



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Johnny Key  
Commissioner of Education  
Arkansas Department of Education  
Four Capitol Mall, Room 304-A  
Little Rock, AR 72201

January 13, 2017

Dear Commissioner Key:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in April and August 2016. As you know, State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals, and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness, and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

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

- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (National Center and State Collaborative/Multi-State Alternate Assessment (NCSC/MSAA)) in grades 3-8 and high school: **Partially meets requirements**

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

The specific list of items required for ADE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State's component has partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Ann Whalen  
Senior Advisor to the Secretary  
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Hope Allen, Director of Student Assessment

**Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed to Meet the Requirements for Arkansas’s Assessment System**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>1.5 – Participation Data</b>	For the State assessment system, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that shows the number of students tested and enrolled, disaggregated by student groups, for each required assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence to support the NCSC/MSAA test design criteria for the writing portion of the R/LA AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</li> </ul>
<b>2.3 – Test Administration</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ADE has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide to address technology-related contingency plans.</li> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</li> <li>○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State applies the test monitoring procedures for its general assessment test administration to the alternate assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has policies and procedures in place for its statewide assessment system to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, in terms of:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies and procedures to safeguard student privacy and data integrity at interfaces among the State, vendor, districts, and schools; and</li> <li>○ Policies and procedures to protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups (e.g., State, district and school report cards).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measures the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (including writing as previously noted in 2.1). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</li> </ul>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Additional Evidence Needed</b>
<b>Cognitive Processes</b>	
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically how the test meets IRT assumptions of test unidimensionality.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in R/LA and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Documentation that the IRT model-data fit issue described in critical element 3.3 has been resolved.</li> </ul>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b>	For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	For NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are provided as an accommodation or an analysis of the comparability of the meaning and interpretation of the assessment results across the technology-based and paper-based versions of the assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	For NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	For NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that it provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (NCSC/MSAA) to IEP teams, educators, parents, and other stakeholders.</li> <li>• Evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed of any possible consequences of taking alternate</li> </ul>

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments).
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including English Learners</b>	<p>For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners; and,</li> <li>○ Evidence that procedures were clearly communicated to parents.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	<p>For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the accommodations provided: (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available.</li> <li>• Evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b>	<p>For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has procedures for monitoring the administration of test accommodations to ensure that they are administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>
<b>6.4 – Reporting</b>	<p>For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> <li>• Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> </ul>

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

## August, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

# STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

## Contents

<b>SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .....	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards .....	4
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only) .....	5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only) .....	6
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only) .....	8
<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	9
2.2 – Item Development.....	10
2.3 – Test Administration .....	11
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only) .....	13
2.5 – Test Security.....	14
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	17
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY .....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	18
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	19
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....	20
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....	21
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER.....</b>	<b>22</b>
4.1 – Reliability.....	22
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	23
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum .....	24
4.4 – Scoring.....	25
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms.....	26
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....	27
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	28
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....	29
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs .....	34
5.3 – Accommodations.....	36
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations .....	38
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING 40</b>	
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students.....	40
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting .....	42
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....	43
6.4 – Reporting.....	44

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

### SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p><b>ARK 1.1</b> SBE_July_2010Adoption of CCSS  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/SBE_2012_to_1995/SBE_2010/SBE_July_2010.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/SBE_2012_to_1995/SBE_2010/SBE_July_2010.pdf</a> (p.5)</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided that the State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p><b>ARK 1.2-a</b> <a href="http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/">http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/</a> English Language Arts Curriculum Framework Documents</p> <p><b>ARK 1.2-b</b> <a href="http://www.corestandards.org/Math/">http://www.corestandards.org/Math/</a> Mathematics Curriculum Framework Documents</p> <p><b>ARK 1.2-c</b> Arkansas Department of Education Rules Governing the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) and the Academic Distress Program September 2014  <i>**Section 9.13.1 Updated 03/18/16 Section 4.01, 4.06,</i>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf</a></p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided for this critical element for AA-AAAS Math &amp; ELA.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>ARK 1.3 Arkansas Department of Education Rules Governing the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) and the Academic Distress Program September 2014 **Section 9.13.1 Updated 03/18/16 Section 5.02.5  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf</a></p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided regarding this element by the State.</p>
<b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>  </u>x<u>  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>ARK 1.4 Arkansas Department of Education Rules Governing the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) and the Academic Distress Program September 2014 **Section 9.13.1 Updated 03/18/16 Sections 3.11, 5.0, 5.02, 5.02.1, 5.02.2, 5.02.3, 5.02.4, 5.02.5, 5.02.5.1, 5.02.5.2, 5.02.5.4, 5.02.5.5  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016</a>.</p>	<p>Sufficient evidence was provided regarding this element by the State.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.		
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
__x_ No additional evidence is required.		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>ARK 1.5 Arkansas Accountability Addendum Final page 11 and page 24</p>	<p>the evidence submitted did not include participation rate data. State evidence included procedures for calculating and reporting participation, but no reports indicating the counts of students tested and enrolled.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p>X Additional evidence is required. *Evidence that shows the number of students tested and enrolled, disaggregated by student groups, for each required assessment.</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

### SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> </ul>	See NCSC submitted evidence	See NCSC peer review notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> </ul>	See NCSC submitted evidence	See NCSC peer review notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> </ul>	See NCSC submitted evidence	See NCSC peer review notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	See NCSC submitted evidence	See NCSC peer review notes
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 2.3, 2.3.a-2</b> Spring 2015 Arkansas Assessment Training Power point</p> <p><b>ARK 2.3, 2.3.a-2</b> Spring 2015 Arkansas Assessment Training Power point</p> <p><b>ARK 2.3, 2.3.a-3</b> PARCC Testing Updates and Accommodations Overview (p. 41-52)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State provided some PARCC evidence. Peers are not sure if the same processes are applied to AA-AAAS. If not, state has to provide evidence for this element (e.g. administration with accommodations)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 2.3, 2.3.a-2</b> Spring 2015 Arkansas Assessment Training Power point</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State provided some evidence for Science. Peers are not sure if the same processes are applied to AA-AAAS. If not, state has to provide evidence for this element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>No state-specific evidence was found showing that state established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> <li>State provided some evidence for Science and or PARCC. Peers are not sure if the same processes are applied to AA-AAAS. If not, state has to provide evidence for this element.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NCSC or state needs to provide evidence that state established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>ARK 2.4.c General assessment Monitor Training Power point Slides 3, 11, 14, 15, 18-37, 57</p>	<p>State submitted evidence of training for test monitors that indicates that monitoring of test administration takes place. However, the evidence submitted was for the State’s general assessments in R/LA and mathematics. It is not clear if this evidence applies to the assessment under review (AA-AAAS) in this peer review.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State applies the test monitoring protocols for its general assessment for the alternate assessments that are part of this review.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 2.5, 2.5.a-1</b> Augmented Benchmark Examination at Grades 5 and 7 Science and Iowa Assessments™ at Grades 1–2 April 2015 District and School Test Coordinators’ Manual Test Security Guidelines page (p.20-25)</p> <p><a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/2015/Iowa_District_School_Test_Coordinators_Manual.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/2015/Iowa_District_School_Test_Coordinators_Manual.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 2.5, 2.5.a-2</b> Arkansas Department of Education Rules Governing the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) and the Academic Distress Program September 2014 <i>**Section 9.13.1 Updated 03/18/16</i> <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf</a> (section 5.07)</p> <p><b>ARK 2.5, 2.5.a-3</b> Testing Irregularities, Security Breaches, Ethics Violations, Alerts Process Training</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detection of test irregularities;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 2.5.b-1</b> Augmented Benchmark Examination at Grades 5 and 7 Science and Iowa Assessments™ at Grades 1–2 April 2015 District and School Test Coordinators’ Manual Training page 14, security page 20-22</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/2015/Iowa_District_School_Test_Coordinators_Manual.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/2015/Iowa_District_School_Test_Coordinators_Manual.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 2.5.b-2</b> Current ACTAAP Rules  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf</a>                      Section 5.07</p> <p><b>ARK 2.5.b-3</b> Testing Impropriety Reporting (p.8)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 2.5.c</b> Arkansas Department of Education Rules Governing the Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program (ACTAAP) and the Academic Distress Program September 2014  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf</a>                      (section 5.07)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 2.5.d-1</b> Augmented Benchmark Examination at Grades 5 and 7 Science and Iowa Assessments™ at Grades 1–2. April 2015 District and School Test Coordinators’ Manual  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/2015/Iowa_District_School_Test_Coordinators_Manual.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/2015/Iowa_District_School_Test_Coordinators_Manual.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 2.5.d-2</b> ACTAAP Rules and Regulations  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/rules/Current/2016/ACTAAP_ER_March_2016.pdf</a>                      (section 5.07)</p> <p><b>ARK 2.5.b-3</b> Testing Impropriety Reporting (p.8)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 2.6.b</b> Arkansas Accountability Addendum Final page 21 Statistical Reliability and Protection of Students’ Privacy (p.21)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>No state-specific evidence was found showing that appropriate procedures had been developed to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of student level data.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 2.6.c</b> Arkansas Accountability Addendum Final page 21 Statistical Reliability and Protection of Students’ Privacy (p.21)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> <li>NCSC or state needs to provide evidence showing that appropriate procedures had been developed to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of student level data</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

### SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 4.7-a</b> Test Monitor Checklist PARCC Spring Online 2015 <u>Grades 3-8, ELA Grade 9-10, Geometry, Algebra I and Algebra II (optional), Grade 11 Literacy (optional)</u> Arkansas Department of Education—Student Assessment questions (p.13-15)</p> <p><b>ARK 4.7-b</b> PARCC Monitor Training 2015</p> <p><b>ARK 4.7-c</b> Monitoring Summary Report for 2015 Testing</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State provided some evidence for monitoring testing for PARCC. Peers are not sure if the same processes are applied to AA-AAAS. If not, state has to provide evidence for this element.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> <li>• State provided some evidence for PARCC. Peers are not sure if the same processes are applied to AA-AAAS. If not, state has to provide evidence for this element</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

### SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> </ul>		<p>Peers did not find evidence clearly explaining the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards. If AA-AAAS students do not receive the same diploma as regular students, state needs to provide evidence for this element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 5.1.b</b>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf</a> (p.8, 19-20)</p>	<p>State-specific evidence was found for this element.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.b</b>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf</a> (p.22)</p> <p>ARK 5.1.c-1 Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for Arkansas Alternate Assessment Program</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found for this element.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf</a> (Appendix A)</p> <p>ARK 5.1.c-2 Arkansas Alternate Portfolio Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities Grades 5, 7, and 10 Science Administration Manual</p> <p><a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/FINAL_2015_2016_APA_Manual_Gr5_7_10_Science.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/FINAL_2015_2016_APA_Manual_Gr5_7_10_Science.pdf</a> (p.8-10)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.d-1a</b> Accommodations in Assessment Center for Parent Information and Resources on SPED <a href="https://arksped.k12.ar.us/Resources/parentResourceLinks.html">https://arksped.k12.ar.us/Resources/parentResourceLinks.html</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.d-1b</b> Supports, Modifications, and Accommodations for Students Center for Parent Information and Resources <a href="http://www.parentcenterhub.org/topics/accommodations/">http://www.parentcenterhub.org/topics/accommodations/</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.d-2</b> Supports, Modifications, and Accommodations for Students Center for Parent Information and Resources a.mht <a href="http://www.parentcenterhub.org/resources/">http://www.parentcenterhub.org/resources/</a></p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.e-1</b> Accommodations in Assessment Center for Parent Information and Resources.mht <a href="https://arksped.k12.ar.us/Resources/">https://arksped.k12.ar.us/Resources/</a></p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="#">parentResourcesLinks.html</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.e-2</b> Supports, Modifications, and Accommodations for Students Center for Parent Information and Resources a.mht  <a href="http://www.parentcenterhub.org/?s=supports%2C+modifications">http://www.parentcenterhub.org/?s=supports%2C+modifications</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.e-3</b> GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSMENT ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (p.3-5)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.f-1</b> Questions Often Asked by Parents about Special Education Services Center for Parent Information and Resources.mht  <a href="https://arksped.k12.ar.us/Resources/parentFAQ.html">https://arksped.k12.ar.us/Resources/parentFAQ.html</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.f-2</b> Categories of Disabilities under IDEA  <a href="http://www.parentcenterhub.org/repository/categories/">http://www.parentcenterhub.org/repository/categories/</a></p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 5.1.g-1</b> Grade 3 Parent Brochure  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_3_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_3_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.g-2</b> Grade 4 Parent Brochure  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_4_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_4_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.g-3</b> Grade 5 Parent Brochure  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_5_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_5_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.g-4</b> Grade 6 Parent Brochure</p>	<p>If AA-AAAS students do not receive the same diploma as regular students, peers need to see the evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_6_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_6_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.g-5</b> Grade 7 Parent Brochure  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_7_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_7_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.g-6</b> Grade 8 Parent Brochure  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_8_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_8_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.g-7</b> Grade 11 Parent Brochure  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_11_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_11_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</a></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.h</b>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf</a> (p.7)</p> <p><b>ARK 5.1.b</b>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Guidance_for_IEP_Teams_on_Alternate_Assessment_2015-2016.pdf</a> (p.2)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If AA-AAAS students do not receive the same diploma as regular students, state needs to provide evidence:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clearly explaining the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments)</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.2, 5.2.a</b> Accessibility Features and Accommodations for EL Students AR PARCC EL Accommodations.pdf pages (p.27-29)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State provided evidences of procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system but those are for PARCC. In addition, state did not provide evidence that procedures were clearly communicated to parents.</p> <p>State-specific evidence was not found for Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation. NCSC or state needs to submit evidence for this.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.2.c</b> Accessibility Features and Accommodations for EL Students AR PARCC EL Accommodations.pdf pages (p.27-28)(table 6, p.45-46)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State needs to confirm that procedures presented in the PARCC document can be also applied to AA-AAAS. If not, state needs to provide evidence for that</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>element. In addition, state needs to show that procedures are clearly communicated to parents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NCSC or state needs to submit evidence of procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation</li> </ul>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.3, 5.3.a-1</b> Accommodations in Assessment Center for Parent Information and Resources.mht  <a href="http://www.parentcenterhub.org/repository/az-disability-accommodations/">http://www.parentcenterhub.org/repository/az-disability-accommodations/</a></p> <p><b>ARK 5.3, 5.3.a-3</b> ADE 2015 Spring Test Training ADE Science Iowa Slides (p.22-33)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.3.b-2</b> ACTAAP_ER_March_2016Laws for Assessment.pdf (section 5.02.5.4)</p> <p><b>ARK 5.3.b-3</b> AR PARCC EL Accommodations.pdf</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was not found for this element. NCSC or state needs to submit evidence for this</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 5.3.c</b> Guidelines for Assessment Accommodations for Students with Disabilities (p.3-4)</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was not found for this element. NCSC or state needs to submit evidence for this</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 5.3.d-1</b> Special Accommodations Request form</p>	<p>State-specific evidence was found for this element However, ARK 5.3.d-1 only have check boxes for</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.	<b>ARK 5.3.d-2</b> PARCC Unique Accommodations Request form	IEP and 504. ARK 5.3.d-2 has check boxes for all types but for PARCC.
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> <li>• NCSC or state needs to submit evidence showing that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ state ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners</li> <li>○ state has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>○ has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 5.4.a</b> ADE 2015 Spring Test training Science.Iowa (p.34-35)</p>	<p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 5.4.b</b> ADE 2015 Spring Test training Science.Iowa (p.23-28)</p>	<p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 5.4.b</b> ADE 2015 Spring Test training Science.Iowa (p.23)</p>	<p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 5.4.b</b> ADE 2015 Spring Test training Science.Iowa (p.23-33)</p>	<p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 5.4.b</b> ADE 2015 Spring Test training Science.Iowa (p.34-41)</p>	<p>The state provided evidence for this element but that is for Science/PARCC.</p> <p>Documentation of monitoring from a previous year was provided in “ARK 4.7-c Monitoring Summary Report 2015.xlsx”</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>_X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> <li>• State needs to provide evidence showing that accommodations are administered with fidelity to test administration for AA-AAAS</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

### SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p><b>ARK 6.4, 6.4.a</b> ACTAAP_ER_March_2016Laws for Assessment.pdf  <u>Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program and the Academic Distress Program (PDF) (p.19-20)</u></p>	<p>State-specific evidence was found.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> </ul>		<p>NA for this review.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li></ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.b-1</b> PARCC Communication Toolkit  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/test_scores/PARCC/Arkansas_Communication_Toolkit_for_PARCC_Scores.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/test_scores/PARCC/Arkansas_Communication_Toolkit_for_PARCC_Scores.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.b-2</b> NCSC Guide for Score Report Interpretation for Arkansas for 2015  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/NCSC_Guide_for_Score_Report_Interpretation_for_Arkansas_Final_2015.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/NCSC_Guide_for_Score_Report_Interpretation_for_Arkansas_Final_2015.pdf</a></p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>State-specific evidence was found for this element</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC submitted evidence</p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.c-1</b>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/NCSC_Guide_for_Score_Report_Interpretation_for_Arkansas_Final_2015.pdf">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/NCSC_Guide_for_Score_Report_Interpretation_for_Arkansas_Final_2015.pdf</a></p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.c-2</b> Grade 3 Parent Brochure 2015 NCSC  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Gr">http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Gr</a></p>	<p>See NCSC peer review notes</p> <p>No evidence was found that reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand. NCSC or state needs to produce those reports</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</li> </ul>	<p><a href="#"><u>ade 3 Parent Brochure 2015 NCSC.pdf</u></a></p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.c-3</b> <a href="#"><u>Grade 4 Parent Brochure 2015 NCSC</u></a>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_4_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf"><u>http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_4_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</u></a></p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.c-4</b> <a href="#"><u>Grade 5 Parent Brochure 2015 NCSC</u></a>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_5_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf"><u>http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_5_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</u></a></p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.c-5</b> <a href="#"><u>Grade 6 Parent Brochure 2015 NCSC</u></a>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_6_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf"><u>http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_6_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</u></a></p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.c-6</b> <a href="#"><u>Grade 7 Parent Brochure 2015 NCSC</u></a>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_7_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf"><u>http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_7_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</u></a></p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.c-7</b> <a href="#"><u>Grade 8 Parent Brochure 2015 NCSC</u></a>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_8_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf"><u>http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_8_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</u></a></p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.c-8</b> <a href="#"><u>Grade 11 Parent Brochure 2015 NCSC</u></a>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_11_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf"><u>http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/Disabilities/Grade_11_Parent_Brochure_2015_NCSC.pdf</u></a></p> <p><b>ARK 6.4.c-9</b>  <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/2015/Arkansas_PARCC_Results_for_Students_in_Grades_3_through_8_and_High_School_Final_1.pdf"><u>http://www.arkansased.gov/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/2015/Arkansas_PARCC_Results_for_Students_in_Grades_3_through_8_and_High_School_Final_1.pdf</u></a></p>	

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	ARK 6.4.c-10 State Report Card <a href="http://www.arkansased.gov/divisions/public-school-accountability/school-performance/report-card">http://www.arkansased.gov/divisions/public-school-accountability/school-performance/report-card</a>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</li> </ul>	<b>ARK 6.4.d</b> ACTAAP_ER_March_2016Laws for Assessment.pdf <a href="#">Arkansas Comprehensive Testing, Assessment and Accountability Program and the Academic Distress Program (PDF)</a>	Evidence of process was found but evidence of the timeline was not.
<b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See NCSC peer review notes for any potential additional requirements</li> <li>NCSC or state needs to provide evidence showing that reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</li> <li>State needs to provide a timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration</li> </ul>		

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

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

## April 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the NCSC Assessment Consortium



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT  
CONSORTIUM**

Contents

<b>SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1 – Test Design and Development.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.2 – Item Development.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.5 – Test Security .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.1 – Reliability.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4.4 – Scoring .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students     .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>6.4 – Reporting.....</b>	<b>32</b>

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.1</p> <p><u>Purpose</u>  <b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);</b> p. 8.</p> <p><b>NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation;</b> p. 1.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,</b> Chapter 1 Introduction to the NCSC System; p. 8.</p> <p><u>Intended Interpretation and uses of results</u>  <b>NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation;</b> pp. 9-12.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,</b> Chapter 9 Reporting Interpretation and Use; pp. 184-189.</p> <p><u>Description of the structure of the assessment</u>  <b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);</b> pp. 8-13.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,</b> Chapter 2 Test Development; see especially pp. 9-24.</p> <p><u>Test blueprints</u>  <b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,</b> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 62-65, and Appendices 2K and 2L.</p>	<p>On page 8 of the test administration manual and page 1 of the Score Guide, the purpose listed as to participation in an assessment that is a measure of what they know and can do in relation to the CCSS.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15:</b> Matrix by Users by Report displays the overall reporting structure. NCSC15, pg. 184. It is not clear to what extent the interdisciplinary team that developed the report design template included teachers and other school personnel working directly with students.</p> <p><b>NCSC10</b> pg.12. When reviewing scores by another person, it may be helpful to communicate with the TA that gave the test to gain information that is useful in interpreting the scores.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15</b> (Appendix 2-M): item selection methods - referred to tiers: Items were presented as a series of items tapping progressively higher levels of a construct based on increasing tier and difficulty information from Pilot Phase 1. It would be helpful to explain the tier development process and what this means -is it related to DOK?</p> <p>NCSC15. NCSC partners approved 10 math targets per grade level, 7-9 reading targets per grade level, and 3 writing targets per grade level. (pp.21) How did the development partner go about selecting passages for grade level and complexity of the tests. More specificity of the process and how this was reviewed by teachers is needed.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b>, Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 9-59.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b>, Appendix 2-M</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b>, Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 80-82. Appendix 3B.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b>, Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 136-137.</p> <p><b>NCSC 8: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrators</b>, Description of interface and assessment features; pp. 58</p> <p>The consortium does not administer computer adaptive assessments. Not applicable to NCSC AA-AAS</p>	
<b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-AAorder thinking skills.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.2</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,</b>  <u>Approach to test design and defining the construct</u>            Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 10-22</p> <p><u>Developing the item model</u>            Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 22-28</p> <p><u>Item Review</u>            Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 31-24</p> <p><u>Item data reviews</u>            Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 52-57</p> <p><u>Technical platform and assessment features</u>            Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 35-36</p> <p><u>Form assembly procedures and specifications</u>            Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 65-59</p> <p><u>Operational blueprints</u>            Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendices 2K, 2L, and 2M.</p> <p><u>Item specifications reflected in exemplar design pattern and task template</u>            Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-z</p>	<p>NCSC 15: Test blueprints reflect the development and emphasis of content in the college and career ready standards. Perhaps the blueprints should also include level(s) of cognition which are operationally defined.</p> <p>In the document referenced, it is not clear how the tiers relate to DOK.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State: 2.3.a</p> <p>Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</p>	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.2</p> <p>Standardized procedures for assessment administration; accessibility tools, features, and accommodations</p> <p>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015)</p> <p>Standardized procedures for assessment administration pp. 9, 10, 12-28</p> <p>Accessibility tools and features, including use of reader pp. 9, 15, 21-23</p> <p>Instructions for accommodations, including use of scribe pp. 9, 15-16, 21-24, 36-37</p> <p>Expectations for training and test security regarding test administration with readers and scribes NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity</li> <li>• Module 3: Optimal Testing Conditions and Assessment Features</li> <li>• Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration</li> </ul> <p>Standardized procedures for assessment administration, (continued) NCSC 3: Directions for Test Administration: Tables of Contents and Front Matter for Mathematics and English Language Arts - Reading Grades 3 – 8 and 11</p>	<p>In the training modules for test administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quizzes would be stronger if they have at least four questions; some modules had only 2 questions.</li> <li>• Quizzes would provide more useful information if the test taker needed to complete the training to answer all the questions.</li> </ul> <p>Invalidation is not defined. As a part of training, it would help users to have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of situations that warrant invalidation.</li> <li>• Clarification of the invalidation decision-making process.</li> </ul> <p>Training would be stronger if it reflected a policy requirement that all students take sample items to learn functionality and format for both online and paper versions of the test.</p>
--	---	--

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<p>2.3.b Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</p>	<p>NCSC coordinated evidence for all States</p> <p>Expectations for NCSC Online Test Administration Training Requirements for Test Administrators and Test Coordinators NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 17, 19</p> <p>NCSC 7: Directions for Test Administration of Mathematics Sample Items Grades 3, 6, 11 and Directions for Test Administration of English Language Arts - Reading Sample Items Grades 4, 8, 11</p> <p>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators Module 1: Training Requirements and Responsibilities of Test Administrators Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity Module 3: Optimal Testing Conditions and Assessment Features Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration Module 5: Navigate the Assessment System Module 6: Before Test: Complete Demographics, LCI, and Accommodations Module 7: Student Response Check Module 8: Student Experience in the NCSC Assessment System Module 9: Mathematics DTA – Administer the Test Module 10: ELA DTA – Administer the Test Module 13: Submitting or Closing a Test, Accommodations- After Test, and End of Test Survey</p> <p>NCSC 6: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators Module 1: Responsibilities of Test Coordinators Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity</p>	<p>NCSC 5. The submission for peer review does not include the field test constructed response items in the ELA Writing assessment. Therefore, Modules 11 and 12, which pertain to the field test constructed response ELA Writing items are expected to be included with the training modules in NCSC 5.</p> <p>It is not clear in situations in which a TC is also a TA, whether he/she is required to also complete the required training for TAs as well as pass the required quiz prior to having access to the test.</p>
<p>Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.</p>		
<p align="center">7</p> <p>Documentation of procedures to ensure that test administrators and coordinators access and complete</p>		

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

<p>2.3.c If the State administers technology-based assessments,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the State has defined technology and other related requirements,</li> <li>(ii) included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and</li> <li>(iii) established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>NCSC coordinated evidence for all States</p> <p>Defined technology and related requirements NCSC 8: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 66-67</p> <p>NCSC 9: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Coordinators; pp. 72-73</p> <p>Technology-based standardized test administration procedures NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 9- 18, and 21-34</p> <p>Contingency plans that outline strategies for managing possible challenges or disruptions during test administration NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015); pp. 16, 19, 35</p> <p>NCSC 8: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Administrator; p. 2</p> <p>NCSC 9: NCSC Assessment System User Guide for Test Coordinator; p. 6</p>	<p>In its current form, the only contingency plan is to directly call the help desk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A troubleshooting guide would provide valuable support to users for addressing technology-related issues (e.g., loss of connectivity, power failure) before calling the contractor.</li> <li>• It is not clear whether there is redundancy in the system that saves and restores student responses in the event of tech problems.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>Evidence of consistent standardized procedures that address (unless determined to be State-specific evidence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test administration instructions and training that address rules for invalidating test results when necessary</li> <li>• Ensuring that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality including sample items before test administration</li> </ul> <p>Evidence of contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.5</p> <p><u>Test security procedures before, during and after test administration</u>  <b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);</b> pp. 15-16,18-19, 25-28, and 36-37</p> <p><u>Incident-reporting procedures and consequences</u>  <b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);</b> p. 28</p> <p><u>Requirements for annual test security training for Test Administrators and Test Coordinators</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);</b> pp. 17, 19, 25</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity</li> </ul> <p><b>NCSC 6: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity</li> </ul>	<p>The process for refreshing items and test forms is not clear which has implications for test security, especially when parts of the test are printed.</p> <p>NCSC should have processes and procedures for preventing, detecting, reporting, investigating, and remediating assessment irregularities or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  Evidence that NCSC has processes and procedures for preventing, detecting, reporting, investigating, and remediating assessment irregularities or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence (unless determined to be State-specific evidence).</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 2.6</p> <p><u>Integrity and confidentiality of test materials, test-related data, and PII</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual, Appendix 2-C: Design for Technical Platform for NCSC Assessment System</b>, p. 15 of 25 (in page navigation) “System Security Layers”</p>	<p>The consortium indicated that the Vendor contracts with States had security requirements for data handling and redress options were not provided to verify. Appropriately redacted test contracts may be needed.</p> <p>The Amazon Web Services (AWS) secure global infrastructure and services are subject to regular third-party compliance audits (NCSC 15 p.13). Most of the cited evidence is a NCSC Glossary.</p> <p>It is unclear how “System Security Layers” protect the integrity of test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that the NSCS has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence (unless determined to be State-specific evidence).</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.1</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,</b> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 9-69.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,</b> <u>Relationship of the Core Content Connectors (CCCs) to grade level academic content standards</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 72-75 and Appendix 3-B, Study 1.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,</b> <u>Alignment of the tasks and items to grade-level CCSS</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 77-80 and Appendix 3-B, Study 3.</p> <p><u>Alignment of NCSC items to the performance level descriptors (PLDs)</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 80-82 and Appendix 3-B, Study 4.</p>	<p>The consortium provided a range of studies that was clear and well documented of the iterative process used to address this area. As part of this process, the consortium demonstrated the breadth of content and cognitive complexity as appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.2</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual,</b> Chapter 2 Test Development</p> <p><u>Interaction Studies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Student and teacher interaction with task templates pp. 57-58</li> <li>- Student interaction with and teacher perception of mathematics and reading items pp. 58-59</li> </ul> <p>End of test survey: data collection and analyses; pp. 59-60, and 62</p> <p>Writing evaluation study; p. 61</p> <p><u>Item specifications reflected in exemplar design pattern and task template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A</p>	<p>It is unclear how the end of test survey questions informed test administration.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.3  <b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>DIF analyses</u>            Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and construct-Related Validity; summarized pp. 177-179 and detailed in appendix 8-C</p> <p><u>Analyses of item statistics by tier</u>            Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses            Classical statistics; pp. 120-121, and IRT parameters; pp. 136-127</p> <p><u>Classical Statics and Reliability</u>            Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and construct-Related Validity; Appendix 8-A</p> <p><u>Dimensionality analyses</u>            Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and construct-Related Validity; pp. 179-183</p>	<p>DIMTEST and DETECT analyses were applied to all grades and content areas.</p> <p>All the DETECT values for 2014-15 indicated moderate to strong and very strong multidimensionality (p.182). It appears that a major IRT assumption is violated.</p> <p>NCSC has identified multidimensionality as a critical issue to be addressed with their TAC and member states.</p>
<p><b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            Evidence that documents how apparent violations of the IRT assumption of test unidimensionality have been sufficiently addressed and remediated for future test administrations.            Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 3.4  <b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Alignment between knowledge, skills, and abilities in assessment to student learning expectations for instruction</u>                      Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 75-76 and Appendix 3-B, Study 2.</p> <p><u>Vertical coherence study</u>                      Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 82-84 and Appendix 3-B, Study 5.</p>	
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      Evidence for 3.1-3.4 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.1</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Test form reliability coefficients and standard error of measurement for all grades and content areas</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; pp. 171-174.</p> <p><u>Reliability coefficients and standard error of measurement for subgroups and disability categories</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; Appendix 8-A.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Overall SEM by grade, content, and form</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; pp. 171-174.</p> <p><u>Test Characteristic Curves (TCCs), Test Information Function (TIFs) and Conditional Standard Error Measurement (CSEM) by grade, content, and form</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-F.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NCSC is not computer-adaptive.</li> </ul>	<p>Writing is missing because it was field tested; however, the coefficient reliability results will be required at a later date as well as the ELA results that include writing.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 4.1,4.3, and 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.2</p> <p><b>Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Principled approach to assessment development and developing the item model</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 12-16 and pp. 22-24.</p> <p><u>Item Specifications Reflected in Example Annotated Design Pattern and Task Template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A.</p> <p><u>Appendix 2-B- Accessibility by Design – Accommodations Committee Work</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-B.</p> <p><u>Item review procedures</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 31-34</p> <p><u>Item data reviews</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 54-57</p> <p><u>Technical platform and assessment features</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; pp. 36-38</p> <p><u>DIF analyses</u> Chapter 8 Studies of Reliability and Construct-Related Validity; summarized pp. 177-179 and detailed in appendix 8-C</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.3  <b>CSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Alignment of the tasks and items to grade-level CCSS</u>                      Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 77-80 and Appendix 3-B.</p> <p><u>Alignment of NCSC items to the performance level descriptors (PLDs)</u>                      Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; pp. 80-82 and Appendix 3-B, Study 4.</p> <p><u>Test Map for Core Items</u>                      Chapter 6 Psychometric Analysis; Appendix 6-B (p.35).</p> <p><u>Performance level and scale score distributions</u>                      Chapter 6 Psychometric Analysis; pp. 130-131 and Appendix 6-I.</p> <p><u>Test Characteristic Curves and Test Information Functions for all grade/ content tests</u>                      Chapter 6 Psychometric Analysis; Appendix 6-F.</p>	<p>Evidence for 4.3 is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</p> <p>Math panelists reported focus KSAs provided full support for some but not all four math claims, writing panelists indicated some but fell short of providing full evidence in support of the claim (pg. 82)</p> <p>TCC, TIF and CSEM curves generally appear as expected.</p> <p>Model-data fit for the “combined” items were problematic. Especially for the grade 11 Tier 1 WP item, the estimated <math>a</math>-parameter equaled 11.34, an extremely abnormal value, with a huge standard error of .61, indicating that the model does not adequately fit the data (p.7). What was done to remedy the fit issue?</p>
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:                      Evidence for 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test.</p>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.4</p> <p><b>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual</b> pp. 12-13, pp. 29-33, and pp. 36-42.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: Training Modules for Test Administrators</b> See modules 9-12 and pp. 193-336.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p>Chapter 4 Test Administration; pp. 86-99.</p> <p><u>Detailed Description of Scoring Procedures</u> Chapter 5 Scoring; pp. 100-114.</p> <p><u>Procedures, rationale, and results for IRT-based scaling</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 121-129 and Appendix 6-C.</p> <p><u>NCSC Scoring Decisions</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-D.</p>	<p>Evidence for 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test, including standardized scoring procedures designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Interrater reliability</li> <li>○ Scoring Math CR items</li> <li>○ Instructions for ELA</li> <li>○ Scoring of Reading Words CR</li> <li>○ Fit issue resolution</li> </ul> <p>2014-15 was the first year of test administration. How will between year equating be conducted for 2014-15 and 2015-16?</p> <p>Appendix 6 D, page 7. Model fit for combined items problematic, 11.34 is high value; high 0.61 indicating the model does not fit the data. How has this fit issue been resolved?</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence for 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4 for the ELA test is required once writing items are part of the operational test to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of standardized scoring procedures designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for ELA, including writing after it is added, and math, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Interrater reliability</li> <li>○ Procedures for scoring math and reading word constructed-response items and writing items</li> <li>○ Instructions for scorers of ELA constructed-response items, including writing</li> <li>○ Documentation that Fit issue has been resolved</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence of impact on scoring based on rules for invalidating test results</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.5  <b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>IRT Calibration, Scaling, and Equating Process</u>            Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 121-130.</p> <p><u>Stability of form variance and difficulty</u>            Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 124-125 (Tables 6-10 and 6-11).</p> <p><u>Test Characteristic Curves (TCC) and Test Information Functions (TIF) for all forms for all grades and content areas</u>            Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-F</p>	<p>Equating across years is not pertinent because 2014-15 is the first administration. How will between-year equating be conducted for 2014-15 and 2015-16?</p> <p>It would be helpful if there was a reference back to whether the forms match the blueprint to address this section.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consortium must provide evidence to address comparability across years, including addressing the inclusion of writing in 2015-16 years.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.6</p> <p><b>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual</b> pp. 12-13, pp. 29-33, and pp. 36-42.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: Training Modules for Test Administrators</b> See modules 9-12 and pp. 193-336.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b>  Chapter 4 Test Administration; pp. 86-99.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b>  <u>Item Specifications Reflected in Example Annotated Design Pattern and Task Template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A.</p> <p><u>Alignment and System Coherence</u> Chapter 3 Alignment and System Coherence; Appendix 3-B.</p>	<p>Clarify choice for paper version use. Is this based on technical support, availability of computers, teacher preference or is it only as an accommodation by the IEP team?</p> <p>If it is not an accommodation only, evidence must be provided to support comparability.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale Evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are an accommodation or documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results across the technology and paper-based version of the assessments.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 4.7</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Chapter 2, Test development</u></p> <p><u>Chapter 3, Alignment and System Coherence</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 16: TAC membership and agendas</b></p> <p><b>NCSC 17: Post-Administration Research Studies</b></p>	<p>Post administration studies are listed in NCSC 17 but there is no plan, timeline, or evidence that any will be completed.</p> <p>NCSC 16 does not provide information on TAC recommendations; there are agendas but no decision points or meeting summaries.</p> <p>Evidence of an ongoing system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of its assessment system for future years.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:  Evidence of an ongoing system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of its assessment system for future years.</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.1</p> <p><b>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training</b></p> <p><u>Guidance for IEP Team decisions</u>  <b>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training;</b> pp. 3-18.</p> <p><b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015)</b>            Student Participation Criteria; p. 20.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Module 2: Overview of NCSC AA-AAS (Test) and Testing Integrity</li> </ul> <p><u>Guidelines to determine assessment using an alternate assessment</u>  <b>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training;</b> pp. 3-18.  <u>Accessibility tools, features, and accommodations</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration</b></p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li>   <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li>   <li>• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State</li> </ul>	<p><b>Manual (2015);</b> pp. 9, 23-25, and 36-37.</p> <p><b>NCSC 4: Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration</b></p> <p><b>NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrators;</b> pp. 18, 26-28, and 55-65.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Module 3: Optimal Testing Conditions and Assessment Features</li> <li>• Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration</li> <li>• Module 6: Before Test: Complete Demographics, LCI, and Accommodations</li> </ul> <p><b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);</b> pp. 9, 23-25.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration</li> </ul> <p><u>IDEA disability categories and assessment decisions</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and</b></p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p>policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State's general assessments);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Mathematics and Training; pp. 5, 6-7 (#2).</b></p> <p><u>Promote access to general curriculum</u>  <b>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training; p. 7 (#4).</b></p> <p><b>NCSC 11: Parent Overview of the NCSC Assessment System: Grades 3 – 8 and 11</b></p> <p><b>NCSC 12: NCSC Brief 1: AA-AAS: Standards That Are the “Same but Different”</b></p> <p><b>NCSC 13: NCSC Brief 5: Standards-based Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for Students Who Participate in AA-AAS</b></p> <p><b>NCSC 14: NCSC Brief 7: NCSC’s Content Model for Grade-Aligned Instruction and Assessment: “The Same Curriculum for All Students”</b></p>	
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.2 <u>English learners and accommodations</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions for the NCSC Alternate Assessment of English Language Arts and Mathematics and Training</b>; p. 7 (#3).</p> <p><u>Accessibility tools, features, and accommodations for English learners</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015)</b>; pp. 9, 23-25.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration</li> </ul> <p><b>NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrators</b>; pp. 55-65</p> <p><u>Guidance for selection of accommodations for English learners</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015)</b>; pp. 9, 24, and 36-37.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test</li> </ul>	<p>The evidence does not address procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide procedures to ensure the inclusion of English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the assessments and clearly communicates this information or clarification that these components should be addressed by state-specific evidence (unless determined to be State-specific evidence).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 5.3 <u>Availability of accommodations for students with disabilities</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);</b> pp. 9, 24, 36-37.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration</li> </ul> <p><b>NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrator;</b> pp. 18, 26-28.</p> <p><u>Accommodations for English learners</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 1: NCSC AA-AAS Test Administration Manual (2015);</b> pp. 9, 24, 36-37.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration</li> </ul> <p><b>NCSC 8: User Guide for Test Administrator;</b> pp. 18, 26-28. <b>Technical Manual</b></p>	<p>While there is a training module and user guide to identify accommodations, there is no discussion of whether the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p> <p>Are there additional accommodations that NCSC suggests as part of procedures for EL and if so, what direction is given to the state?</p> <p>NCSC evidence does not address EL procedures for inclusion of all EL students in the state assessment. NCSC is silent on providing any direction to the states around</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learner.</li> </ul>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Principled approach to assessment development and developing the item model</u> Chapter 2 Test Development.</p> <p><u>Item Specifications Reflected in Example Annotated Design Pattern and Task Template</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-A.</p> <p><u>Accessibility by Design – Accommodations Committee Work</u> Chapter 2 Test Development; Appendix 2-B.</p> <p>Chapter 4 Test Administration; pp. 88-90.</p> <p><u>Documentation of accommodations, Student response check, Accessibility Features</u> Chapter 4 Test Administration; p. 96.</p> <p><u>Accommodations Frequencies</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; Appendix 6-L.</p> <p><b>NCSC 5: NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Module 4: Test Accommodations and Procedures for Assessing Students Who Are Blind, Deaf, or Deaf-Blind: Additional Directions for Test Administration; pp. 62-84.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence that the accommodations provided (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> <li>○ Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners (EL) are available.</li> <li>○ Evidence of a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>		<p><b>The Consortium did not provide a response to Critical Element 5.4. It was indicated that this will be state specific evidence.</b></p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p>___ No additional evidence is required or</p> <p>___ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.1</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Development of Grade Level Performance Level Descriptors</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-A.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Performance Level Descriptor Front Matter and Performance Level Descriptors</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-B.</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Performance level and scale score distributions</u> Chapter 6 Psychometric Analyses; pp. 130-131 and Appendix 6-I.</p>	
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p><u>Rationale for selection of method</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; p. 132.</p> <p><u>Selection and characteristics of panelists</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp.144-146.</p> <p><u>Detailed description of procedures</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 146-157.</p> <p><u>Results, evaluation, and policy adjustments</u> Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 158-168.</p> <p><u>External evaluation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 7 Standard Setting; pp. 169-170.</li> <li>• Synopsis of Validity Evidence for the Cut scores Derived from the Grades 3 - 8 and 11 Standard Setting               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-O.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Review of the Standard Setting Report               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-P.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Plake validity evidence memo               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-Q.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column for AA-AAAS</p> <p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.3</p> <p><b>NCSC 15: NCSC 2015 Operational Assessment Technical Manual</b></p> <p>Chapter 7 Standard Setting; Appendix 7-A.</p> <p><u>Alignment between knowledge, skills, and abilities in assessment to student learning expectations for instruction.</u></p> <p>Chapter 3 Alignment and System coherence; pp. 75-76, Appendix 3-B, Study 2.</p> <p><u>Vertical coherence study</u></p> <p>Chapter 3 Alignment and System coherence; pp. 82-84, Appendix 3-B, Study 5.</p>	<p>Evidence provided shows that the alternate academic achievement standards demonstrate adequate linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Consortium provided the following information in response to Critical Element 6.4</p> <p><u>Interpretive guidance for use with State report</u>  <b>NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation</b></p> <p><u>Examples of reports of assessment results</u>  <b>NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation</b>; pp. 17-23.</p> <p><u>Interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of assessment results</u>  <b>NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation</b>; pp. 1-8, 9 – 12, 27 – 41 (performance level descriptors).</p> <p><u>Individual student reports for each content area and grade level</u></p> <p><b>NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation, Appendix A. Individual Student Report</b>;          pp. 23, 25-26.</p> <p><u>Interpretive guidance that accompanies individual student reports</u>  <b>NCSC 10: NCSC AA-AAS 2015 Guide for Score Report Interpretation</b>;          pp. 25-26.</p> <p><b>NCSC 11: Parent Overview of the NCSC Assessment System: Grades 3 – 8 and 11</b></p>	<p>There are no itemized score analyses at any reporting level. Scores are only presented at the test level, no domain or “subtest” scores. Efforts should be made to generate reports at finer content/process grain sizes (e.g., reporting reading and writing).</p> <p>The evidence does not indicate that reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p> <p>NCSC10, Page 14 test status: lists several different test statuses, but it is not clear how each status impacts scores and reporting. Specifically the “did not test, DNT” status is not defined as to what is included, such as parent refusal, ESR/ESM, and invalid.</p> <p>There is no information on timeliness of reporting results to parents, educators, and principals.</p> <p>There is no indication that descriptive assessment reports are available in alternate format (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p> <p>No consortium report at the content level test provided detailed information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students.</p>

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE NCSC ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic assessment reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand (unless determined to be State-specific evidence).</li> <li>• Evidence must be provided the State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration (unless determined to be State-specific evidence).</li> <li>• data element definitions (e.g., do not test category include and how is it reflected in reports) in reports to clarify how each student is counted and reported.</li> </ul>		

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