



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 403A
Little Rock, AR 72201

May 2, 2018

Dear Commissioner Key:

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

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

External peer reviewers and Department staff carefully evaluated ADE's submission and the Department found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet most, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of sections 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts (R/LA) for grades 3-8 (ACT Aspire). **Substantially meets requirements**

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

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

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts (R/LA) for high school (ACT Aspire). **Substantially meets requirements**
- General assessments in science for grades 5 and 7 (ACT Aspire). **Substantially meets requirements**
- General assessments in science for high school (ACT Aspire). **Substantially meets requirements**

Substantially meets requirements means that these components meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required.

ADE also provided information regarding the Multi-State Alternate Assessments (MSAA), the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Feedback regarding this component of your assessment system will be presented in a subsequent letter.

The specific list of items required for ADE to submit is enclosed with this letter. ADE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days for when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host 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.

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

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The ADE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA will apply to State assessments. Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the ACT Aspire assessments substantially meet most of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff have carefully reviewed ADE evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the ADE must also provide evidence that the ACT Aspire incorporate principles of universal design, as specified in section 1111(a)(1)(A) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. This requirement is noted under Critical Element 4.2 in the enclosed list of items.

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

Page 3 – The Honorable Johnny Key

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 Joseph Suh of my staff at: OSS.Arkansas@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary,
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Position of
Assistant Secretary, Office of
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Hope Allen, Director of Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the general assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts (R/LA) for grades 3-8 and high school, and science for grades 5, 7, and high school (ACT Aspire):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional evidence of alignment (e.g., independent alignment study/studies) specific to the full range of Arkansas content and complexity standards for R/LA, mathematics in grades 3,4, 6 and 7, and science for all tested grades. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alignment evidence should include all grade levels, and should be based upon the current state academic content standards. • Additional information documenting how issues identified in the State's alignment evidence (the Fordham study) for mathematics and R/LA in grades 5, 8 and high school have been addressed by Arkansas Department of Education (ADE).
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the general assessments in mathematics and R/LA for grades 3-8 and high school, and science for grades 5, 7, and high school (ACT Aspire):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate alignment between the State's assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure, such as an independent alignment study of the assessments, content standards, and achievement standards (see critical element 2.1).
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the general assessments in mathematics and R/LA for grades 3-8 and high school, and science for grades 5, 7, and high school (ACT Aspire):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional information documenting how issues related to weak cognitive demand identified in the Fordham study have been addressed by ADE (see critical element 2.1); OR • Other evidence (such as an independent alignment study described in critical element 2.1) that demonstrates that the assessments measure the intended cognitive processes contained within the academic content and achievement standards.
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For the general assessments in mathematics and R/LA for grades 3-8 and high school, and science for grades 5, 7, and high school (ACT Aspire):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide validity evidence that the State's assessment scores are related as expected to other variables.
4.2 – Fairness and accessibility	<p>For the general assessments in mathematics and R/LA for grades 3-8 and high school, and science for grades 5, 7, and high school (ACT Aspire):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has examined test reliability for student sub-groups. • Evidence that the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure the accessibility of its assessments, including evidence of updates to accessibility features for the ACT test delivery platform. • Evidence that the assessments are developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning. This may include documentation of steps the State has taken in the design and development of its assessments, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation describing approaches used in the design and development of the State's assessments (e.g., principles of universal design, language simplification, accessibility tools and features embedded in test items or available as an accompaniment to the

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>items), OR;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation of the approaches used for developing items; OR ○ Documentation of procedures used for maximizing accessibility of items during the development process, such as guidelines for accessibility and accessibility tools and features included in item specifications; OR ○ Description or examples of instructions provided to item writers and reviewers that address writing accessible items, available accessibility tools and features, and reviewing items for accessibility; OR ○ Documentation of procedures for developing and reviewing items in alternative formats or substitute items and for ensuring these items conforms to item specifications.
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p>	<p>For the general assessments in mathematics and R/LA for grades 3-8 and high school, and science for grades 5, 7, and high school (ACT Aspire):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of strong alignment as described in critical element 2.1 above.
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p>	<p>For the general assessments in mathematics and R/LA for grades 3-8 and high school, and science for grades 5, 7, and high school (ACT Aspire):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that reports and guides are available in alternate formats upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.

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

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes (includes resubmission of 2016 Peer Review evidence)



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, INCLUDING
RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS .	4
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	4
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	5
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	7
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only).....	8
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only).....	10
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	12
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	12
2.2 – Item Development.....	15
2.3 – Test Administration	20
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	23
2.5 – Test Security	26
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	30
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	33
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	33
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	35
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	37
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	38
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	39
4.1 – Reliability.....	39
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	41
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum.....	46
4.4 – Scoring	47
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	48
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	49
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	50
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	51
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	51
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	54
5.3 – Accommodations.....	56
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	58
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	59
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	59
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting.....	60
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	61
6.4 – Reporting.....	62

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, INCLUDING
RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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>English Language Arts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[077] - State Board Minutes, July 15, 2016 (agenda item A-9, p. 6) <p>Mathematics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[078] - State Board Minutes April 14, 2016 (agenda item A-3, p. 6) <p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High School Evidence #[079] - State Board Minutes, December 8, 2016 (p. 6) • K-8 Evidence #[080] - State Board Minutes, June 11, 2015 (agenda item A-7, p. 6) <p>Requirement in Law:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[081] - ACTAAP Rule (section 4.0.1, p. 9) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence included adoption of ELA standards for 2017-18 school year (#077), Math standards for 2017-18 school year (#078), HS Science standards for 2018-19 school year (#079), K-8 Science standards for 2016+ (#080) • Evidence from 2016 peer review (ARK 1.1a) showed adoption of Common Core in 2010 for ELA and Math, but not Science.
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence from previous peer review for science standards currently in effect. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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>Evidence #[122] - Act 930 (section 6-15-2906, p. 44)</p> <p>Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[082] - Arkansas English Language Arts K-12 Standards • Evidence #[083] - Arkansas Mathematics Frameworks • Evidence #[084] - Arkansas Science Frameworks <p>Standards Revision Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[093] - Letter to Commissioner Key after the Task Force- Governor's Letter to SBE • Evidence #[094]- Governor's Council on Common Core Review - Findings and Recommendations • Evidence #[118] - Statement from ACT about CCSS.pdf • Evidence #[120] - Arkansas English Language Arts & Disciplinary Literacy Revision Oct 2015 • Evidence #[121] - CCSS Math Review Big Group 912.pptx <p>Stakeholder Involvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence #[085] - ELA List of Public Contributors to Standards ○ Evidence #[086] - ELA Standards Survey Results ○ Evidence #[087] - Review and Comments Analysis of CCSS-ELA • Mathematics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence #[088] - Mathematics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards are provided in detail (#082, 083, 084). • How do the approved standards differ from the CCSS: State provided evidence that the revised standards “recommended little change to the standards.” Given that the CCSS standards were adopted in 2010, are these the effective standards on which to judge the fitness of the ACT Aspire assessment versus the standards adopted for use in future years, or ACT’s CCR standards? • Provided evidence for stakeholder involvement (#85-92).

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">Survey CM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence #[089] - Math Survey (Responses) ○ Evidence #[090] - ADE CC Report FINAL • Science <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence #[091] - Science Public Input Surveys ○ Evidence #[092] - Science Standards Community Survey Results and Comments • Sharing of Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[119] - Online Links • Evidence #[123] - APCA, April 28th, 2016 (Slide 13) 	
Section 1.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.3 – 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"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>Evidence #122 (pg. 45) outlines assessments to measure ELA, math, and science as identified by the state board, assessments of ELP of all ELs, and assessments that serves any student in grades 10-12.</p> <p>(p. 46) outlines that all students enrolled in a public school district shall participate in the statewide student assessment system.</p> <p>While K-2 and 10-12 are explicitly highlighted, grades 3-8 are not in evidence #122.</p> <p>Evidence #95 (pg. 7) outlines that ACTAAP rules require attesting whether ALL students have participated in the appropriate grade-level assessment(s).</p> <p>Pg. 11 highlights the required assessment for grades1-11, which include ACT Aspire and the ACT, and ELPA21 for all EL students. Also included are ALT assessments for students, including science ALT portfolios (see evidence #117 too).</p> <p>Questions: Does the ACT Aspire include a science assessment? Yes! Pg. 44 of evidence #95 confirms this.</p>	<p>3 State-submitted items meet criteria; no additional evidence required.</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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 ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</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"> • 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; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Evidence #122 (p. 46) outlines that all students enrolled in a public school district shall participate in the statewide student assessment system.</p> <p>Evidence #81 (pg. 11) outlines the policy for accounting for students with disabilities and ELs in the assessments. Makes mention of IEP policy, as well as ELs with less than one year in a U.S. school.</p> <p>Section 5.05.4 outlines that all students enrolled in a State-tested grade shall be accounted for in the AR comp. assessment program.</p> <p>Evidence #117 outlines more general requirements as it relates to ADE guidelines for assessment accessibility (e.g., use of accessibility features and accommodations).</p>	<p>3</p> <p>State-submitted items meet criteria; no additional evidence 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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – 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>Evidence #116 is an excel spreadsheet that highlights the subgroups (TAGG, white, Black, Hispanic, Female, Male, Migrant, LEP, SPED, and economically disadvantaged) for the 206-2017SY. Part rate for ALT assessment also called out.</p> <p>The spreadsheet also calls out the denominator and numerator, which then yields a percentage tested.</p> <p>Evidence #100 outlines how the State calculates part rate (all student enrolled in an LEA on the first day of the test are included in the denominator and all students who take the test are included in the numerator).</p> <p>The description of the method used for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation was a sentence in evidence #100, but was very straightforward.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>State-submitted items meet criteria; no additional evidence required.</p>
<p>ALT Assessment – Peer Review Summer 2016</p>	<p>Evidence ARK 01 Response is an excel spreadsheet with the part rate for the various tests, including the ALT assessments. The data is disaggregated by various subgroups.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>Evidence ARK 01 Response does not provide a date. The reviewer is left to infer that this data corresponds to the 15-16SY assessment rather than the 16-17SY assessment.</p>
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review: For the State assessment system, ADE must provide: Evidence that shows the number of students tested and enrolled, disaggregated by student groups, for each required assessment.</p>		
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: NCSC/MSAA: State must provide evidence that the data presented corresponds to the 2015-16 school year.</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • 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; • 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); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>Alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[001]: Fordham Institute, “Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments.” The independent alignment study evaluated the alignment of English language arts/literacy and mathematics assessments to the Common Core State Standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodology (pp. 31-40) ○ English/language arts findings (pp. 41-53) ○ Mathematics findings (pp. 54-63) • Evidence #[002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alignment to college readiness standards (pp. 1.5-1.6, Section 1.4) • Evidence #[003]: Draft Alignment ACT Aspire Science to Next Generation Science Standards (Draft dated 3/29/2016) • Evidence #[004]: How ACT Assessments Align with State College and Career Readiness Standards (pp. 2-3 discuss alignment to the Common Core State Standards) <p>Statement of claims and intended interpretations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual for the statement of the principal and secondary claims, interpretations and uses of the ACT Aspire battery (pp. 1.1-1.4, Section 1.2) <p>Test framework and blueprints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[002]: ACT Aspire Summative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *The peer review team is operating under the assumption that the state standards from which the current evidence relates is the CCSS. • *Arkansas has received a waiver from assessing the speaking and listening standards. #[135] • 2.1a: Evidence for statement of purpose and interpretations and uses includes comments in submission as well as evidence from technical manual (#002) and includes sufficient evidence. • 2.1b: Blueprint details provided in technical manual (#002). • 2.1b/c ELA & Math: Alignment study (#001) by Fordham for ELA and Math refers to CCSS. The study specified that some of the alignment was weak or limited. Narrative in AR submission specifies that many of the issues have been addressed. State must provide additional information to indicate what/how issues have been addressed. • 2.1b/c Science: Evidence of alignment to Science standards (#003) is conducted by ACT (not independent), and refers to NGSS. Crosswalks provided for Aspire do not include Science. • 2.1c: ACT defines DOK differently from Webb’s commonly used levels (#002) and does not include level 4. • 2.1 d: Assessment is not computer-adaptive. NCSC/MSAA • *Additional evidence from 2016 peer review to have been submitted by NCSC

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Technical Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ English Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 3.3.1, pp. 3.2-3.6 ○ Reading Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 3.3.2, pp. 3.6-3.11 ○ Writing Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 3.3.3, pp. 3.11-3.13 ○ Mathematics Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 3.4, pp. 3.13-3.29 ○ Science Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 3.5, pp. 3.30-3.39 ○ General design elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construct coherence (Section 2.1, pp. 2.1-2.2) ▪ Item types (Section 2.1.1, pp. 2.2) ▪ Depth of knowledge and cognitive complexity (Section 2.1.2, pp. 2.2-2.3) <p>Processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test development processes (Section 2.2, pp. 2.3-2.5) • Evidence #[005]: National Curriculum Survey. The diagram illustrates different processes and sources of evidence used to inform ACT Aspire test blueprints (Diagram, p. 2). 	
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide an independent alignment study/studies specific to the full range of AR content and complexity standards for ELA, Math, and Science. Alignment study must include all grade levels. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ELA/Math: If the Fordham study is to be included as supplemental evidence for ELA and Math, additional information documenting how issues have been addressed must be included. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> ○ ELA/Math: Alignment study should be based on currently adopted (effective 2016+) AR state standards, rather than CCSS or CCR. ○ Science: Alignment study conducted by ACT is insufficient for independent evidence. Independent alignment study for Science for relevant grades must be conducted. 	

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</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>General item development procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test development processes (Section 2.2, pp. 2.3-2.5). • Evidence #[006]: ACT Item Quality Rubric <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This rubric provides for a standard baseline of quality across content areas. • Evidence #[007]: ACT Stimulus Quality Rubric <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This rubric provides for a standard baseline of quality for stimulus material across content areas. It is used in conjunction with other rubrics and guidelines for assessing stimulus complexity (e.g., ELA Text Complexity Rubrics). <p>Selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[008]: Forms Construction Guide Part 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Statistical reviews (Sections 2.1, 2.2, p. 2-1). ○ Item reviews (Sections 3.2, 3.2.4a, 3.2.4b, pp. 2-2 and 2-3). ○ Form specifications (Section 4.0, p. 2-6). ○ Item/Passage mix on a form (Sections 5.1, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, pp. 2-8 to 2-9). ○ Reviews and review elements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Item development and selection depend on alignment to standards in terms of content and cognitive process (see Critical Element 2.1). • Item development: Narrative includes description of why ACT item writing guidelines were provided rather than Aspire. • Item development: How well do item writing guidelines for ACT (high school students) represent guidelines for writing items for elementary grades? • Item selection: Need more information about statistical analysis of items. Later sections describe 2-PL being used. • Item selection: Does form construction use CTT or IRT? Form construction guide for ACT, which the narrative said is used for Aspire is dated 2008, and seems to use outdated technology/methodology?

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">(sections 9.0, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.1.3, 9.1.4, 9.3.2, 9.3.3, 9.4, 9.4.1, pp. 2-15 to 2-17 and pp. 2-19 to 2-20).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Subject-specific item development and selection procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ACT Stimulus and Item Development Guides.</i> • Evidence #[009]: English Test Item Writer’s Guide Grades 3-10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General ACT processes for developing high-quality, passage-based ELA items (pp. 4-11). • Overview of item taxonomy and task models (pp. 12-23). • Examples of individual item specifications/task models (see “ORG” item category: Organization, Unity, and Cohesion, pp. 35-50). • Evidence #[010]: ACT English Essay Writer’s Guide Grades 3-10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines for essay writers (pp. 4-8) • Evidence #[011]: ACT Reading Test Item Writer’s Guide Grades 3-10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General ACT processes for developing high-quality, passage-based ELA items (pp. 1-8). • Overview of item task models (pp. 10-13). • Examples of individual item specifications (see “IDT” item 	

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">category: Central Ideas, Themes, and Summaries, pp. 20-24).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology Enhanced Items (pp. 63-65) • Evidence #[012]: ACT Reading Constructed Response Guidelines Grades 3-10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of ACT Aspire Reading CR items (pp. 2-5) • Reading CR Task Types (pp. 5-9) • Task model templates (pp. 15-31) • Evidence #[013]: ACT Reading Passage Selection Guide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines for selecting passages (pp. 3-7) • Exemplar passages at different complexity levels (pp. 9-22) • ACT Qualitative Text Complexity Rubrics (Appendix, pp. 24-26) • Evidence #[014]: ACT Text Complexity Evaluation Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes process used by ELA test developers to ensure reading passages have an appropriate balance of complexity characteristics for the grade and assessment targets. • Evidence #[015]: Item Writer’s Guide– Mathematics–ACT and ACT Aspire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General ACT processes for developing high-quality items (pp. 2-8). • Content and cognitive categories (pp. 5-6). • Calculators (p. 8). 	

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • Sample items (p. 8). • Item Quality Descriptors (p. 9). • Evidence #[016]: ACT Aspire Science Item Writer’s Guide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of ACT Aspire Science Tests (pp. 2-3). • Passage formats (pp. 3-9). • Overview of item and depth of knowledge classification categories (pp. 10-11). • General guidelines (pp. 13-19). <p>Example of assignments provided to item writers re. item specifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[017]: Item Writer Assignments. Example assignment given to ELA Item Writers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample reading assignment • Sample English assignment <p>Qualifications of ACT Test Development Content Specialists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[018]: Science Content Experience and Degrees • Evidence #[019]: ELA Content Specialist Overview 	
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide information about evaluation of items using IRT (described in later sections). • State must describe (or verify if 2008 guide is still valid) methodology used to construct forms. • State must verify that ACT item writing guidelines are representative for all item types and grades used for Aspire. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • 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; • 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. 	<p>Training and communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[098] - DTC Required Training CM (Commissioner's Memo) • Evidence #[095] - 16-17 DTC Training PPT FINAL Nov 7 • Evidence #[096] - 2017 Security Agreement updated 11/21 • Evidence #[099] - Recorded Webinars on ADE Website • Evidence #[101] - DTC newsletter example • Evidence #[097] - ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility - final • Evidence #[113] - ACT Aspire Accessibility Co-op Training for Attendees ppt • Evidence #[109] - Summative Training Template for DTCs • Evidence #[124] - Fall 2016 DTC Required Training Sign-in Sheets.pdf <p>Procedures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[020]: ACT Aspire Test Coordinator Manual Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General policies (pp. 2-10) • Paper testing instructions (pp. 11-19) • Online testing instructions (pp. 20-23) • Evidence #[021]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Online Summative Testing Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and Procedures (pp. 2-4) • Guidelines administration (pp. 5-10) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #096 is an excellent and comprehensive security agreement. • Sufficient evidence of procedures and communication. • Sufficient evidence of training for DTC (#124); may wish to include evidence of training for additional personnel, such as additional sign in sheets or dates of local training. Consider submitting contingency plans for when designated test administrators are absent. • Sufficient evidence defining technology requirements, including contingency plans for technological problems. <p>NCSC-MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient evidence in the troubleshooting guides provided (ARK 2, 3, & 4) • Evidence that practice is available (ARK 3 and 5), no evidence for policy requiring or allowing access to practice materials. • Sufficient evidence of training for administration (ARK 6-12)

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • Test administration procedures (pp. 11-12) • Verbal Instructions (pp. 13-14) • After testing (p. 32) • Evidence #[022]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Paper Summative Testing Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General policies (pp. 2-4) • Guidelines administration (pp. 5-10) • Test administration procedures (pp. 11- 12) • After testing (p. 36) • Technology Requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[023]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Readiness Manual provides information to ensure technology is functioning appropriately prior to testing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction for computer-based testing provides background on allowable devices (p. 4) • List of the computer-based testing components and the manual provides more detail for each component (p. 5) • Contingency plan (pp. 85-86) • Evidence #[020]: ACT Aspire Test Coordinator Manual Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about technical requirements (pp. 20-21) • Additional Available Training provided by ACT: 	

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • Evidence #[024]: Online Tutorials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Houses a collection of training videos including pre-test tech readiness, assessment preparation, assessment administration, post-assessment steps, and reporting and data usage 	
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review (if consortium does not provide, State must): For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide to address technology-related contingency plans. ○ 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. ○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools. 		
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for ACT Aspire. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSC/MSAA: State must provide evidence of policy or procedure that assures 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. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</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>Evidence #102 outlines the monitor training for the previous school year. It outlines responsibilities of key personnel, as well as what a monitor should and should not be seeing. It also outlines the questions to be asked of various personnel, and recorded. Pg. 3 states that monitor visits are unannounced and monitors required to submit a detailed report following the visit. It also notes that districts are selected based on one of the following: district had a major testing infraction previously, report of a possible testing impropriety, or the school is randomly selected.</p> <p>Evidence #104 is a form for the test coordinator that asks him/her to address how electronic policy during testing, daily procedures for testing, including distribution, and information about students testing with ADE approved special accommodations.</p> <p>Evidence #107 is a sample test impropriety letter that a school would receive in the event there was impropriety. A note within the critical element reference document states that the ADE reviews all monitor reports and follows up with the district superintendents as necessary.</p> <p>Evidence ARK 14e Response is a map that outlines the districts monitored for the MSAA in the Spring of 2016 and 2017. One district was monitored in the spring of 2016 and seven were monitored in the spring of 2017.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>Arkansas provided evidence of monitoring evidence as it relates to the general assessment. However, there was no evidence to indicate that monitoring took place for the general assessment.</p>
<p>ALT Assessment – Peer Review Summer</p>	<p>Evidence ARK 03 response is the 2017MSAA Test</p>	<p>2</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
2016	<p>Administration Manual. On pg. 25 it briefly outlines how to monitor and report test irregularities.</p> <p>Evidence ARK 06 Response is an MSAA 2017 administration PPT and webinar. The slide deck outlines information regarding the assessment and assessment administration. Slide 20 refers to pg. 25 of Evidence ARK 03 Response for test security and test irregularities. Slide 27 refers to monitoring simply by stating that testing coordinators and administrators must “monitor and report observed or suspected inappropriate test practices...”</p> <p>Evidence ARK 13 Response is a Monitor Training PowerPoint, but only references ACT Aspire, and not the ALT assessment.</p> <p>Evidence ARK 14e Response is a map that outlines the districts monitored for the MSAA in the Spring of 2016 and 2017. One district was monitored in the spring of 2016 and seven were monitored in the spring of 2017.</p>	State must submit protocol, which is related to the ALT assessment, or clarify that the protocol used for ACT Aspire was that used for the ALT.
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review: For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence that the State applies the test monitoring procedures for its general assessment test administration to the alternate assessments. 		
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required for ACT Aspire.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSC/MSAA: State must submit protocol, which is related to the ALT assessment, or clarify that the protocol used for ACT Aspire was that used for the ALT. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • 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; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>State law and required training that requires adherence to security procedures can be found in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[108] - AR CODE 6-15-438 Test Security & Confidentiality • Evidence #[095] - 16-17 DTC Training PPT FINAL Nov 7 • Evidence #[096] - 2017 Security Agreement updated 11/21 • Evidence #[105] - Impropriety Rules • Evidence #[109] - Summative Training Template for DTCs <p>Prevention: Information about <u>storage</u>, <u>administration</u>, and <u>return</u> of test materials can be found in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[020]: ACT Aspire Test Coordinator Manual Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Receipt and security of paper materials (pp. 11-12) ○ Storage and return of paper materials (pp. 12,15-19) ○ Online testing guidelines (p. 22) ○ Desirable testing conditions (pp. 14-15 and 22) • Evidence #[021]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Online Summative Testing Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Desirable testing conditions (p. 9) ○ Test administration procedures and student authorization tickets (pp. 11-12) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (For evidence 095 & 109, please include slide numbers in evidence list rather than notes section.) • Consider providing list of prohibited student behaviors or sample scenarios in the prohibited behaviors section. (Are they all covered in security agreement?) • Detection and remediation section does not refer to detection, but to reporting? (Remediation in investigation section) • Data forensics can be used to detect test irregularities. • Monitor the internet for secure test items being shared. • Consider providing examples of irregularities other than technical (Are they all covered in security agreement?). • Recommend developing detailed plans for conducting investigations in schools-for example, for cases of massive alleged test compromise or cheating. • Recommend providing examples of consequences to students, test administrators, and educators in cases of improprieties.

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> ○ Unauthorized testing aids (p. 6) • Evidence #[022]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Paper Summative Testing Arkansas Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Desirable testing conditions (pp. 9-10) ○ Instructions for after testing (p. 36) ○ Unauthorized testing aids (p. 5) • Evidence #[023]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Readiness Manual includes information about the secure platform used for computer-based testing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ List of the computer-based testing components and the manual provides more detail for each component (p. 5) <p>Information about <u>prohibited behaviors</u> and how to <u>report irregularities</u> are included in multiple publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[020]: ACT Aspire Test Coordinator Manual Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prohibited behaviors (p. 10) ○ Reporting irregularities (p. 10) • Evidence #[021]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Online Summative Testing Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prohibited behaviors (p. 8) ○ Reporting irregularities (p. 8) • Evidence #[022]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Paper Summative 	

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Testing Arkansas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prohibited behaviors (p. 8) ○ Reporting irregularities (pp. 8-9) <p>Information about the <u>security agreement</u> for district and school officials is included on the front cover in multiple publications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[020]: ACT Aspire Test Coordinator Manual Arkansas (p.2) • Evidence #[021]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Online Summative Testing (pp. 3-4) • Evidence #[022]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Paper Summative Testing Arkansas (p.3) • Evidence #[096] - 2017 Security Agreement updated 11/21 <p>Information about what to do if there are <u>technical issues</u> during testing can be found in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[023]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Readiness Manual provides information on what to do if there are technical issues during testing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contingency plan (pp. 85-86) <p>Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[020]: ACT Aspire Test Coordinator Manual Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Selecting and training testing staff (pp. 6-9) <p>Detection & Remediation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[020]: ACT Aspire Test 	

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Coordinator Manual Arkansas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reporting Irregularities (p. 10) ● Evidence #[021]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Online Summative Testing Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reporting Irregularities (pp. 8-9) ● Evidence #[022]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Paper Summative Testing Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reporting Irregularities (p. 8) <p>Investigation: In all investigations, AR cooperates with ACT Aspire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence #[020]: ACT Aspire Test Coordinator Manual Arkansas (p. 4) ● Evidence #[021]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Online Summative Testing Arkansas (p. 4) ● Evidence #[022]: ACT Aspire Room Supervisor Manual for Paper Summative Testing Arkansas (p. 4) ● Evidence #[105] Impropriety Rules ● Evidence #[106] - Sample Referral Form Code of Ethics for AR Educators .pdf ● Evidence #[107] - sample test impropriety 45-day letter 	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • 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. 	<p>State policy on Data Privacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[110] - IT Security Policy 2015.pdf • Evidence #[111] - Statewide Information System (SIS) Handbook (pp. 1-3) • Evidence #[100] - ESEA Flexibility Accountability Addendum (p. 21) • Evidence #[112] - Information System Best Practices.pdf (sections 1.1-1.6, pp. 3-7) • Evidence #[115] - ACT Aspire for 17-18 and 18-19 (pp. 23-26) <p>Testing Materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[020]: ACT Aspire Test Coordinator Manual Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information about securing test materials before, during, and after testing and secure distribution of paper test materials (pp. 11-19) • Evidence #[023]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Readiness Manual includes information about the secure platform used for computer-based testing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ List of the computer-based testing components and the manual provides more detail for each component (p. 5). • Evidence #[025]: ACT Aspire Portal User Guide Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information about the role of the test administration, which 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 115 refers to future test years. • Sufficient information regarding the test materials • Sufficient information regarding minimum number of students for reporting of scores for groups. <p>NCSC/MsAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training information about data privacy provided (ARK 16) • An example is given of data sharing agreement (ARK 15). What is the current data agreement with the test vendor? What are the test vendors privacy and data management policies? (Is this included in NCSC/MsAA submission?) • Minimum reporting number specified (ARK 16A)

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">includes managing and monitoring testing (p. 5)</p> <p>Test-related data and personally identifiable information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[026]: ACT Aspire LLC Customer Privacy Policy • Evidence #[027]: ACT Aspire LLC Data Usage Policy • Evidence #[028]: ACT Information Security Program Summary. The document is for internal ACT staff to protect test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information. • Evidence #[029]: Pearson Information Security Management Policy 	
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review: For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies and procedures to safeguard student privacy and data integrity at interfaces among the State, vendor, districts, and schools; and ○ 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). 		
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSC/MSAA: State must provide additional information about current vendor data protection and privacy policy (unless it is already included in NCSC/MSAA combined submission). 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • 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; • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#115] - ACT Aspire Contract for 17-18 and 18-19 <p>Alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#001]: Fordham Institute, “Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments.” The independent alignment study evaluated the alignment of English language arts/literacy and mathematics assessments in grades 5 and 8 to the Common Core State Standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodology (pp. 31-40) ○ English/language arts findings (pp. 40-53) ○ Mathematics findings (pp. 54-63) • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alignment to the Next Generation Science Standards (Section 1.4, p. 1.6) ○ Alignment to college readiness standards (Section 1.4, pp. 1.5-1.6) ○ Alignment to ACT College and Career Readiness Standards (Section 1.3, pp. 1.4-1.5) • Evidence [#004]: How ACT Assessments Align with State College and Career Readiness Standards (pp. 2-3 discuss alignment to the Common Core State 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must specify which standards (CCSS, CCR, or ADE) apply to the content validity evidence. • Alignment study (#001) showed weak or limited alignment for some of the standards. • Much of the evidence provided refers to review during item development. • Narrative of AR submission describes operational form review for state specific standards. Is this just for future administrations (#115) or was this applicable to the recent administrations? If so, then the state needs to provide documentation of reviews. • Develop multi-year plan to address validity.

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">Standards)</p> <p>Validity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Content-Oriented Evidence (pp. 17.3-17.5) <p>ACT Aspire ELA Content Review Documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#031]: Reading English Content Review Invitation • Evidence [#032]: Reading Content Review Panel Guidelines • Evidence [#033]: Grade 5 Reading Unit Review Sample • Evidence [#034]: Grade 8 English Discrete Set 1 Review Sample • Evidence [#035]: Reading Item Review General Observations Sample 	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale for ACT Aspire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must specify which standards (e.g. CCSS, CCR, ADE, etc.) apply to the content validity evidence presented in the 2017 peer review. (Hope Allen responded by e-mail on 8/10 that currently adopted ADE should be considered.) • State must conduct an independent alignment study/studies (see Critical Element 2.1). • State must provide documentation of ADE review of operational test forms. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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>Expert judgment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence regarding cognitive processes (Section 17.2.2, pp. 17.5–17.6) ○ Information about item reviews (Section 2.2.3, p. 2.4) • Evidence [#008]: Forms Construction Guide - Part1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidelines and qualifications for review panels (pp. 2-15 to 2-19 and Appendix A) ○ Review of field test items (Section 3.2, pp. 2.2-2.5) <p>Cognitive rigor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#036]: ACT Aspire Summative Overview <p>Accessibility of computer-based platform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#037]: Aspire/TestNav 8 Tablet Usability Study (May 2013) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overall findings (pp. 1-2) • Evidence [#038]: Aspire/TestNav 8 Tablet Usability Study (July 2013) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overall findings (pp. 1-2) • Evidence [#039]: Designing a Test Delivery System for the Non-Sighted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Executive summary (pp. 3-4) • Evidence [#040]: Low Vision Cog Labs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommendations for computer- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence (#002) describes cognitive lab studies for CR items with older students. Consider other cognitive lab studies, such as for younger students, or cognitively demanding multiple-choice items, or consider providing a summary of applicable previous research. • How have the issues identified in the accessibility studies (#37-41) been addressed? • Explore possibility of assessing DOK Level 4. • Consider conducting study specifically evaluating cognitive demand, rather than content alignment, across Aspire tests. • Recommend specifically addressing “limited/weak” ratings on cognitive demand from Fordham study. • Develop multi-year plan to address validity.

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	based platform from cognitive labs (pp. 3-4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#041]: Mobile Device Accessibility Features 	
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed for ACT Aspire/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence of updates to accessibility features. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER REVIEW EVIDENCE

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>Subscore structures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence regarding internal structure (Section 17.2.3, pp. 17.6-17.32) ○ Reliability for Spring 2015 ACT Aspire Forms (2016 Update, Section 3, pp. U32–U33). ○ Changes to the Program for 2016 (2016 Update, Section 4, pp. U34–U37). • Evidence [#076]: Coefficient Alpha Ranges Spring 2016 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math: If factor analyses results suggest a speediness component, can other data be used to check the degree of speediness (particularly for grade 6 online tests)? New study to check if factor structure changed with different time limits in 2016. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recent reliability by groups shows lower reliability for Black students. Consider additional speediness research by groups. • Develop multi-year plan to address validity.
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed for ACT Aspire/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence of studies of speediness’ and factor structures from recent Aspire forms with updated section lengths and time limits. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Study 1: Comparison of ACT Explore and ACT Plan scores to ACT Aspire scores (Section 17.2.4.1, pp. 17.33-17.48) ○ Study 2: Comparison of state assessment scores to ACT Aspire scores (Section 17.2.4.2, pp. 17.49-17.64) ○ Evidence based on relationships with other criteria (Section 17.2.5, p. 17.64) • Evidence [#042]: ACT Aspire Scores Associate with AP Exam Success: A Preliminary Linkage • Evidence [#043]: How Do Grade 10 ACT Aspire Scores Relate to Grade 11 ACT Scores? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct studies of relationships to other variables such as grades, teacher ratings, and/or other test scores such as NAEP. • Consider conducting predictive validity studies when additional data is available. • Develop multi-year plan to address validity. • Good to see that Aspire Technical Manual includes section on Consequential Validity.
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed for ACT Aspire/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must develop a multi-year plan to address all aspects of validity (Critical Elements 3.1-3.4). Plan must specify timeline for when results would be available as evidence for TACs and peer reviews. 		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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>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"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>Overall reliability, including standard error of measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual. The technical bulletin includes a chapter on reliability evidence (Chapter 16, pp. 16.1-16.8). Reliability evidence includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Raw score reliability (Section 16.2, pp. 16.2-16.6) ○ Scale score reliability and conditional standard error of measurement (Section 16.3, pp. 16.6-16.8) ○ Reliability for Spring 2015 ACT Aspire Forms (2016 Update, Section 3, pp. U32–U33) ○ Changes to the Program for 2016 (2016 Update, Section 4, pp. U37–U37) • Evidence [#076]: Coefficient Alpha Ranges Spring 2016 <p>Classification consistency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#044]: Classification consistency analysis for Arkansas <p>Rater consistency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Writing test correlations (Section 16.2, pp. 16.3-16.5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any theories to explain the reliability and CSEM curve differences by group in #044 (e.g. ELA Grade 4 Hispanic, Math Grades 4-6 Black, etc.)? • (Why is #044 listed as evidence for classification consistency?) • 4.1 c: Consistency and accuracy of achievement levels is not addressed in this section. Designation of cut scores and achievement levels described in later section. • Evidence #142 provided more information about writing assessment reliability including classification consistency and inter-rater reliability for AR – Reliability numbers are lower for writing: more information on writing scoring would be useful (e.g. Does agreement refer to each domain or to total score? How are highly inconsistent ratings treated? What are ACT’s explanations for the lower reliability?).

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> ○ Scoring constructed-response tasks (Section 4.3, pp. 4.1-4.7) 	
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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>Accessibility:</p> <p><u>General</u> information about accessibility features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#045]: ACT Aspire Accessibility User’s Guide Arkansas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACT Aspire Accessibility System: Levels of Support (pp. 3-8) • Accessibility Supports Tables (pp. 9-17) • Choosing Accessibility Supports & Worksheet (pp. 18-26 and Appendix A) • Administration Procedures for Accessibility Supports (pp. 27-37) • General Response Dictation and Scribing Procedures (Appendix B) • Guidelines for Sign Language Interpretation (Appendix C) • Approved Bilingual Dictionaries (Appendix D) • Procedures for Local Delivery of Read Aloud Support (Appendix E) <p>Accessibility as part of <u>item and test development:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#046]: Sample Aspire Item Accessibility-Construct Review Feature Mapping. Provides a sample feature mapping process chart that is created for every item and every form for all audio scripted ACT Aspire items. Includes targeted learner population and content metadata targets for each item. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Grade 3 for an example 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are limitations identified in usability studies being addressed? (See Critical Element 3.2) • Sufficient evidence for reasonable steps design, development, and analysis. • Consider conducting additional studies to investigate differences in reliability by group (for an example, see Critical Element 3.3).

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • Evidence [#047]: ACT Item Accessibility Evaluation Rubric <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item Features (p. 1) • Passage or item stimulus (p. 2) • Item stem (p. 3) • Answer choice (p. 4) • Visuals (pp. 5-6) • Page layout (pp. 7-8) <p>Information about <u>translation</u> can be found in the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#048]: Framework for Translation Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General decision matrix for frequently requested ELL supports (p. 2) • Process for translating tests (p. 4) • Evidence [#049]: ACT Aspire Translation Procedure. Describes Spanish translation procedures for a form of the ACT Aspire computer-based version. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key experts (pp. 1-2) • Process (pp. 2-6) • Recommendations for improvement (pp. 6-7) <p>Information about <u>audio scripting</u> can be found in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#050]: ACT Audio Scripting Guidelines for STEM Content • Evidence [#051]: ACT Audio Scripting Guidelines for Writing Content <p><u>Usability studies</u> informed by examinees both with</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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>and without disabilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#037]: Aspire/TestNav 8 Tablet Usability Study (May 2013) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall findings (pp. 1-2) • Evidence [#038]: Aspire/TestNav 8 Tablet Usability Study (July 2013) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall findings (pp. 1-2) • Evidence [#039]: Designing a Test Delivery System for the Non-Sighted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive summary (pp. 3-4) • Evidence [#040]: Low Vision Cog Labs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations for computer-based platform from cognitive labs (pp. 3-4) <p>Surveys of assessment accommodations regarding blind examinees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#052]: Results for Assessment Accommodations Survey: Elementary and Middle School Version • Evidence [#053]: Results for Assessment Accommodations Survey: High School Version • Evidence [#041]: Mobile Device Accessibility Features <p><u>English language learners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#054]: National consultants for English Language Learners • Evidence [#055]: ELL Fairness Presentation—Part 1 for item developers • Evidence [#056]: ELL Fairness Presentation—Part 2 for item developers • Evidence [#045]: ACT Aspire Accessibility User’s Guide 	

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • Appendix D: Approved Bilingual Dictionaries <p>Code of Fair Testing Practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual (Preface) <p>Item writers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#009]: English Test Item Writer’s Guide Grades 3-10 (p. 8) • Evidence [#010]: ACT English Essay Writer’s Guide Grades 3-10 (pp. 7-8) • Evidence [#011]: ACT Reading Test Item Writer’s Guide Grades 3-10 (p. 5-6) • Evidence [#012]: ACT Reading Constructed Response Guidelines Grades 3-10 (p. 4) • Evidence [#013]: ACT Reading Passage Selection Guide (p. 6) • Evidence [#015]: Item Writer’s Guide–Mathematics–ACT and ACT Aspire (pp. 3-4) • Evidence [#016]: ACT Aspire Science Item Writer’s Guide (p. 13) <p>Fairness Reviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item review for content and fairness (Section 2.2.3, p. 2.4) • Evidence [#057]: ACT Fairness Review Consultant’s Guide 	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed for ACT Aspire/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence of updates to accessibility features (Same requirement listed in Critical Element 3.2). 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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>Conditional Standard Error of Measurement plots:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluating the constant CSEM property (Section 10.4.3, pp. 10.21-10.25) • Evidence #[044]: Scale Score Reliability and CSEM for Arkansas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient evidence contained in (#002 and #044).
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACT Aspire scores (Chapter 9, pp. 9.1-9.5) • Technology-enhanced item scoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (Section 4.2, p. 4.1) • Constructed-response tasks (Section 4.3, pp. 4.1-4.8) • Writing scoring rubrics (Section 3.3.3.2, pp. 3.12-3.13; Appendix F.15-F.28) • ACT Aspire score scale (Chapter 10, pp. 10.1-10.31) • ACT Aspire equating (Chapter 20, pp. 20.1-20.18.) • Evidence [#142]: Inter-rater Reliability Evidence for Arkansas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When is longitudinal growth study of expected to be conducted/completed? • Evidence #142 provided more information about writing assessment reliability including classification consistency and inter-rater reliability for AR – Reliability numbers are lower for writing: more information on writing scoring would be useful (e.g. Does agreement refer to each domain or to total score? How are highly inconsistent ratings treated? What are ACT’s explanations for the lower reliability?). • Interpretation of writing scores different than other scores (lack of vertical scale). Does this affect interpretation of ELA scores? <p>NCSC/MSAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSC will submit
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review (if consortium does not provide, State must):</p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability. 		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</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>Construction of multiple forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#008]: Forms Construction Guide - Part1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines and qualifications for review panels (pp. 2.15-2.19 and Appendix A) • Review of field test items (Section 3.2, pp. 2.2-2.5) • Selection of items for forms (Section 4, pp. 2.6-2.7) • Guidance about item quality (Section 5, pp. 2.7-2.12) • Subject-specific specifications (e.g., for English, Appendix B, section 5-7) <p>Psychometric analyses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual • ACT Aspire equating (Chapter 20, pp. 20.1-20.18.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does form construction for Aspire compare with construction of previous ACT tests (#008)? • How many forms are administered in AR and are procedures for administering multiple forms consistent across districts and schools?
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER REVIEW EVIDENCE

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"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>Mode comparability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACT Aspire mode comparability study (Chapter 19, pp. 19.1–19.43) ACT comparisons of scale scores across modes (Chapter 19, pp. 19.44-19.62). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few paper forms used (only as an accommodation as stated in AR notes). How consistent are devices used across AR? Is there a device comparability study? <p>NCSC/MSAA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence submitted that paper version provided as an accommodation as specified by IEP (ARK 17)
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review (if consortium does not provide, State must):</p> <p>For NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: 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.</p>		
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</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>Maintenance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Purposes, claims, interpretations, and uses of ACT Aspire (Chapter 1, pp. 1.1–1.4) <p>Monitoring and Improving</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence [#058]: ACT Technical Advisory Committee description • Evidence [#139 and 141] Arkansas Technical Advisory Committee Agendas • Evidence [#140] Arkansas TAC Overview 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure the ongoing maintenance and monitoring of AR state results, the TAC may want to consider looking at only AR results and technical information rather than all Aspire results. <p>NCSC/MsAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years should be included in the consortium submission. • Evidence included information from debrief session and TAC meeting (ARK 18, 18A 18B) shows the state participation in monitoring assessments. • (How is ARK 18C related? ARK 18D appears to be missing?)
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review (if consortium does not provide, State must):</p>		
<p>For NCSC/MsAA, ADE must provide:</p>		
<p>Evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years.</p>		
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> </u>X_ 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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • 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; • 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; • 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; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with 	<p>State Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[097] - ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility • Evidence #[136]- Accommodations and SpEdUpdates • Evidence #[113] - ACT Aspire Accessibility Co-op Training for Attendees ppt • Evidence #[045]: ACT Aspire Accessibility User’s Guide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACT Aspire Accessibility System: Levels of Support (pp. 3-8) • Accessibility Supports Tables (pp. 9-17) • Choosing Accessibility Supports & Worksheet (pp. 18-26 and Appendix A) • Administration Procedures for Accessibility Supports (pp. 27-37) • Personal Needs Profile Worksheet (Appendix A) • General Response Dictation and Scribing Procedures (Appendix B) • Guidelines for Sign Language Interpretation (Appendix C) • Approved Bilingual Dictionaries (Appendix D) • Procedures for Local Delivery of Read Aloud Support (Appendix E) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include <i>Guidance for IEP teams for Participation in the AR Alternate Assessment Program</i> document in evidence (rather than link to document #136). <p>NCSC/MSAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent brochure example (ARK 19) provided which explains the MSAA- does not specifically state the differences from the on grade-level academic achievement standards. • Evidence 136 contains link to information that describes impact of alternate achievement standards, but does not indicate how/when parents or other stakeholders are informed of limited connection to the general curriculum. • Documentation showing no consequences on graduation (ARK 20) for taking alternative assessments if the conditions of the IEP are upheld. Parents are notified of the conditions of the IEP (ARK 22 and 22A). Therefore, the state has provided sufficient evidence for consequences of participating in alternate assessments.

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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); • 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. 		
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review (if consortium does not provide, State must): For NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Evidence that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed of any possible consequences of taking alternate 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). 		
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSC/MSAA: State must provide additional evidence specifying the connection between on grade-level standards and alternate standards and how it is communicated with IEP teams, educators, parents, and other stakeholders. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>State Policy and Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[097] (pp.19-20)- ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility • Evidence #[113] (slides 26-28) - ACT Aspire Accessibility co-op training for attendees.ppt • Evidence #[109] (slide 49) - Summative Training Template for DTCs • Evidence #[045]: ACT Aspire Accessibility User’s Guide Arkansas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview (pp. 1-2) ○ Levels of Support (pp. 3-8) ○ Accessibility Supports (pp. 9-17) ○ Choosing Appropriate Supports for Testing (pp. 18-27) ○ Personal Needs Profile Worksheet (pp. 39-43, Appendix A) ○ Approved Bilingual Word-to-Word Dictionaries (pp. 52-70, Appendix D) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All ELs are included in Math and Science assessments, ELs in the US less than a year are not included in ELA testing (#109). • Accommodations are available based on LPAC and PNP. <p>NCSC/MsAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 097 which specifies guidelines for all assessments would include NCSC/MsAA. • Evidence for inclusion of ELs in ARK 23. • Accommodations available to English learners with disabilities as identified on the IEP. Parents notified of IEP, which requires signature (ARK 22 and 22A). • ARK 23B provides additional evidence specifying that team members consider all relevant guidance for assessing EL students with disabilities.

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review (if consortium does not provide, State must): For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide: 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); ○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners; and, ○ Evidence that procedures were clearly communicated to parents. 		
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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 ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • 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; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • 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; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>State Policy and Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[097] - ADE Guidelines for Assessment Accessibility • Evidence #[113] - ACT Aspire Accessibility co-op training for attendees.ppt • Evidence #[045]: ACT Aspire Accessibility User’s Guide Arkansas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview (pp. 1-2) ○ Levels of Support (pp. 3-8) ○ Accessibility Supports (pp. 9-17) ○ Choosing Appropriate Supports for Testing (pp. 18-26) ○ Personal Needs Profile Worksheet (pp. 39-43, Appendix A) • Evidence #[046]: Aspire Item Accessibility –Construct Review Feature Mapping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See Grade 3 for an example. • Evidence #[048]: Framework for Translation Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General decision matrix for frequently requested ELL supports (p. 2) ○ Process for translating tests (p. 4) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include Special Accommodation Request form as evidence (link available in Evidence 136). • Provide evidence that the full range of AR classroom accommodations are available on Aspire. <p>NCSC/MSAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of available accommodations should be provided by NCSC/MSAA. • Effectiveness of accommodations- provide some background research about different features available relative to construct equivalence and score interpretations – should be provided by NCSC/MSAA. • Evidence is sufficient for accommodations for ELs (ARK 22A). • Include Special Accommodation Request form as evidence (link available in Evidence 136). Does this include NCSC/MSAA?

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review (if consortium does not provide, State must): For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available. • 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. 		
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSC/MSAA must provide evidence for the accommodations available and the effectiveness of accommodations, construct equivalence, and score interpretation, which can be in the form of background research. • State must include Special Accommodation Request Form in evidence and verify that it applies to all assessments (e.g. Aspire tests and NCSC/MSAA). • State must provide evidence that the full range of AR classroom accommodations are available on Aspire. 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • 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; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>State Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[096] - 2017 Security Agreement updated 11/21 • Evidence #[102] - Aspire Monitor Training 2016.pdf • Evidence #[103] - 2016 Collecting School Test Schedules • Evidence #[104] - Test Monitor Checklist Spring 2016 ACT Aspire • Evidence #[138] - Monitor Sites 2017 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drop in monitoring was described. What is the typical frequency of monitoring? What sort of monitoring is done on an ongoing basis, other than incident reporting from room monitors? <p>NCSC/MsAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence included monitoring form (ARK 14) which shows there are procedures for monitoring. • Evidence included a redacted monitoring form which shows that monitoring has been conducted. Additional evidence can be included which shows evidence of monitoring beyond the map of districts monitored (ARK 14e), such as a summary report of monitoring.
<p>Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review: For the NCSC/MsAA, ADE must provide: 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.</p>		
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARKANSAS, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • 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; • 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; • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[077] - State Board Minutes, July 15, 2016 .pdf (section A-16, p. 10) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation in Critical Element 6.2 described cut scores for achievement levels and how the cut scores were determined. (Prefer appropriate documentation referenced here, as well.)
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u> X </u> 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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[002]: ACT Aspire Summative Technical Manual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ACT Readiness Benchmarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grades 8-10 (Section 13.2.1, pp. 13.2-13.3) ▪ Grades 3-7 (Section 13.2.2, pp. 13.3-13.4) ▪ Writing (Section 13.3, p. 13.4) ○ ACT Readiness Levels (Section 13.5, pp. 13.5-13.7) • Evidence #[059]: Technical Report for the Aspire Performance Level Descriptors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Background (pp. 2-4) ○ Panelist roles and experience (pp. 5-13) ○ Workshop materials (pp. 14-17) ○ Workshop implementation (pp. 18-32) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient evidence
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u> X </u> 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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[060]: Allen, J. (2013). Updating the ACT College Readiness Benchmarks • Evidence #[059]: Technical Report for the Aspire Performance Level Descriptors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Table 2.2, p. 8. • Evidence #[061]: ACT Aspire Performance Level Descriptors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Critical Element 6.3 also depends on alignment to standards in terms of content and cognitive process (see Critical Element 2.1). • Evidence #002 p.13.4 states that benchmarks may be updated as longitudinal data become available. Provide plan for updating benchmarks to effectively map college and career readiness from young grades. • Evidence of defining benchmarks (together with previous evidence relating Aspire to other ACT tests) specifies what proficient students should be able to do by graduation. • Evidence #059 shows AR participation in defining PLD, supporting the State’s content standards
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide plan for updating benchmarks for college and career readiness based on longitudinal data. • State must provide independent alignment studies (See Critical Element 2.1). 		

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • 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; • 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; • 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"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., 	<p>State reporting and posting procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[114] - Arkansas Law 6-15-433 section 3(A)(ii) • Evidence #[115] - 2017-03-15 ACT Aspire for 17-18 and 18-19 p. 16 • Evidence #[119] - Online Links <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • includes links to publically available score reports and resources for understanding the results. <p>Reporting results</p> <p><i>Access</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[025]: ACT Aspire Portal User Guide Arkansas (pp. 109-118) <p><i>Student</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ACT Aspire Individual Student Report (ISR) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[062]: Grade 3 ISR • Evidence #[063]: Grade 9 ISR • Example <p><i>Classroom</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[064]: The ACT Aspire Classroom-Level Current Progress Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarizes aggregate performance in a given class and compares that class’s performance to ACT Readiness Levels (p. 1) • Supplemental score information, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence 115 lists procedures and dates for future years, is this the same as past/current process? • The score reports (#062-073) for classroom and school were prototypes- provide final designs. • Consider conducting a usability study to determine how parents and students are interpreting and using the results provided in the ISR. • For whom are the interpretive guides (#074, #075) intended (Consider developing an interactive guide so each audience accesses information specific to report.) • Are there other format/language options for reports and guides? • Need timeline for reporting at each level for the most recent administration. <p>NCSC/MSAA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information about timeline and formats to be submitted by AZ.

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>including the classroom’s national percentile rank (p. 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficiency summary for a given subject and itemized score analysis for each skill within that subject (p. 3) Each student’s overall proficiency in a given subject, as well as his or her itemized score analysis for particular skills (p. 4) <p><i>School</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #[065]: ACT Aspire School-Level Proficiency by Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Example using mathematics shows how each class within a grade performed on a given subject and compares the class’s overall progress on a particular subject as well as an itemized score analysis for each class. Evidence #[066]: ACT Aspire School-Level Subject Proficiency by Grade Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of performance of each grade on all subject areas and includes comparison to ACT Readiness Levels. <p><i>District</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence #[067]: ACT Aspire District-Level Subject Proficiency by School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows how each school within the district performed in every subject at a given grade level. Evidence #[068]: ACT Aspire District-Level 	

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> Subject Proficiency by Demographic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breaks down student performance in each subject area by demographic group. • Evidence #[069]: ACT Aspire District-Level Subject Proficiency by Grade Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows the overall performance of each grade level within a district according to each subject area and includes the overall district performance for each subject area. • Evidence #[070]: ACT Aspire Student Performance File <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides districts and states with a complete listing of student scale score for each subject. <p><i>State</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[071]: ACT Aspire State-Level Subject Proficiency by Grade Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows how student in each grade in the state performed in every subject area and includes an overall state average. • Evidence #[072]: ACT Aspire State-Level Subject Proficiency by District <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows how each district within the state performed in every subject area according to ACT Readiness Levels. • Evidence #[073]: ACT Aspire State-Level Subject Proficiency by Demographic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breaks down student performance according to ACT 	

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">Readiness Levels in each subject area according to demographic group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[070]: ACT Aspire Student Performance File <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides districts and states with a complete listing of student scale score for each subject. <p>Interpretations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence #[074]: Understanding Your ACT Aspire Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annotated sample Individual Score report with accompanying explanatory text (p. 5). • Figure including predicted ACT score range and ACT Composite score (p. 6). • Evidence #[075]: Interpretative Guide for ACT Aspire Summative Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides information on how to understand results from ACT Aspire summative tests. 	

Additional evidence requested, stemming from 2016 peer review (if consortium does not provide, State must):
 For the NCSC/MSAA, ADE must provide:

- Evidence of a timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.
- 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.

Section 6.4 Summary Statement

 X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

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, INCLUDING RESUBMISSION OF 2016 OEER
REVIEW EVIDENCE**

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"> • State must provide timeline for reporting at each level for the most recent administration for Aspire and for MSAA. • State must provide evidence that reports and guides are available in other formats for Aspire and for MSAA. 	

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.