targeted	17	oklahoma-2025 peer review	General systems mature; DLM Science/ELP remain.
Oklahoma	2024	General / DLM / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Mixed	Targeted	17	oklahoma-7-108553.pdf	DLM Science and ELP.
Oregon	2025	OSAS / ORExt / ELPA21	Assessment Peer Review	Mixed: Meets / Substantially Meets	Universal	15	oregon-2025 peer review	ORExt fully approved; ELP findings remain.
Pennsylvania	2022-23	DLM / DLM Science	Assessment Peer Review	Meets / Substantially Meets	Universal	9	Pennsylvania 2022-23 letter	Mature system; DLM Science only finding.
Rhode Island	2025	RICAS / SAT / NGSA / DLM / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	23	rhode-island-2025 peer review	Science, DLM Science, fairness, postsecondary.
Rhode Island	2022-23	ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	19	Rhode Island ACCESS letter	ELP alignment, privacy, reliability, DIF.
South Carolina	2024	General / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	22	South-Carolina-6.pdf	DOK, reporting, monitoring.
South Carolina	2024	SC-Alt	Assessment Peer Review	Partially Meets	Intensive	28	south-carolina-7-108555.pdf	Alternate assessment broad findings.
South Dakota	2025	SDSA / SDSAA / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Mixed: Meets / Substantially Meets	Targeted	25	south-dakota-2025 peer review	Science complexity and Alternate ACCESS.
South Dakota	2022-23	ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantial / Partial	Targeted	22	sd12.pdf	Alternate ELP national pattern.
Tennessee	2024	Peer review letter	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	17	tennessee-5-108881.pdf	Alignment/validity.
Texas	2024	Peer review letter	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	23	tx-peer-review-23-108532.pdf	Alt ELP monitoring and postsecondary.
Texas	2022-23	STAAR / STAAR Alt / TELPAS Alt	Assessment Peer Review	Meets / Substantially Meets	Targeted	20	TX10.pdf	Mature general system; TELPAS Alt and postsecondary evidence.
Utah	2022-23	RISE / Aspire Plus / DLM	Assessment Peer Review	Mixed	Targeted	17	UT-gen-and-alt-peer-review-letter-send.pdf	CAT precision, high school assessment monitoring.

State / System	Review Period	Assessment / Component	Review Type	Federal Determination	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Primary Source File	Proposal Relevance
Vermont	2025	VTCAP / MSAA / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Partially Meets	Intensive	32	vermont-2025 peer review	Broad multi-domain findings; intensive TA archetype.
Vermont	2024	Peer review letter	Assessment Peer Review	Partially Meets	Intensive	32	vt8-108882.pdf	Broad intensive profile.
Vermont	2022-23	VTAA	Assessment Peer Review	Partially Meets	Intensive	30	vt7.pdf	Intensive AA-AAAS profile.
Virginia	2025	VSOL / VAAP	Assessment Peer Review	Partially Meets	Intensive	26	virginia-2025 peer review	Broad corrective-action list across general and alternate.
Washington	2025	Smarter Balanced / WA-AIM / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	21	washington-2025 peer review	Mature system with Alternate ACCESS/accessibility concerns.
West Virginia	2026	Alternate ELPA21	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	22	WV Alternate ELPA21 letter	Monitoring, reporting, scoring, technical manual evidence.
West Virginia	2025	WVGSA / DLM / SAT / ELPA21	Assessment Peer Review	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets	Targeted	20	west-virginia-2025 peer review	SAT Science and DLM Science unresolved.
West Virginia	2024	Peer review letter	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	22	west-virginia-12-108819.pdf	Science and monitoring/reporting.
Wisconsin	2024	Peer review letter	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	16	WI-13.pdf	DLM Science and ELP conditions.
Wisconsin	2022-23	Forward RLA/Math	Assessment Peer Review	Meets	Universal	3	wi11.pdf	Positive example of resolved reliability finding.
Wisconsin	2022-23	ACT / Forward Science / DLM Science	Assessment Peer Review	Meets / Substantially Meets	Universal	9	Wisconsin_12.pdf	DLM Science blueprint remains.
Wyoming	2025	WY-TOPP / WY-ALT / ACCESS	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	27	wyoming-2025 peer review	Alternate ACCESS and science findings.
Wyoming	2022-23	WY-TOPP / WY-ALT	Assessment Peer Review	Substantially Meets	Targeted	21	WY8.pdf	DOK, alignment, postsecondary, accessible reports.

Note. N = 87 state or system assessment peer review records. Review Period is the federal review year; review periods span 2022 through 2026. Total Domain Score is the summed peer-review domain coding for the record, with higher scores indicating more extensive findings. Recommended TA Tier reflects the suggested technical-assistance intensity (Universal, Targeted, or Intensive).

Table 7*Federal Assessment Peer Review Determinations by State and Assessment Component*

St/Sys	RP	Assess/Comp	Fed Det	M	SM	PM/HR	Notes
Alabama	2025	ACAP / ACAP Alternate	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Math alignment, TAC, postsecondary readiness.
Alabama	2024	Peer review letter	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alignment and monitoring.
Alaska	2025	AK STAR / DLM / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	CAT alignment, item pool, Alternate ACCESS.
Arizona	2026	Family engagement monitoring / required actions	Required Actions	0	0	0	Required action monitoring evidence useful for TA tiering.
Arizona	2025	AzSCI / MSAA Science	Partially Meets	0	0	1	Science alignment, security lifecycle, privacy, DIF.
Arkansas	2024	Posting + peer review	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	ELP and alignment concerns.
Arkansas	2022-23	ACT Aspire / DLM Science	Meets / Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Early DLM Science blueprint pattern.
BIE	2022-23	Assessment system	Broad findings	0	0	1	Prototype intensive TA system.
California	2025	ELPAC / Alternate ELPAC	Meets	1	0	0	Positive exemplar for mature ELP/Alt ELP system.
California	2022-23	CAST / CAA / ELPAC	Mixed	0	0	0	Science and ELP in otherwise strong system.
Connecticut	2025	CAAELP / Alternate ELP	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Monitoring, reliability, validity, scoring, accommodations.
Connecticut	2024	SAT / Science / AA-AAAS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Science/alt science and postsecondary.
Delaware	2025	DLM / ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets	0	0	1	DLM strong; ELP systems weaker.
Delaware	2024	SAT / ELP / DLM	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	SAT alignment/ELP.
Delaware	2022-23	Science / DLM Science	Improved to Meets / Substantial	1	0	0	Corrective action improvement example.
District of Columbia	2022-23	Science / PARCC / ACCESS	Partial / Substantial	0	0	0	Science and alignment redesign.
Florida	2025	FAST / AA-AAAS / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Technical adequacy, alignment, validity, TAC.
Florida	2022-23	FSAA / ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Sophisticated system with substantial evidence needs.
Georgia	2026	Family engagement monitoring	Commendation / no required actions	0	0	0	Positive contrast for stakeholder engagement systems.
Georgia	2026	Alternate ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alternate ELP technical quality and scoring evidence.
Georgia	2022-23	GAA 2.0 / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alignment and accessibility studies.
Hawaii	2026	Family engagement monitoring / required actions	Required Actions	0	0	0	Required action profile for family/stakeholder TA.
Hawaii	2022-23	ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS / HSA-Alt	Partial / Substantial	0	0	0	Alt ELP and alternate assessment broad needs.
Illinois	2025	SAT High School RLA/Math	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alignment, validity, maintenance, monitoring.
Indiana	2024	SAT / ILEARN / I AM / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alignment, reporting, accessibility.
Indiana	2022-23	ILEARN	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alignment/DOK deficiencies.
Iowa	2026	ELPA21 / Alternate ELPA21	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Strong ELP/Alt ELP evidence needs across critical elements.
Iowa	2025	ELPA21	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	ELP blueprint, alignment, monitoring, reporting.
Iowa	2025	General + DLM Science	Meets / Substantially Meets	0	1	0	DLM Science Essential Element sampling only.

St/Sys	RP	Assess/Comp	Fed Det	M	SM	PM/HR	Notes
Iowa	2022-23	ISASP / DLM Science	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	ISASP alignment and DLM Science.
Kansas	2024	Math / Science	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Science, reliability, accessibility.
Kansas	2022-23	KELPA	Partially Meets	0	0	1	Alternate ELP absence/conditions.
Kentucky	2024	KSA / AKSA	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alignment, reporting, postsecondary.
Louisiana	2025	LEAP / LEAP Connect	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alternate validity, alignment studies, parent accessibility.
Louisiana	2024	ELP	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	ELP alignment/reporting.
Maine	2024	MTYA / MSA / MSAA Science	Partial / Substantial	0	0	0	Multiple assessment systems, strong alignment/design need.
Maine	2022-23	Achievement standards enforcement	High Risk / Corrective Action	0	0	1	Governance/achievement standards compliance.
Maryland	2022-23	MISA / SAT	Partial / Substantial	0	0	0	Science and SAT compliance.
Massachusetts	2024	Peer review letter	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alignment/validity profile.
Michigan	2025	MI-Access AA-AAAS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	AA-AAAS alignment, precision, postsecondary outcomes.
Michigan	2025	General assessments / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	SAT alignment, disability DIF, parent reporting.
Minnesota	2025	ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	ELP standards alignment and accommodations monitoring.
Minnesota	2025	Alternate ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alternate ELP alignment, reliability, TAC.
Mississippi	2025	LAS Links / Alternate ELP	Partially Meets	0	0	1	No/weak Alternate ELP evidence; public technical reporting.
Mississippi	2022-23	Cambridge IGCSE	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Nationally recognized high school assessment compliance.
Mississippi	2022-23	MAAP / MAAP-A	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alignment, data privacy, accommodations, postsecondary.
Missouri	2022-23	MAP Science / DLM Science	General Science Partially Meets	0	0	1	Comprehensive science deficiency profile.
Nebraska	2024	ELPA21	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	ELP alignment and monitoring.
Nebraska	2024	Science / Alternate Science	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Science/alt science broad requirements.
Nevada	2022-23	ACT / NAA	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	NAA alignment, scoring, TAC, postsecondary.
New Hampshire	2026	ESEA amendment approval	Approved	0	0	0	Policy/accountability example, lower TA-needs value.
New Hampshire	2024	SAT / DLM Science	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	SAT alignment/DLM Science/TAC.
New Jersey	2022-23	Science / DLM Science / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Science, ACCESS, monitoring, TAC.
New Mexico	2022-23	ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS	Substantial / Partial	0	0	0	ELP/Alt ELP alignment, scoring, reporting.
North Carolina	2024	NCEXTEND1	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Security/comparability/postsecondary.
North Dakota	2026	ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS / DLM	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets	0	0	1	Alternate ACCESS and implementation infrastructure concerns.
North Dakota	2025	DLM Science	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Science EE coverage and monitoring/security documentation.
North Dakota	2024	General / DLM	Meets / Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Positive contrast, mature system.
Ohio	2024	General / AA-AAAS	Partial / Substantial	0	0	0	AA-AAAS broad findings.
Ohio	2024	ELPA21	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	ELP evidence needs.

St/Sys	RP	Assess/Comp	Fed Det	M	SM	PM/HR	Notes
Oklahoma	2025	OSTP / DLM / ACCESS	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets	0	0	1	General systems mature; DLM Science/ELP remain.
Oklahoma	2024	General / DLM / ACCESS	Mixed	0	0	0	DLM Science and ELP.
Oregon	2025	OSAS / ORExt / ELPA21	Mixed: Meets / Substantially Meets	0	1	0	ORExt fully approved; ELP findings remain.
Pennsylvania	2022-23	DLM / DLM Science	Meets / Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Mature system; DLM Science only finding.
Rhode Island	2025	RICAS / SAT / NGSA / DLM / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Science, DLM Science, fairness, postsecondary.
Rhode Island	2022-23	ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	ELP alignment, privacy, reliability, DIF.
South Carolina	2024	General / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	DOK, reporting, monitoring.
South Carolina	2024	SC-Alt	Partially Meets	0	0	1	Alternate assessment broad findings.
South Dakota	2025	SDSA / SDSAA / ACCESS	Mixed: Meets / Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Science complexity and Alternate ACCESS.
South Dakota	2022-23	ACCESS / Alternate ACCESS	Substantial / Partial	0	0	0	Alternate ELP national pattern.
Tennessee	2024	Peer review letter	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alignment/validity.
Texas	2024	Peer review letter	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alt ELP monitoring and postsecondary.
Texas	2022-23	STAAR / STAAR Alt / TELPAS Alt	Meets / Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Mature general system; TELPAS Alt and postsecondary evidence.
Utah	2022-23	RISE / Aspire Plus / DLM	Mixed	0	0	0	CAT precision, high school assessment monitoring.
Vermont	2025	VTAP / MSAA / ACCESS	Partially Meets	0	0	1	Broad multi-domain findings; intensive TA archetype.
Vermont	2024	Peer review letter	Partially Meets	0	0	1	Broad intensive profile.
Vermont	2022-23	VTAA	Partially Meets	0	0	1	Intensive AA-AAAS profile.
Virginia	2025	VSOL / VAAP	Partially Meets	0	0	1	Broad corrective-action list across general and alternate.
Washington	2025	Smarter Balanced / WA-AIM / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Mature system with Alternate ACCESS/accessibility concerns.
West Virginia	2026	Alternate ELPA21	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Monitoring, reporting, scoring, technical manual evidence.
West Virginia	2025	WVGSA / DLM / SAT / ELPA21	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets	0	0	1	SAT Science and DLM Science unresolved.
West Virginia	2024	Peer review letter	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Science and monitoring/reporting.
Wisconsin	2024	Peer review letter	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	DLM Science and ELP conditions.
Wisconsin	2022-23	Forward RLA/Math	Meets	1	0	0	Positive example of resolved reliability finding.
Wisconsin	2022-23	ACT / Forward Science / DLM Science	Meets / Substantially Meets	0	1	0	DLM Science blueprint remains.
Wyoming	2025	WY-TOPP / WY-ALT / ACCESS	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	Alternate ACCESS and science findings.
Wyoming	2022-23	WY-TOPP / WY-ALT	Substantially Meets	0	1	0	DOK, alignment, postsecondary, accessible reports.

Note. N = 87 state or system assessment peer review records. Column abbreviations: *RP* = Review Period; *St/Sys* = State/System; *Assess/Comp* = Assessment / Component; *Fed Det* = Federal Determination; *M* = Meets; *SM* = Substantially Meets; *PM/HR* = Partially Meets / High Risk. M, SM, and PM/HR are binary indicators (1 = the federal determination falls in that category; 0 = otherwise); rows coded 0 across all three reflect determinations outside these categories, such as required-action or monitoring letters. The Notes column is unabbreviated. Review periods span 2022 through 2026.

Table 8*Recommended Technical Assistance Tier by State and System*

State / System	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Significant Findings	Primary Rationale	Suggested Supports
Alabama	Targeted	24	10	Math alignment, TAC, postsecondary readiness.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Alabama	Targeted	20	6	Alignment and monitoring.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Alaska	Targeted	24	9	CAT alignment, item pool, Alternate ACCESS.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Arizona	Intensive	30	14	Science alignment, security lifecycle, privacy, DIF.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Arizona	Targeted	9	3	Required action monitoring evidence useful for TA tiering.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Arkansas	Targeted	17	3	ELP and alignment concerns.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Arkansas	Universal	8	1	Early DLM Science blueprint pattern.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
BIE	Intensive	31	15	Prototype intensive TA system.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
California	Targeted	24	9	Science and ELP in otherwise strong system.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
California	Universal	3	0	Positive exemplar for mature ELP/Alt ELP system.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
Connecticut	Targeted	24	9	Science/alt science and postsecondary.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Connecticut	Targeted	21	7	Monitoring, reliability, validity, scoring, accommodations.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Delaware	Targeted	18	4	SAT alignment/ELP.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Delaware	Targeted	16	2	DLM strong; ELP systems weaker.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Delaware	Universal	12	2	Corrective action improvement example.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
District of Columbia	Intensive	26	10	Science and alignment redesign.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.

State / System	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Significant Findings	Primary Rationale	Suggested Supports
Florida	Targeted	25	10	Sophisticated system with substantial evidence needs.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Florida	Targeted	24	8	Technical adequacy, alignment, validity, TAC.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Georgia	Targeted	23	8	Alignment and accessibility studies.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Georgia	Targeted	17	5	Alternate ELP technical quality and scoring evidence.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Georgia	Universal	5	0	Positive contrast for stakeholder engagement systems.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
Hawaii	Intensive	30	14	Alt ELP and alternate assessment broad needs.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Hawaii	Targeted	9	3	Required action profile for family/stakeholder TA.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Illinois	Targeted	17	6	Alignment, validity, maintenance, monitoring.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Indiana	Targeted	22	8	Alignment, reporting, accessibility.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Indiana	Targeted	15	3	Alignment/DOK deficiencies.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Iowa	Targeted	23	10	Strong ELP/Alt ELP evidence needs across critical elements.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Iowa	Targeted	22	9	ELP blueprint, alignment, monitoring, reporting.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Iowa	Targeted	17	5	ISASP alignment and DLM Science.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Iowa	Universal	7	1	DLM Science Essential Element sampling only.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
Kansas	Intensive	22	9	Alternate ELP absence/conditions.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Kansas	Targeted	21	8	Science, reliability, accessibility.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Kentucky	Targeted	20	7	Alignment, reporting, postsecondary.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Louisiana	Targeted	26	10	Alternate validity, alignment studies, parent accessibility.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Louisiana	Targeted	17	5	ELP alignment/reporting.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.

State / System	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Significant Findings	Primary Rationale	Suggested Supports
Maine	Intensive	30	14	Multiple assessment systems, strong alignment/design need.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Maine	Intensive	9	3	Governance/achievement standards compliance.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Maryland	Targeted	22	8	Science and SAT compliance.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Massachusetts	Targeted	18	3	Alignment/validity profile.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Michigan	Targeted	20	7	AA-AAAS alignment, precision, postsecondary outcomes.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Michigan	Targeted	20	7	SAT alignment, disability DIF, parent reporting.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Minnesota	Targeted	22	10	Alternate ELP alignment, reliability, TAC.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Minnesota	Targeted	17	6	ELP standards alignment and accommodations monitoring.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Mississippi	Targeted	26	11	Alignment, data privacy, accommodations, postsecondary.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Mississippi	Intensive	25	12	No/weak Alternate ELP evidence; public technical reporting.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Mississippi	Targeted	19	7	Nationally recognized high school assessment compliance.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Missouri	Intensive	30	14	Comprehensive science deficiency profile.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Nebraska	Targeted	27	13	Science/alt science broad requirements.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Nebraska	Targeted	22	9	ELP alignment and monitoring.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Nevada	Targeted	24	9	NAA alignment, scoring, TAC, postsecondary.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
New Hampshire	Targeted	20	7	SAT alignment/DLM Science/TAC.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
New Hampshire	Universal	3	0	Policy/accountability example, lower TA-needs value.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
New Jersey	Targeted	28	12	Science, ACCESS, monitoring, TAC.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.

State / System	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Significant Findings	Primary Rationale	Suggested Supports
New Mexico	Targeted	24	11	ELP/Alt ELP alignment, scoring, reporting.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
North Carolina	Targeted	15	2	Security/comparability/postsecondary.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
North Dakota	Targeted	24	8	Alternate ACCESS and implementation infrastructure concerns.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
North Dakota	Targeted	18	4	Science EE coverage and monitoring/security documentation.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
North Dakota	Universal	3	0	Positive contrast, mature system.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
Ohio	Intensive	28	14	AA-AAAS broad findings.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Ohio	Targeted	22	9	ELP evidence needs.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Oklahoma	Targeted	17	3	General systems mature; DLM Science/ELP remain.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Oklahoma	Targeted	17	3	DLM Science and ELP.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Oregon	Universal	15	3	ORExt fully approved; ELP findings remain.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
Pennsylvania	Universal	9	2	Mature system; DLM Science only finding.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
Rhode Island	Targeted	23	8	Science, DLM Science, fairness, postsecondary.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Rhode Island	Targeted	19	7	ELP alignment, privacy, reliability, DIF.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
South Carolina	Intensive	28	14	Alternate assessment broad findings.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
South Carolina	Targeted	22	8	DOK, reporting, monitoring.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
South Dakota	Targeted	25	10	Science complexity and Alternate ACCESS.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
South Dakota	Targeted	22	9	Alternate ELP national pattern.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Tennessee	Targeted	17	3	Alignment/validity.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Texas	Targeted	23	7	Alt ELP monitoring and postsecondary.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.

State / System	Recommended TA Tier	Total Domain Score	Significant Findings	Primary Rationale	Suggested Supports
Texas	Targeted	20	7	Mature general system; TELPAS Alt and postsecondary evidence.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Utah	Targeted	17	7	CAT precision, high school assessment monitoring.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Vermont	Intensive	32	16	Broad multi-domain findings; intensive TA archetype.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Vermont	Intensive	32	16	Broad intensive profile.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Vermont	Intensive	30	14	Intensive AA-AAAS profile.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Virginia	Intensive	26	12	Broad corrective-action list across general and alternate.	Sustained TA plan, recurring technical meetings, evidence-management support, implementation monitoring, cross-domain coordination.
Washington	Targeted	21	7	Mature system with Alternate ACCESS/accessibility concerns.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
West Virginia	Targeted	22	9	Monitoring, reporting, scoring, technical manual evidence.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
West Virginia	Targeted	22	7	Science and monitoring/reporting.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
West Virginia	Targeted	20	6	SAT Science and DLM Science unresolved.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Wisconsin	Targeted	16	2	DLM Science and ELP conditions.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Wisconsin	Universal	9	2	DLM Science blueprint remains.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
Wisconsin	Universal	3	0	Positive example of resolved reliability finding.	Resource library, webinars, exemplars, peer learning, periodic office hours.
Wyoming	Targeted	27	12	Alternate ACCESS and science findings.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.
Wyoming	Targeted	21	6	DOK, alignment, postsecondary, accessible reports.	Focused consultation, domain-specific workgroups, evidence review, targeted coaching.

Note. N = 87 state or system assessment peer review records, arranged alphabetically by State/System; states with more than one record are ordered by Total Domain Score (highest first). Total Domain Score is the summed peer-review domain coding (higher = more extensive findings); Significant Findings is the count of domains coded as significant. Recommended TA Tier denotes suggested support intensity: Intensive (sustained, comprehensive), Targeted (focused, domain-specific), or Universal (light-touch, general). Records span the 2022–2026 peer review corpus.

Table 9*State-Level Federal Peer-Review Risk Profile (June 2026 Status Snapshot)*

State/Sys	CwD	M	SM	PM	DNM	NCD	PPR	ACC	HS	TA Tier	Risk Pattern
Alabama	5	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	1	Targeted / Specialized TA	Multiple Substantially Meets evidence needs
Alaska	5	1	4	0	0	3	0	1	1	Targeted / Specialized TA	Multiple Substantially Meets evidence needs
Arizona	4	2	1	1	0	4	0	0	2	Targeted / Specialized TA	One Partially Meets component
Arkansas	7	5	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	Targeted / Specialized TA	Lower current federal concern
Bureau of Indian Education	4	0	1	3	0	4	0	1	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
California	6	5	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews
Colorado	8	1	6	1	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Connecticut	7	3	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Substantially Meets evidence needs
Delaware	8	4	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
District of Columbia	8	1	4	3	0	0	0	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Florida	8	0	8	0	0	0	3	3	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews
Georgia	8	7	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews
Hawaii	8	0	7	1	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Idaho	5	2	3	0	0	3	4	3	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews
Illinois	8	0	3	5	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Indiana	8	0	7	1	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Iowa	7	5	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews
Kansas	4	3	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	Universal / General TA	Lower current federal concern
Kentucky	8	0	6	2	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Louisiana	2	0	2	0	0	6	7	2	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews
Maine	6	1	1	4	0	2	7	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Maryland	7	2	3	2	0	1	1	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Massachusetts	4	1	1	2	0	4	7	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Michigan	4	0	3	1	0	4	8	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Minnesota	7	4	3	0	0	1	7	2	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews
Mississippi	3	0	2	1	0	5	8	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Missouri	8	0	3	5	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Montana	5	3	2	0	0	3	0	1	1	Targeted / Specialized TA	Lower current federal concern
Nebraska	6	0	6	0	0	2	1	2	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Substantially Meets evidence needs
Nevada	8	1	3	4	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
New Hampshire	8	0	6	2	0	0	1	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
New Jersey	8	3	4	1	0	0	1	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
New Mexico	5	0	4	1	0	3	8	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
New York	5	2	0	3	0	3	8	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
North Carolina	8	0	6	2	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components

State/Sys	CwD	M	SM	PM	DNM	NCD	PPR	ACC	HS	TA Tier	Risk Pattern
North Dakota	5	3	1	1	0	3	8	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Ohio	7	0	5	2	0	1	0	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Oklahoma	8	3	3	2	0	0	3	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Oregon	7	4	3	0	0	1	4	1	1	Targeted / Specialized TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews
Pennsylvania	6	4	1	1	0	2	0	1	2	Targeted / Specialized TA	One Partially Meets component
Puerto Rico	6	0	4	0	2	2	1	2	3	Intensive / Sustained TA	Does Not Meet component present
Rhode Island	7	0	5	2	0	1	0	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
South Carolina	8	0	7	1	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
South Dakota	5	3	2	0	0	3	0	1	1	Targeted / Specialized TA	Lower current federal concern
Tennessee	7	0	6	1	0	1	8	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Texas	8	4	3	1	0	0	0	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Utah	7	1	6	0	0	1	7	3	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews
Vermont	7	0	2	5	0	1	0	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Virginia	8	0	1	7	0	0	8	3	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Partially Meets components
Washington	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple Substantially Meets evidence needs
West Virginia	7	3	3	1	0	1	2	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Wisconsin	8	5	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	Intensive / Sustained TA	One Partially Meets component
Wyoming	7	0	7	0	0	1	8	3	1	Intensive / Sustained TA	Multiple upcoming/pending reviews

Note. N = 53 state or system records reflecting the June 2026 federal peer-review status snapshot (determinations current to May 1, 2026). Column abbreviations: *State/Sys* = State/System; *CwD* = Components with Determination; *M* = Meets Count; *SM* = Substantially Meets Count; *PM* = Partially Meets Count; *DNM* = Does Not Meet Count; *NCD* = No Current Determination Listed; *PPR* = Pending/Planned Review Count; *ACC* = Alternate Components with Concern; *HS* = Highest Severity; *TA Tier* = Overall TA Tier Signal; *Risk Pattern* = Primary Risk Pattern; *Story Signal* = Proposal/TA Story Signal. Count columns tally assessment components in each category; Highest Severity is an ordinal score (1–3), with higher values indicating greater concern.

Table 10*State-Level Peer Review Notes: Major Findings and Proposal Relevance*

State / System	Review Period	Primary Source File	Major Findings	Proposal Use / Center Relevance
Alabama	2025	alabama-2025 peer review	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Math alignment, TAC, postsecondary readiness.
Alabama	2024	alabama-9-109006.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Monitoring; Security; Accommodations	Alignment and monitoring.
Alaska	2025	alaska-2025 peer review	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	CAT alignment, item pool, Alternate ACCESS.
Arizona	2026	Family engagement monitoring letter	Governance & Compliance; Monitoring; Reporting	Required action monitoring evidence useful for TA tiering.
Arizona	2025	arizona-2025 peer review	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Science alignment, security lifecycle, privacy, DIF.
Arkansas	2024	arkansas 2024 files	Alignment; Validity; ELP	ELP and alignment concerns.
Arkansas	2022-23	Arkansas 2022-23 letter	Alt Science	Early DLM Science blueprint pattern.
BIE	2022-23	BIE 2022-23 letter	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Prototype intensive TA system.
California	2025	california-2025 peer review	No significant finding coded	Positive exemplar for mature ELP/Alt ELP system.
California	2022-23	California 2022-23 letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; ELP	Science and ELP in otherwise strong system.
Connecticut	2025	ct-2025 peer review	Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; ELP; Alt ELP	Monitoring, reliability, validity, scoring, accommodations.
Connecticut	2024	ct-9.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness	Science/alt science and postsecondary.
Delaware	2025	delaware-2025 peer review	ELP; Alt ELP	DLM strong; ELP systems weaker.
Delaware	2024	de12-1.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; ELP	SAT alignment/ELP.
Delaware	2022-23	Delaware 2022-23 letters	Science; Alt Science	Corrective action improvement example.
District of Columbia	2022-23	DC 2022-23 letters	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Reporting; Science; ELP	Science and alignment redesign.

State / System	Review Period	Primary Source File	Major Findings	Proposal Use / Center Relevance
Florida	2025	florida-2025 peer review	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Technical adequacy, alignment, validity, TAC.
Florida	2022-23	Florida 2022-23 letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP; Postsecondary Readiness	Sophisticated system with substantial evidence needs.
Georgia	2026	Family engagement monitoring letter	No significant finding coded	Positive contrast for stakeholder engagement systems.
Georgia	2026	Georgia Alternate ACCESS letter	Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; ELP; Alt ELP	Alternate ELP technical quality and scoring evidence.
Georgia	2022-23	Georgia 2022-23 letters	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Accessibility; Accommodations; Science; Alt Science; ELP	Alignment and accessibility studies.
Hawaii	2026	Family engagement monitoring letter	Governance & Compliance; Monitoring; Reporting	Required action profile for family/stakeholder TA.
Hawaii	2022-23	Hawaii 2022-23 letters	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Alt ELP and alternate assessment broad needs.
Illinois	2025	illinois-2025 peer review	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Monitoring; Accommodations; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Alignment, validity, maintenance, monitoring.
Indiana	2024	indiana-10-109007.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Accessibility; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; ELP	Alignment, reporting, accessibility.
Indiana	2022-23	Indiana 2022-23 letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity	Alignment/DOK deficiencies.
Iowa	2026	Iowa ELPA21 / Alternate ELPA21 letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP	Strong ELP/Alt ELP evidence needs across critical elements.
Iowa	2025	iowa-elpa21-2025	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP	ELP blueprint, alignment, monitoring, reporting.
Iowa	2025	iowa-dlm-science-2025	Alt Science	DLM Science Essential Element sampling only.
Iowa	2022-23	Iowa 2022-23 letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Science; Alt Science	ISASP alignment and DLM Science.
Kansas	2024	ks10-108886.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Science; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness	Science, reliability, accessibility.
Kansas	2022-23	Kansas 2022-23 letter	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Accommodations; ELP; Alt ELP	Alternate ELP absence/conditions.
Kentucky	2024	kentucky-9-108787.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness	Alignment, reporting, postsecondary.

State / System	Review Period	Primary Source File	Major Findings	Proposal Use / Center Relevance
Louisiana	2025	louisiana-2025 peer review	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Postsecondary Readiness	Alternate validity, alignment studies, parent accessibility.
Louisiana	2024	louisiana-8-109151.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reporting; ELP	ELP alignment/reporting.
Maine	2024	maine15-108816.pdf	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Multiple assessment systems, strong alignment/design need.
Maine	2022-23	Maine enforcement letters	Governance & Compliance; Reporting; Postsecondary Readiness	Governance/achievement standards compliance.
Maryland	2022-23	Maryland 2022-23 letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Postsecondary Readiness	Science and SAT compliance.
Massachusetts	2024	ma-9-24-108528.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity	Alignment/validity profile.
Michigan	2025	michigan-miaccess-2025	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Reporting; Postsecondary Readiness	AA-AAAS alignment, precision, postsecondary outcomes.
Michigan	2025	michigan-general-2025	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Reporting; ELP	SAT alignment, disability DIF, parent reporting.
Minnesota	2025	minnesota-access-2025	Alignment; Validity; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; ELP	ELP standards alignment and accommodations monitoring.
Minnesota	2025	minnesota-alt-access-2025	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Alternate ELP alignment, reliability, TAC.
Mississippi	2025	mississippi-las-links-2025	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	No/weak Alternate ELP evidence; public technical reporting.
Mississippi	2022-23	Mississippi IGCSE letter	Alignment; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting	Nationally recognized high school assessment compliance.
Mississippi	2022-23	Mississippi MAAP letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Alignment, data privacy, accommodations, postsecondary.
Missouri	2022-23	Missouri 2022-23 letter	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Comprehensive science deficiency profile.
Nebraska	2024	nebraska-11-108525.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP	ELP alignment and monitoring.

State / System	Review Period	Primary Source File	Major Findings	Proposal Use / Center Relevance
Nebraska	2024	nebraska-12-108883.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Science/alt science broad requirements.
Nevada	2022-23	Nevada 2022-23 letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Monitoring; Accommodations; Reporting; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	NAA alignment, scoring, TAC, postsecondary.
New Hampshire	2026	NH ESEA amendment letter	No significant finding coded	Policy/accountability example, lower TA-needs value.
New Hampshire	2024	new-hampshire-13-108817.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; TAC / Continuous Improvement	SAT alignment/DLM Science/TAC.
New Jersey	2022-23	New Jersey 2022-23 letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Science, ACCESS, monitoring, TAC.
New Mexico	2022-23	New Mexico 2022-23 letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	ELP/Alt ELP alignment, scoring, reporting.
North Carolina	2024	nc-8-108530.pdf	Security; Postsecondary Readiness	Security/comparability/postsecondary.
North Dakota	2026	North Dakota peer review letter	Governance & Compliance; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP	Alternate ACCESS and implementation infrastructure concerns.
North Dakota	2025	north-dakota-dlm-science-2025	Assessment Design; Monitoring; Security; Alt Science	Science EE coverage and monitoring/security documentation.
North Dakota	2024	north-dakota-12-108818.pdf	No significant finding coded	Positive contrast, mature system.
Ohio	2024	ohio-6-108531.pdf	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	AA-AAAS broad findings.
Ohio	2024	ohio-7-108526.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP	ELP evidence needs.
Oklahoma	2025	oklahoma-2025 peer review	Alt Science; ELP; Alt ELP	General systems mature; DLM Science/ELP remain.
Oklahoma	2024	oklahoma-7-108553.pdf	Alt Science; ELP; Alt ELP	DLM Science and ELP.
Oregon	2025	oregon-2025 peer review	Reliability; ELP; Alt ELP	ORExt fully approved; ELP findings remain.
Pennsylvania	2022-23	Pennsylvania 2022-23 letter	Assessment Design; Alt Science	Mature system; DLM Science only finding.
Rhode Island	2025	rhode-island-2025 peer review	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Accessibility; Science; Alt Science; ELP; Postsecondary Readiness	Science, DLM Science, fairness, postsecondary.
Rhode Island	2022-23	Rhode Island ACCESS letter	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Accommodations; ELP	ELP alignment, privacy, reliability, DIF.

State / System	Review Period	Primary Source File	Major Findings	Proposal Use / Center Relevance
South Carolina	2024	South-Carolina-6.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP	DOK, reporting, monitoring.
South Carolina	2024	south-carolina-7-108555.pdf	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Alternate assessment broad findings.
South Dakota	2025	south-dakota-2025 peer review	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Science; Alt Science; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Science complexity and Alternate ACCESS.
South Dakota	2022-23	sd12.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Accommodations; ELP; Alt ELP; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Alternate ELP national pattern.
Tennessee	2024	tennessee-5-108881.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity	Alignment/validity.
Texas	2024	tx-peer-review-23-108532.pdf	Monitoring; Security; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP; Postsecondary Readiness	Alt ELP monitoring and postsecondary.
Texas	2022-23	TX10.pdf	Monitoring; Security; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP; Postsecondary Readiness	Mature general system; TELPAS Alt and postsecondary evidence.
Utah	2022-23	UT-gen-and-alt-peer-review-letter-send.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Accommodations; Reporting	CAT precision, high school assessment monitoring.
Vermont	2025	vermont-2025 peer review	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; ELP; Alt ELP; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Broad multi-domain findings; intensive TA archetype.
Vermont	2024	vt8-108882.pdf	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; ELP; Alt ELP; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Broad intensive profile.
Vermont	2022-23	vt7.pdf	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Intensive AA-AAAS profile.
Virginia	2025	virginia-2025 peer review	Governance & Compliance; Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Broad corrective-action list across general and alternate.
Washington	2025	washington-2025 peer review	Reliability; Monitoring; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP	Mature system with Alternate ACCESS/accessibility concerns.
West Virginia	2026	WV Alternate ELPA21 letter	Validity; Reliability; Monitoring; Security; Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting; ELP; Alt ELP	Monitoring, reporting, scoring, technical manual evidence.

State / System	Review Period	Primary Source File	Major Findings	Proposal Use / Center Relevance
West Virginia	2025	west-virginia-2025 peer review	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Science; Alt Science	SAT Science and DLM Science unresolved.
West Virginia	2024	west-virginia-12-108819.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Monitoring; Security; Reporting; Alt Science	Science and monitoring/reporting.
Wisconsin	2024	WI-13.pdf	Assessment Design; Alt Science	DLM Science and ELP conditions.
Wisconsin	2022-23	wi11.pdf	No significant finding coded	Positive example of resolved reliability finding.
Wisconsin	2022-23	Wisconsin_12.pdf	Assessment Design; Alt Science	DLM Science blueprint remains.
Wyoming	2025	wyoming-2025 peer review	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Accessibility; Reporting; Science; Alt Science; ELP; Alt ELP; Postsecondary Readiness; TAC / Continuous Improvement	Alternate ACCESS and science findings.
Wyoming	2022-23	WY8.pdf	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity; Reliability; Reporting; Postsecondary Readiness	DOK, alignment, postsecondary, accessible reports.

Note. Each row is a state or system assessment peer review record (N = 87). Review Period is the federal review year. Major Findings lists the coded assessment domains flagged in the review, separated by semicolons; “No significant finding coded” indicates no domain was flagged. Proposal Use / Center Relevance summarizes how the record informs the National Assessment Center application. Review periods span 2022 through 2026.

Table 11*Comparison of State Categories Across Source Tables*

State	SY (T1)	OPC (T1)	SY (T2)	RC (T2)	Review Period (T5)	TA Tier (T5)	RP (T6)	Fed Det (T6)	TA Tier (T7)	TA Tier (T9)
Alabama					2025; 2024	Targeted	2025; 2024	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Targeted / Specialized TA
Alaska					2025	Targeted	2025	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Targeted / Specialized TA
Arizona	2018-19	Concern	2018-19	Moderate	2026; 2025	Targeted; Intensive	2026; 2025	Required Actions; Partially Meets	Intensive; Targeted	Targeted / Specialized TA
Arkansas					2024; 2022-23	Targeted; Universal	2024; 2022-23	Substantially Meets; Meets / Substantially Meets	Targeted; Universal	Targeted / Specialized TA
BIE					2022-23	Intensive	2022-23	Broad findings	Intensive	Intensive / Sustained TA
California	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	Concern; None	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	High; Moderate	2025; 2022-23	Universal; Targeted	2025; 2022-23	Meets; Mixed	Targeted; Universal	Intensive / Sustained TA
Colorado	2017-18; 2018-19	Concern; None	2017-18; 2018-19	Moderate; Low						Intensive / Sustained TA
Connecticut	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	None	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	High; Low; Moderate	2025; 2024	Targeted	2025; 2024	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Delaware	2018-19; 2021-22	None; Concern	2018-19; 2021-22	High	2025; 2024; 2022-23	Targeted; Universal	2025; 2024; 2022-23	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets; Substantially Meets; Improved to Meets / Substantial	Targeted; Universal	Intensive / Sustained TA
District of Columbia	2018-19	Concern	2018-19	High	2022-23	Intensive	2022-23	Partial / Substantial	Intensive	Intensive / Sustained TA
Florida	2017-18	None	2017-18	High	2025; 2022-23	Targeted	2025; 2022-23	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Georgia	2022-23	None	2022-23	Critical	2026; 2022-23	Universal; Targeted	2026; 2022-23	Commendation / no required actions; Substantially Meets	Targeted; Universal	Intensive / Sustained TA
Hawaii	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	Concern; None	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	Moderate; Low	2026; 2022-23	Targeted; Intensive	2026; 2022-23	Required Actions; Partial / Substantial	Intensive; Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Idaho										Intensive / Sustained TA
Illinois	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	Concern; None	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	High; Moderate	2025	Targeted	2025	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Indiana					2024; 2022-23	Targeted	2024; 2022-23	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Iowa					2026; 2025; 2022-23	Targeted; Universal	2026; 2025; 2022-23	Substantially Meets; Meets / Substantially Meets	Targeted; Universal	Intensive / Sustained TA
Kansas	2017-18	None	2017-18	Moderate	2024; 2022-23	Targeted; Intensive	2024; 2022-23	Substantially Meets; Partially Meets	Intensive; Targeted	Universal / General TA
Kentucky					2024	Targeted	2024	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA

State	SY (T1)	OPC (T1)	SY (T2)	RC (T2)	Review Period (T5)	TA Tier (T5)	RP (T6)	Fed Det (T6)	TA Tier (T7)	TA Tier (T9)
Louisiana					2025; 2024	Targeted	2025; 2024	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Maine					2024; 2022-23	Intensive	2024; 2022-23	Partial / Substantial; High Risk / Corrective Action	Intensive	Intensive / Sustained TA
Maryland	2017-18; 2018-19	None	2017-18; 2018-19	Moderate; Low	2022-23	Targeted	2022-23	Partial / Substantial	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Massachusetts					2024	Targeted	2024	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Michigan					2025	Targeted	2025	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Minnesota	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	None; Significant Concern	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	High; Moderate; Critical	2025	Targeted	2025	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Mississippi					2025; 2022-23	Intensive; Targeted	2025; 2022-23	Partially Meets; Substantially Meets	Targeted; Intensive	Intensive / Sustained TA
Missouri					2022-23	Intensive	2022-23	General Science Partially Meets	Intensive	Intensive / Sustained TA
Montana	2021-22	Concern	2021-22	Moderate						Targeted / Specialized TA
Nebraska					2024	Targeted	2024	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Nevada					2022-23	Targeted	2022-23	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
New Hampshire					2026; 2024	Universal; Targeted	2026; 2024	Approved; Substantially Meets	Targeted; Universal	Intensive / Sustained TA
New Jersey	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	Concern; None	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	High; Moderate; Critical	2022-23	Targeted	2022-23	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
New Mexico	2018-19; 2021-22	None; Significant Concern	2018-19; 2021-22	Moderate; High	2022-23	Targeted	2022-23	Substantial / Partial	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
New York	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	None; Concern; Significant Concern	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	High; Moderate						Intensive / Sustained TA
North Carolina					2024	Targeted	2024	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
North Dakota					2026; 2025; 2024	Targeted; Universal	2026; 2025; 2024	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets; Substantially Meets; Meets / Substantially Meets	Targeted; Universal	Intensive / Sustained TA
Ohio					2024	Intensive; Targeted	2024	Partial / Substantial; Substantially Meets	Intensive; Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Oklahoma					2025; 2024	Targeted	2025; 2024	Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets; Mixed	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Oregon	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	Concern; Significant Concern	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	High; Moderate	2025	Universal	2025	Mixed: Meets / Substantially Meets	Universal	Targeted / Specialized TA

State	SY (T1)	OPC (T1)	SY (T2)	RC (T2)	Review Period (T5)	TA Tier (T5)	RP (T6)	Fed Det (T6)	TA Tier (T7)	TA Tier (T9)
Pennsylvania	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	None	2017-18; 2018-19; 2021-22	High; Moderate; Critical	2022-23	Universal	2022-23	Meets / Substantially Meets	Universal	Targeted / Specialized TA
Puerto Rico										Intensive / Sustained TA
Rhode Island	2018-19; 2021-22	Concern; None	2018-19; 2021-22	High	2025; 2022-23	Targeted	2025; 2022-23	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
South Carolina					2024	Targeted; Intensive	2024	Substantially Meets; Partially Meets	Intensive; Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
South Dakota					2025; 2022-23	Targeted	2025; 2022-23	Mixed: Meets / Substantially Meets; Substantial / Partial	Targeted	Targeted / Specialized TA
Tennessee	2022-23	None	2022-23	Critical	2024	Targeted	2024	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Texas	2022-23	None	2022-23	Critical	2024; 2022-23	Targeted	2024; 2022-23	Substantially Meets; Meets / Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Utah					2022-23	Targeted	2022-23	Mixed	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Vermont	2021-22	Concern	2021-22	Moderate	2025; 2024; 2022-23	Intensive	2025; 2024; 2022-23	Partially Meets	Intensive	Intensive / Sustained TA
Virginia	2017-18; 2018-19	None	2017-18; 2018-19	Moderate; Low	2025	Intensive	2025	Partially Meets	Intensive	Intensive / Sustained TA
Washington					2025	Targeted	2025	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
West Virginia					2026; 2025; 2024	Targeted	2026; 2025; 2024	Substantially Meets; Mixed: Meets to Partially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA
Wisconsin					2024; 2022-23	Targeted; Universal	2024; 2022-23	Substantially Meets; Meets; Meets / Substantially Meets	Targeted; Universal	Intensive / Sustained TA
Wyoming	2021-22	None	2021-22	Moderate	2025; 2022-23	Targeted	2025; 2022-23	Substantially Meets	Targeted	Intensive / Sustained TA

Note. Each row is a state or jurisdiction (N = 53). Columns are culled from the indicated source tables: T1 = Table 1 and T2 = Table 2 (federal 1% AA-AAAS letter scoring); T5 = Table 5, T6 = Table 6, T7 = Table 7, and T9 = Table 9 (federal assessment peer review). SY = School Year; OPC = Overall Participation Concern; RC = Risk Category; Review Period/RP = peer review period; Fed Det = Federal Determination; TA Tier = recommended technical-assistance tier. Where a state appears multiple times within a source table, the cell lists that state's distinct values; a blank cell indicates the state did not appear in that source table. "BIE" consolidates Bureau of Indian Education records across tables.

Table 12*Assessment Peer Review Finding Frequency by Domain (Focus on Interventions)*

Domain	Mentioned	Significant	% Significant	Center Function
Governance & Compliance	79	18	20.7%	Assessment Governance & Federal Compliance
Alignment	80	60	69.0%	Assessment Alignment & Validation
Assessment Design	78	61	70.1%	Assessment Design & Blueprint Support
Validity	79	63	72.4%	Validity Research & Peer Review Evidence
Reliability	77	45	51.7%	Reliability, Precision & Classification Analytics
Monitoring	78	40	46.0%	Monitoring & Administration Fidelity Systems
Security	38	22	25.3%	Test Security & Incident Management
Accessibility	78	48	55.2%	Accessibility Systems Design
Accommodations	76	43	49.4%	Accommodation Policy & Implementation Monitoring
Reporting	80	49	56.3%	Reporting & Family Communication
Science	61	28	32.2%	Science Assessment Development & Validation
Alt Science	58	34	39.1%	Alternate Science Assessment Technical Assistance
ELP	61	43	49.4%	ELP Assessment Technical Assistance
Alt ELP	54	27	31.0%	Alternate ELP Technical Assistance
Postsecondary Readiness	50	26	29.9%	Postsecondary Readiness & Outcomes Validation
TAC / Continuous Improvement	80	26	29.9%	TAC Facilitation & Continuous Improvement

Note. Each row is an assessment peer review domain (total reviews N = 87). Mentioned is the number of reviews in which the domain was coded (score ≥ 1); Significant is the number coded as a significant finding (score = 2); % Significant is Significant divided by total reviews (87). Center Function is the proposed National Assessment Center service line aligned to the domain. Data reflect the 2022–2026 peer review corpus.

Table 13*Crosswalk of Federal Themes Across 1% Monitoring and Peer Review Evidence*

Federal Theme	1% Monitoring Evidence	Peer Review Evidence	Combined Interpretation	TA Tier Implication
Participation decision-making	Repeated federal emphasis on AA-AAAS eligibility, IEP team training, participation guidelines, LEA justifications, parent involvement.	Indirectly connected through alternate assessment participation, accessibility, accountability, and monitoring findings.	Participation is an implementation system, not simply a compliance metric.	Universal resources + Targeted consultation + Intensive improvement planning for persistent over-1% states
Monitoring & implementation fidelity	Waiver/condition letters increasingly require LEA oversight, progress monitoring, public plans, and corrective action evidence.	Monitoring is a major peer review domain; states often have policy but insufficient evidence of implementation.	Federal oversight increasingly expects proof that systems operate as intended.	Targeted/Intensive
Data systems & reporting integrity	States expected to validate EDFacts participation data, analyze trends, and track district/subgroup patterns.	Reporting and documentation findings recur across assessment types.	Data systems are central to participation, accountability, peer review, and TA readiness.	Universal dashboards/templates + Targeted data-system consultation
Accessibility & accommodations	Participation guidance includes parent, IEP team, and appropriate access decision-making.	Accessibility and accommodations findings appear across many peer review determinations.	Accessibility is a cross-cutting validity issue.	Universal guidance + Targeted accessibility audits + Intensive system redesign
Alignment & assessment design	Less central in 1% letters except through appropriate AA-AAAS participation and alternate achievement standards.	Alignment and assessment design are among top peer review findings.	States need ongoing alignment, blueprint, and remediation support.	Targeted/Intensive
Validity, reliability & technical quality	Indirect through expectations for defensible systems and progress monitoring.	Validity, reliability, scaling, scoring, technical manuals, and evidence quality are recurring findings.	Technical quality is a sustained maintenance burden.	Targeted/Intensive
Science and alternate science	Occasionally reflected in conditions tied to science assessment concerns.	Science and alternate science repeatedly remain unresolved when R/LA and math are approved.	Science is a specialized national TA need.	Targeted/Intensive
ELP and Alternate ELP	Connected to participation and equity for English learners with disabilities.	ELP/Alt ELP findings recur across alignment, reliability, reporting, scoring, and accessibility.	Alternate ELP is an emerging national capacity gap.	Targeted/Intensive
Family/stakeholder engagement	Federal letters increasingly require stakeholder engagement, transparency, public comment, and parent involvement.	Reporting findings include parent-friendly, accessible, multilingual, and alternate-format reporting.	Family engagement is federally relevant, not peripheral.	Universal/Targeted
Peer review readiness & evidence management	1% evidence management includes plans, timelines, public postings, and LEA justifications.	Peer review findings reveal challenges organizing and defending evidence across Critical Elements.	States need reusable evidence repositories and technical documentation support.	Universal templates + Targeted mock review + Intensive submission support

Federal Theme	1% Monitoring Evidence	Peer Review Evidence	Combined Interpretation	TA Tier Implication
Continuous improvement & TAC infrastructure	Federal expectations moved toward measurable improvement and sustained monitoring.	TAC/continuous improvement appears as a peer review domain and maturity marker.	Federal oversight increasingly rewards ongoing systems, not one-time fixes.	Targeted
Postsecondary readiness/outcome validation	Indirect through expectations that AA-AAAS participation has meaningful implications.	Postsecondary readiness is emerging in peer review, including alternate achievement standards and competitive integrated employment.	Outcome validation is a growing technical assistance need.	Targeted/Intensive

Note. Each row is a federal theme integrating evidence from two streams. 1% Monitoring Evidence summarizes findings from federal correspondence on the 1.0% AA-AAAS participation cap (letters dated 2019–2024); Peer Review Evidence summarizes findings from the assessment peer review database (2022–2026); Combined Interpretation states the integrated conclusion drawn across both streams; TA Tier Implication indicates the suggested mix of Universal, Targeted, and Intensive technical assistance for the theme.

Table 14*Emerging National Assessment Center Functions Derived from Peer Review Evidence (Focus on Interventions)*

Center Function	Primary Supporting Domains	Evidence Pattern	TA Products / Services
Assessment Alignment & Validation	Alignment; Assessment Design; Validity	Recurring need across general, alternate, science, and ELP assessments.	Alignment studies; blueprint reviews; remediation plans; cognitive complexity audits.
Science Assessment Development & Validation	Science; Alt Science; Alignment; Validity	Science and alternate science repeatedly remain unresolved when R/LA and math are approved.	NGSS alignment; science blueprint support; science cognitive process studies; DLM science support.
Alternate Assessment Leadership	Alt Science; Governance; Postsecondary; Accessibility	Alternate assessment findings span design, participation policies, achievement standards, and outcomes.	AA-AAAS system reviews; participation policy reviews; standards/ALD supports.
ELP & Alternate ELP Support	ELP; Alt ELP; Reliability; Scoring; Reporting	ACCESS/Alternate ACCESS and state ELP systems repeatedly show alignment, reliability, scoring, and reporting needs.	ELP peer review checklists; Alternate ELP readiness support; scoring protocols; reporting templates.
Postsecondary Readiness Validation	Postsecondary Readiness; Governance	Federal reviewers increasingly ask for evidence that proficiency/alternate proficiency connects to college, career, and employment outcomes.	Longitudinal outcome studies; transition evidence templates; postsecondary readiness validation models.
Monitoring & Security Systems	Monitoring; Security; Accommodations	States often have policies but lack evidence of implementation, monitoring, follow-up, and incident resolution.	Monitoring protocols; incident logs; fidelity checklists; district follow-up templates.
Accessibility & Accommodations	Accessibility; Accommodations; Reporting	Frequent findings include disability DIF, accommodations effectiveness, accessible parent reports, and translation/oral translation.	Accommodation research syntheses; DIF studies; accessible reporting guidelines.
Peer Review Readiness & Evidence Management	TAC / Continuous Improvement; Reporting; Governance	Evidence exists but is often not organized, public, or connected to Critical Elements.	Critical Element crosswalk; evidence inventory; technical report template; mock peer review.
TAC Facilitation & Continuous Improvement	TAC / Continuous Improvement; Validity; Reliability	Peer reviews increasingly request documented TAC review, recommendations, and maintenance cycles.	TAC facilitation; agenda/minute templates; annual technical quality review cycles.
Assessment System Modernization	Assessment Design; Governance; Reporting	SAT, ACT, Cambridge, CAT, local alternatives, and consortium assessments require state-specific ESEA evidence.	High school assessment comparability reviews; CAT alignment checks; vendor evidence crosswalks.

Note. Each row is a proposed National Assessment Center service function derived from federal assessment peer review findings (2022–2026 corpus). Primary Supporting Domains lists the peer review domains that most support the function; Evidence Pattern summarizes the recurring federal finding; TA Products / Services lists the proposed technical-assistance offerings.

Table 15*Crosstabulation of State and Federal (1% and Peer Review) Risk*

State or Jurisdiction	T1S Risk	T5 1% Review	T5 SY	T4 SY	T9 Fed Risk
Alabama	Universal	—	—	—	Targeted
Alaska	Universal	—	—	—	Targeted
American Samoa	Intensive	—	—	—	—
Arizona	Universal	Moderate	2018-19	2018-19	Targeted
Arkansas	Universal	—	—	—	Targeted
Bureau of Indian Education (BIE)	Intensive	—	—	—	Intensive
California	Universal	Moderate	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
Colorado	Targeted	Low	2018-19	2018-19	Intensive
Connecticut	Universal	Moderate	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
Delaware	Universal	High	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
District of Columbia	Intensive	High	2018-19	2018-19	Intensive
Florida	Universal	High	2017-18	2017-18	Intensive
Georgia	Intensive	Critical	2022-23	2022-23	Intensive
Guam	Intensive	—	—	—	—
Hawaii	Universal	Moderate	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
Idaho	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
Illinois	Intensive	High	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
Indiana	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
Iowa	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
Kansas	Targeted	Moderate	2017-18	2017-18	Universal
Kentucky	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
Louisiana	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
Maine	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
Maryland	Targeted	Low	2018-19	2018-19	Intensive
Massachusetts	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
Michigan	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
Minnesota	Universal	Critical	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
Mississippi	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
Missouri	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
Montana	Universal	Moderate	2021-22	2021-22	Targeted
Nebraska	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
Nevada	Intensive	—	—	—	Intensive

State or Jurisdiction	T1S Risk	T5 1% Review	T5 SY	T4 SY	T9 Fed Risk
New Hampshire	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
New Jersey	Universal	Critical	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
New Mexico	Universal	High	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
New York	Targeted	High	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
North Carolina	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
North Dakota	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
Northern Mariana Islands	Intensive	—	—	—	—
Ohio	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
Oklahoma	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
Oregon	Universal	High	2021-22	2021-22	Targeted
Pennsylvania	Universal	Critical	2021-22	2021-22	Targeted
Puerto Rico	Intensive	—	—	—	Intensive
Rhode Island	Intensive	High	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
South Carolina	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
South Dakota	Intensive	—	—	—	Targeted
Tennessee	Targeted	Critical	2022-23	2022-23	Intensive
Texas	Universal	Critical	2022-23	2022-23	Intensive
U.S. Virgin Islands	Intensive	—	—	—	—
Utah	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
Vermont	Intensive	Moderate	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive
Virginia	Universal	Low	2018-19	2018-19	Intensive
Washington	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
West Virginia	Universal	—	—	—	Intensive
Wisconsin	Targeted	—	—	—	Intensive
Wyoming	Intensive	Moderate	2021-22	2021-22	Intensive

Note. N = 57 states and jurisdictions. T1S = Table 1S state triage (BRT review of public state assessment websites); intervention levels are reported as Universal (Level 1), Targeted (Level 2), and Intensive (Levels 3 and 4 combined). T5 = Table 5 scoring matrix and T4 = Table 4 master letter, both derived from federal 1% AA-AAAS correspondence; the risk category and school year (SY) reported are those of the most recent year available for each jurisdiction. T9 = Table 9 federal peer-review risk profile; tiers are Universal/General TA, Targeted/Specialized TA, and Intensive/Sustained TA. Em dashes indicate that the jurisdiction did not appear in that source table.

Because Tables 4 and 5 are drawn from the same federal 1% letter archive, they cover an identical set of 25 jurisdictions and report the same category and school year for each; the 32 jurisdictions without 1% data did not generate a 1% letter.

Table 16*State Profile Summary Across Professional Organizations*

State/System	Coded Signals	Top Recurring Needs	Preliminary TA Implication
National/Multiple	1528	State Governance / Policy (298); Reporting & Data Use (171); Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (168); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (168); Accessibility & Accommodations (146); ELP / Alternate ELP (141)	Targeted/Intensive
Ohio	72	Family / Parent Engagement (12); State Governance / Policy (11); Accessibility & Accommodations (8); Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (8); TAC / Continuous Improvement (8); ELP / Alternate ELP (7)	Targeted/Intensive
Texas	50	State Governance / Policy (12); Accessibility & Accommodations (6); Assessment Modernization (6); Human Capacity / Staffing (5); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (5); Procurement / Vendor Management (5)	Targeted/Intensive
Nebraska	50	TAC / Continuous Improvement (14); State Governance / Policy (12); Reporting & Data Use (8); Procurement / Vendor Management (4); Science Assessment (4); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (4)	Targeted/Intensive
Oregon	45	Family / Parent Engagement (8); State Governance / Policy (7); KEA / Early Learning (7); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (4); TAC / Continuous Improvement (4); Accessibility & Accommodations (4)	Targeted/Intensive
New Mexico	42	KEA / Early Learning (10); Reporting & Data Use (7); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (6); Accessibility & Accommodations (5); ELP / Alternate ELP (5); State Governance / Policy (5)	Targeted/Intensive
Hawaii	39	State Governance / Policy (10); Accessibility & Accommodations (5); Human Capacity / Staffing (4); Science Assessment (4); Assessment Modernization (4); Reporting & Data Use (3)	Targeted/Intensive
Virginia	32	Reporting & Data Use (8); KEA / Early Learning (8); State Governance / Policy (5); Family / Parent Engagement (5); Accessibility & Accommodations (2); ELP / Alternate ELP (2)	Targeted/Intensive
Arizona	30	Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (7); State Governance / Policy (7); TAC / Continuous Improvement (5); Accessibility & Accommodations (3); Assessment Modernization (3); Reporting & Data Use (2)	Targeted/Intensive

State/System	Coded Signals	Top Recurring Needs	Preliminary TA Implication
Maryland	29	KEA / Early Learning (7); State Governance / Policy (5); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (4); Accessibility & Accommodations (4); Reporting & Data Use (4); ELP / Alternate ELP (3)	Targeted/Intensive
North Carolina	27	Reporting & Data Use (5); KEA / Early Learning (5); State Governance / Policy (4); Human Capacity / Staffing (3); Assessment Modernization (3); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (3)	Targeted/Intensive
Washington	24	KEA / Early Learning (9); Family / Parent Engagement (8); State Governance / Policy (5); Reporting & Data Use (1); Accessibility & Accommodations (1)	Targeted/Intensive
Montana	22	State Governance / Policy (6); Assessment Modernization (5); Reporting & Data Use (3); Human Capacity / Staffing (3); Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (3); Accessibility & Accommodations (1)	Targeted/Intensive
Massachusetts	21	State Governance / Policy (5); Assessment Modernization (3); Science Assessment (3); KEA / Early Learning (3); Procurement / Vendor Management (2); Human Capacity / Staffing (2)	Targeted/Intensive
Indiana	20	Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (4); Assessment Modernization (4); Human Capacity / Staffing (3); State Governance / Policy (3); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (2); Procurement / Vendor Management (2)	Targeted/Intensive
Maine	18	Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (4); State Governance / Policy (4); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (3); Reporting & Data Use (2); Human Capacity / Staffing (2); Science Assessment (2)	Targeted
California	18	State Governance / Policy (4); Accessibility & Accommodations (3); Human Capacity / Staffing (3); ELP / Alternate ELP (3); Reporting & Data Use (2); Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (1)	Targeted
Rhode Island	17	Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (5); State Governance / Policy (5); Human Capacity / Staffing (3); Reporting & Data Use (2); Accessibility & Accommodations (1); KEA / Early Learning (1)	Targeted
Kansas	15	State Governance / Policy (4); ELP / Alternate ELP (3); Accessibility & Accommodations (2); Reporting & Data Use (2); Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (1); Science Assessment (1)	Targeted
Florida	15	Reporting & Data Use (4); Family / Parent Engagement (3); ELP / Alternate ELP (3); State Governance / Policy (2); KEA / Early Learning (2); Assessment Modernization (1)	Targeted

State/System	Coded Signals	Top Recurring Needs	Preliminary TA Implication
Arkansas	14	Accessibility & Accommodations (3); Human Capacity / Staffing (3); State Governance / Policy (3); Family / Parent Engagement (2); KEA / Early Learning (2); Reporting & Data Use (1)	Targeted
Minnesota	14	Reporting & Data Use (4); Human Capacity / Staffing (3); State Governance / Policy (3); Accessibility & Accommodations (1); Family / Parent Engagement (1); Assessment Modernization (1)	Targeted
Delaware	14	Science Assessment (4); State Governance / Policy (4); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (2); Assessment Modernization (2); Accessibility & Accommodations (1); KEA / Early Learning (1)	Targeted
South Carolina	14	KEA / Early Learning (5); Reporting & Data Use (4); Family / Parent Engagement (3); Accessibility & Accommodations (1); State Governance / Policy (1)	Targeted
Georgia	13	Accessibility & Accommodations (3); ELP / Alternate ELP (3); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (3); State Governance / Policy (3); KEA / Early Learning (1)	Targeted
Utah	12	State Governance / Policy (3); Accessibility & Accommodations (2); Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (2); TAC / Continuous Improvement (2); Human Capacity / Staffing (1); Reporting & Data Use (1)	Targeted
District of Columbia	12	Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (3); Human Capacity / Staffing (3); Science Assessment (3); State Governance / Policy (2); KEA / Early Learning (1)	Targeted
Alabama	11	Assessment Modernization (4); State Governance / Policy (4); Human Capacity / Staffing (1); Accessibility & Accommodations (1); KEA / Early Learning (1)	Targeted
Illinois	11	State Governance / Policy (4); Alternate Assessment / AA-AAAS (3); Human Capacity / Staffing (2); Reporting & Data Use (1); KEA / Early Learning (1)	Targeted
Kentucky	9	Reporting & Data Use (2); State Governance / Policy (2); Family / Parent Engagement (2); KEA / Early Learning (2); Accessibility & Accommodations (1)	Targeted
Colorado	9	Reporting & Data Use (3); State Governance / Policy (3); Accessibility & Accommodations (1); ELP / Alternate ELP (1); KEA / Early Learning (1)	Targeted
New York	7	Reporting & Data Use (3); State Governance / Policy (2); Accessibility & Accommodations (1); Family / Parent Engagement (1)	Universal/Targeted
Louisiana	7	KEA / Early Learning (2); State Governance / Policy (2); Reporting & Data Use (1); Family / Parent Engagement (1); Technical Documentation / Evidence Management (1)	Universal/Targeted

State/System	Coded Signals	Top Recurring Needs	Preliminary TA Implication
Mississippi	7	Reporting & Data Use (2); Family / Parent Engagement (2); KEA / Early Learning (2); State Governance / Policy (1)	Universal/Targeted
West Virginia	5	Reporting & Data Use (2); State Governance / Policy (2); Family / Parent Engagement (1)	Universal/Targeted
Wyoming	5	Reporting & Data Use (2); State Governance / Policy (2); Assessment Modernization (1)	Universal/Targeted
Oklahoma	5	Family / Parent Engagement (2); KEA / Early Learning (2); Reporting & Data Use (1)	Universal/Targeted
BIE	4	Accessibility & Accommodations (1); Reporting & Data Use (1); Human Capacity / Staffing (1); State Governance / Policy (1)	Universal/Targeted
Iowa	4	KEA / Early Learning (2); Reporting & Data Use (1); State Governance / Policy (1)	Universal/Targeted
Connecticut	3	Reporting & Data Use (1); KEA / Early Learning (1); State Governance / Policy (1)	Universal/Targeted
Missouri	3	Human Capacity / Staffing (1); KEA / Early Learning (1); State Governance / Policy (1)	Universal/Targeted
Nevada	2	Family / Parent Engagement (1); KEA / Early Learning (1)	Universal/Targeted

Note. Coded Signals indicates the number of demand signals coded for each state or system. Values in parentheses within Top Recurring Needs report the frequency with which each theme was coded. TA = technical assistance.