



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 304A
Little Rock, AR 72201-1071

May 10, 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, 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 and February 2018.

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 section 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:

- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in reading/language arts and mathematics (Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA)). **Substantially meets requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB.**

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.

ADE also provided information regarding the ACT Aspire, a general assessment in mathematics and reading/language arts for grades 3-8. Feedback regarding this component of your assessment system was presented in a letter sent on April 12, 2018.

The assessments that **substantially meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB**, mean that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that ADE may be able to provide this additional information within one year. The specific list of items required for ADE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, the Department is continuing to place a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, ADE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. ADE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If 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 MSAA assessment substantially meets 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 alternate academic achievement standards (AAAS) ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. This requirement is noted under Critical Element 6.3 in the enclosed list of items.

Page 3 – The Honorable Johnny Key

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students.

If you have any questions, please contact 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 Assistant Secretary
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
2.3 – Test Administration	For the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that item response theory assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.
4.1 – Reliability	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the reading/language arts tests (with operational constructed response writing items) demonstrate appropriate reliability.
4.4 – Scoring	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <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, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards (AAAS) ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act ESSA). ADE should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.
6.4 – Reporting	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

**U. S. Department of Education --
Combined(NCSC/MSAA)
Peer Review of State Assessment Systems
August 2017 State Assessment Peer
Review Notes for the NCSC/MSAA
Assessment Consortium
RESUBMISSION**
(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION**

Contents—NOTE—The items shown below represent areas from the 2016 consortium peer review where additional evidence was requested

2.1 – Test Design and Development	3
2.3 – Test Administration.....	6
2.5 – Test Security	8
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	10
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	12
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....	13
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	16
4.1 – Reliability.....	17
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	19
4.4 – Scoring.....	20
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	21
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	22
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	24
5.3 – Accommodations	26
6.4 – Reporting	29

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAА ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</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>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 82 (Chapter 3, Study #5, Vertical Coherence)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 72-75 (Relationship of the CCCs to Grade-level CCSS Academic Content Standards: Alignment Question #1)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 65 (English Language Arts)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 28-29 (Adoption of Prioritized Academic Grade-Level Content)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 25-30 (Item Development)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 64 (Table 2-15b)</p>	<p>NCSC 15: The Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer preview. At the time the technical manual was constructed, writing items were not part of the operational test.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 28. The writing panelists indicated that the focal KSAs/Essential Understandings provided some evidence of the writing claim but fell short of providing full evidence in support of it.</p> <p>Of the three content areas, only writing panelists indicated that many of the focal KSAs/Essential understandings at higher grades represented skills identical to those at the lower grades.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 83. The results from the Mathematics, Reading, and Writing Relationship Studies indicated that the prioritized academic grade-level content targets and their alignment to intended college and career ready standards was strong with regard to content centrality, performance centrality, and DOK.</p> <p>Results of the End of the Test Survey (EOTS) were not located in NCSC 15.</p> <p>While the NCSC Coordinated Peer Review Response lists “Balancing reading and writing items” as part of the process described on pgs.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 66-67 (Operational Design; Operational Core Items and Embedded Field Test Items; Specifications)</p> <p>NCSC 10: Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 27-34 (Performance Level Descriptors for ELA)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 187 (Reporting of the Writing Prompt (Field Test))</p> <p>NCSC 100: Writing Timeline (2013-2015 Writing Timeline)</p>	<p>25-30, there is only one mention of balancing reading and writing, and it is just listed as a “factor” on p. 26. Peers were not clear on how decisions about balancing reading and writing for the ELA tests were made.</p> <p>NCSC 15: pgs. 33-34 describes the Item Content Review Focus Group Reports for Math and for Reading. It is not clear if this not done for writing.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p.65.The three CCCs prioritized for writing at each grade level consist of one CCC assessed by a Constructed Response item and two CCCs assessed by Student Response (SR) items. The CR writing items were considered field-test items and did not count toward the student’s score.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 64. The writing CR items (prompts) were field tested as part of the 2015 administration, so are not represented as part of the actual ELA distribution of content shown in Table 2-15b. This table shows that writing comprises 19-21% of the overall ELA Blueprint across all grade levels but the guidelines on the same page account for 30%. It is assumed that the CR items will fill the additional 10-11%.</p> <p>NCSC 15: Page 73. The one major change that was made to the Pilot Phase 2 forms for the operational assessment was the addition of writing sessions to create a full ELA test.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015. Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade. It is unclear if Tier 2 writing prompts been included as part of operational tests.</p> <p>MSAA 5: BAFO Measured Progress for MSAA; p. 5. “We recommend, and our best and final offer reflects, that the first operational writing test be administered in Spring 2018 rather than in Spring 2017. In Spring 2017, we recommend field testing additional writing prompts”. It is unclear if this is the final plan for the operational plan for writing.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “State must provide evidence to support the NCSC test design criteria for the writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4”</p>		
<p>Section 2.1 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 to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4. No new relevant information was presented. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 13 (Sample Test Items)</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17, 19, 24 (Test Administration Training Requirements)</p> <p>NCSC 8: System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 65-67 (Keyboard-Only Navigation Shortcuts, Technology Requirements)</p> <p>NCSC 9: System User Guide for Test Coordinators; pp. 72-73 (Technology Requirements)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 94-95 (Administration Support, NCSC Service Center, Additional Supports)</p> <p>MSAA 3: Test Administration Manual 2016: pp. 7, 36 (MSAA Technical Support, State Specific Information) p. 12 (Sample Test Items)</p>	<p>NCSC 1, 8, 9, and 15: The Test Administration Manual 2015, the System User Guide for Test Administrators, the System User Guide for Test Coordinators were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>NCSC 1:p. 13, 16. Availability of sample items does not ensure that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality. As a starting point, TAs are asked to review and complete the sample items with students Additionally, a policy statement and possibly some systematic documentation may be warranted.</p> <p>NCSC 1: p.19. TCs must complete the NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators, including NCSC accommodations.</p> <p>NCSC 15:pp.94-95. Numerous examples of test administrative support and technical support through the NCSC Service Center during test administration were provided It appears that TAs and students do not have access to sample items in writing.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 95. The Tip Sheet described on of might be meeting this need. The tip sheets developed in each year should probably be aggregated and given out at the beginning of</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>MSAA 1: EOTS Data 2016 (Accessibility Features, Barriers)</p> <p>MSAA 2: EOTS Data 2017 (Accessibility Features, Barriers)</p> <p>MSAA 3: p.7, 36. Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans.</p>	<p>the next year to help alert folks to commonly occurring issues. This meets the needs of the troubleshooting guide.</p> <p>MSAA 3: p. 12-14. In the narrative, it states TAs and students can access multiple sample items for both ELA and math. The actual wording is “for both reading and math.” The examples given on pgs 13-14 are for reading and math, but none are provided for writing.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA 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><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (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 THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17 (Responsibilities for Test Administrators)</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; p.13 (Open Response: Foundational Reading)</p> <p>NCSC 123: Architecture and Technology System Requirements; pp. 53-56; 64-69 (Component Transport; Security)</p> <p>MSAA 3: Test Administration Manual 2016 p.12 (Open Response: Foundational Reading)</p> <p>MSAA 4: Test Administration Manual 2017 (TAMs from the past two administrations in comparison with each other)</p> <p>MSAA 11: MSAA Technical Report 2016; Appendix O - Tables O1-O3 (MSAA Participation Rates by Subgroup)</p> <p>MSAA 15: System Testing Data Validation for 2016-17 (Slides 1-3)</p> <p>MSAA 5: BAFO Measured Progress for MSAA; pp. 19-20 (FERPA)</p>	<p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer review.</p> <p>NCSC noted that individual states handle investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. Training modules 1 and 2 were dedicated to testing irregularities and testing integrity.</p> <p>NCSC 5: p. 31. TAs must follow their state procedures. Pages 33-36. The peers noted the quiz for TAs regarding inappropriate test practices is low level and an educator could likely pass it without taking the training.</p> <p>Note: While states have specific responsibility in test security, the underlying architecture responsibility is with NCSC. States using NCSC will need to be aware of their responsibility as part of Test Security.</p> <p>MSAA 4: Since the Early Stopping Rule seems to be the main cause of irregularities in the past, the MSAA work on this is designed to help prevent this irregularity. It is noted that the decision needs to be made by TC instead of TA which helps in the process of prevention.</p> <p>MSAA 4: p. 39 indicates procedures for reporting assessment irregularities. The 2017 TAM includes a section entitled “Test Security</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		and Test Irregularities” the 2016 TAM did not provide such a section. Three topics are addressed: security requirements for administering the MSAA; examples of test irregularities that could impact a secure test administration; and how to monitor and report test irregularities.
Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide then State must): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the NCSC/MSAA, documentation of a process to prevent, detect, report, investigate, and remediate assessment regularities. 		
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 THE MSAА ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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. 	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See element 2.1</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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: For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the MSAA/ NCSC as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>See 3.1 comment NCSC/MSAA may consider cognitive lab or observational data to address validity evidence for this critical element.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the MSAA/NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. 		

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 THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 179-183 (Dimensionality Analyses)</p> <p>NCSC 104: Exploring Dimensionality within the 2015 NCSC Operational Administration Data 12-16; pp. 5-10 (Exploratory Factor Analysis), pp. 15-20 (Dimensionality Review Workshops; Further Investigation; Discussion)</p> <p>NCSC 15-B: Appendix 2_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 2-K update pp. 2-3 (Table B1; B2)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 123-124 (Calibration; Item Response Theory Results)</p> <p>NCSC 15-F: Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-A – 6-L)</p> <p>MSAA 12: MSAA Fall 2016 TAC Meeting Minutes_09222317_Final Draft SECURE; pp. 6-7 (Additional Analysis into how Student Answer Choice Affects Dimensionality by Measured Progress)</p> <p>MSAA 13: MSAA Spring 2017 TAC Meeting Minutes_022817_Draft SECURE; pp. 6-8 (New Research on Student Answer</p>	<p>NCSC 104: p.6. The Center for Assessment essentially confirmed results from 2015 Technical Manual. All grade/content combinations showed two dimensions except ELA at third and fourth grade.</p> <p>NCSC 104: p. 20. The quantitative and qualitative (review committee) results suggested that some students favor a particular response option and that this favoritism is reflected as multidimensionality on certain forms. It was suggested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Future form development and revision carefully consider the balance of the number of correct responses per selected response option, particularly in math. 2. Students’ preferential selection of a given response option be studied further, potentially using qualitative means. Such behavior, if undesirable, could be corrected through revisions to the test administration procedure. <p>It is unclear whether the above two suggestions were implemented and if so, whether they worked. It is recommended that the current data be factor analyzed.</p> <p>NSCS 104: makes the case that the tests, as a whole, function unidimensionally even though there with a few students with an aberrant item selection behavior. NCSC refers to Test Characteristic Curves (TCC), Test Information Function (TIF) curves, and Conditional</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Choice Affects Dimensionality by Measured Progress) , p. 8 – 2nd paragraph, last sentence (TAC’s Evaluation of Dimensionality of the Operational Test)</p> <p>MSAA 14: 2016 R9 Stringer Counts SECURE Table</p> <p>MSAA 11: Technical Report 2016. Page 36.</p>	<p>Standard Error of Measurement (CSEM) curves, and the IRT model fit analyses as evidence.</p> <p>MSAA 12 – Study done by Measured Progress found similar results to those found by the Center for Assessment (NCSC). In fall 2016 these two organizations will work together to coordinate their analyses and make recommendations.</p> <p>MSAA 12: The TAC suggested training issues and adjustments in TAM, in addition to more analyses. TAC speculated on system display and scrolling issues as a high priority.</p> <p>MSAA 11: p.36. “There were also issues that the survey uncovered that will take thoughtful, long-range planning to resolve. One of these issues is how students and teachers scroll to see the entire test item in the online platform. Currently, the item display is such that the whole item cannot be seen on the screen. This has proven difficult to fix as it requires code changes and changes to the APIP for each item. Another issue raised by the teachers is the lack of familiarity and reliability with the contexts and scenarios used in the writing prompts and other items.”</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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: For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p>		
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104 and MSAA11. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>MSAA 12: TAC Notes MSAA 13: TAC Notes MSAA 14: TAC Notes</p>	<p>No new relevant information was presented.</p> <p>It is possible to address this by providing data to show correlations between writing and other variables such as math, science, reading or any other norm tests.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the MSAA/ NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. 		

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 THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 124-128; 171-177 (Item Response Theory Results; Chapter 8)</p> <p>NCSC 15-F: Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-F</p> <p>NCSC 15-I: Appendix 8_2015 Tech Manual Appendices 8-A and 8-B</p>	<p>NCSC 15, 15-F and 15-I: Test Administration Manual 2015 plus the two appendices were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Statistical tables show ELA and Mathematics, but not Writing.</p> <p>NCSC 15-F: p.5, Appendix 6. Example item-level fit plots for Tier 1 Writing Prompt I items were presented. The purpose seemed to be determining whether combined or single item scores should be used, reporting reliability for Writing.</p> <p>ELA scores used in the various statistical analyses contained between 19% and 22% writing items.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 187. Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade this year to enable further research and examination of results. Further development is in progress with the intention of including Tier 2 writing prompts in the overall ELA score for students in the future. Writing SRs and Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015.</p> <p>It is unclear if there will be writing reliability data independent of ELA. The TAC meeting discussion reviewed the writing issue, but did not provide any guidance.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		All data provided in evidence relates to field test writing items. No new evidence about operational items was presented.
Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.		
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If MSAA implements CR operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine 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 THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>NCSC 15: p. 19. To allow the widest possible range of students to demonstrate what they know and can do and to be able to make valid inferences about the performance of all students who participate in an assessment, universally designed assessments are developed from the beginning with an eye toward maximizing fairness.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>The use of UDL (Universal Design for Learning) is designed to meet the full continuum.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>NCSC 15: Operation Assessment Technical Manual 2015 p. 105 -110 –training of scorers – on field-test items p. 114 –Inter-rater reliability on Field Test Writing CR items p. 187 Reporting of field-test Writing Prompt</p> <p>NCSC 10: Guide for Score Report Interpretation pgs. 27-34: Performance Level Descriptors for Writing are embedded in ELA</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 188 – Some states opted to not report writing. It is unclear if this was true in 2016-17 as well as 2015.</p> <p>No new evidence was presented regarding training of raters, scoring rubrics, or evaluation of inter-rater reliability, other than on field-test writing items. It is unclear if this same process used for operational writing items.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts 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; and ○ Documentation that the model-data fit issue identified in item 3.3 has been resolved. 		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For the MSAA/NCSC, evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <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, and evaluation of inter-rater 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 THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 9, 24 (Overview of NCSC AA-AAS; Accommodations)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 67-68 (Table 2-16; Table 2-17)</p> <p>MSAA: No new evidence. See Security 2.5.</p>	<p>NCSC 1 and 15: The Test Administration Manual 2015 and the Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>The use of a paper-based presentation of test item/s is a state-specific policy. (P.9 and Appendix A).</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 13. NCSC created and adopted policies for accessibility and item features that resulted in flexible assessment design and delivery (computer vs paper based). On p. 89, they refer to paper version of items as an accommodation.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For NCSC/MSAA, evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are 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>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>NCSC 17: Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies; pp. 1-15</p> <p>NCSC 106: Final Project Meeting Agenda</p> <p>NCSC 107: Final Project Meeting Evaluation</p> <p>NCSC 109: Estimating and Evaluating Student Growth</p> <p>NCSC 110: Evaluating Precision of NCSC Scores</p> <p>NCSC 111: Future Test Development</p> <p>NCSC 112: Item Difficulty Study</p> <p>NCSC 113: Managing Assessment Assets</p> <p>NCSC 116: Part Perf analysis as of 12-20-16</p> <p>NCSC 117: Part Rate Follow-up as of 12-26-</p> <p>NCSC 118: UKY Communication White Paper Final</p> <p>NCSC 119: UKY Communicative Competence Policy Brief Final</p> <p>NCSC 120: UKY On-line Learning Final</p> <p>NCSC 121: UNCC 4 Studies 9-16</p>	<p>NCSC 17: The Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies was previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Writing scores were not analyzed independent of ELA.</p> <p>12 research reports documenting NCSC support for studies to do ongoing research for evaluating and improving the assessment system. The evidence provided are final reports. It is unclear if there are plans to do more research in the future. In NCSC 107, members indicated in using the information provided from studies to improve the system for the future.</p> <p>MSAA 12: The University of North Carolina at Charlotte conducted four studies to examine the effectiveness of the curriculum and instructional materials of students who participated in the National Centers and States Collaborative assessment system.</p> <p>The MSAA TAC minutes present evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>NCSC 122: UNCC How Teach Standards 9-16</p> <p>MSAA 12: MSAA Fall 2016 TAC Meeting Minutes_09222317_Final Draft SECURE; p. 1 (TAC Membership) p. 3 (Tier Difficulty Study) p. 4 (Precision of Cut Scores Study) p. 4 (Options for Growth Modeling Study) p. 5 (Dimensionality Study) p. 7 (Stage Adaptive Study) p. 7-8 (Stage Adaptive Study) pp. 8-11 (Writing Prompts and Rubrics)</p> <p>MSAA 13: MSAA Spring 2017 TAC Meeting Minutes_022817_Draft SECURE; pp. 4-5 – paragraphs 1-3 on page 5 (Monitoring) pp. 5-8 – Dimensionality Studies (Maintaining) pp. 10-11 – Font and Graphic Size Change (Improving Student Interaction) pp. 8-10 – Change to Stage-adaptive Administration pp. 11-13 (Increasing the Breadth of the Writing Prompts)</p>	
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For NCSC/MSAA, 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>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP teams on participation decisions</p>	<p>See 5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>NCSC 2: p. 3-3. If ELLs have an IEP that calls for the alternate assessment, they will be included in this test. Accommodations will be determined for ELLs in the same way they are determined for all students taking this assessment.</p> <p>NCSC 15-B, p. 6-7 accommodation “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.3.)</p> <p>It would be helpful if this is accommodation is communicated for TA use. Clarification should be provided to TAs regarding the accommodations listed as allowed.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <p>For the NCSC/MSAA, 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"> o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 		
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>For the MSAA/NCSC 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); and 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; pp. 3-4 (Introduction; Description of the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]; Participation Decisions)</p> <p>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 5 (Do Not Use the Following as Criteria for Participation Decisions)</p> <p>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 8 (How do I know if the [NCSC Alternate Assessment] is appropriate for an ELL with an IEP whose language proficiency makes it difficult to assess content knowledge and skills?) Participation Decisions Document; pp. 52-63 (Student Profile Example C) pp. 12-18 (Appendices A-C)</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 23 (Table 11. NCSC Assessment Features) p. 24 (Accommodations) pp. 44-56 (Assessment Features)</p> <p>NCSC 5: Test Administration Training for Test Administrators; p. 66 (What are test accommodations?)</p> <p>NCSC 8: System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 18; 26-28 (Accommodations: Before Test & After Test)</p>	<p>NCSC 1, 2, 5, 8, 15-B, 15, and 15-F: were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>NCSC 2: p. 7. “An ELL should be considered for the alternate assessment if (a) his/her intellectual functioning indicates a significant cognitive disability using assessments in his/her home language as appropriate, and (b) he/she meets the other participation guidelines for the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]”. Frequently Asked Questions</p> <p>NCSC 5: pgs. 23-24. All accessibility features and accommodations listed in each student’s IEP are applicable to each eligible participant, including English Learners. Accessibility features are also listed in the training for TA.</p> <p>NCSC 5: p. 66. Each state in the NCSC consortium has its own process by which unique/non-traditional accommodations are processed for approval</p> <p>NCSC 5: p. 66. “Accommodations are changes in the materials or procedures of the assessment that do not alter the construct being measured.” “If a student requires an Accommodation for the assessment that is not currently in his/her IEP, please see TAM, Appendix A. State Specific Information.” The accommodations were designed to remove construct-irrelevant barriers related to individual characteristics that would interfere</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>NCSC 15-B: Appendix 2; 2015 Tech Manual Appendix 2-B update 2.pdf; ELA Appendix C</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 88 (Documentation of Accommodations)</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 34 (Accommodations: After Test)</p> <p>NCSC 15-F: Appendix 6; 2015 Tech Manual (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p>NCSC 101: NCME 2016 Accessibility Presentation; (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p>NCSC 102: NCME 2016 Accessibility Handout); Accessibility: Consideration of the Learner, the Teacher, and Item Performance</p>	<p>with the measurement of the target construct.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 61. Recommendations for areas of further study included the use of accommodations. It is not clear if further study was completed. If so, what were the results.</p> <p>In NCSC 15-B, p. 6-7. the accommodation “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.2.)</p> <p>Several studies are cited, but none seem to address the question of whether the accommodations provided allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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 MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For both the NCSC/MSAA, 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. • For the NCSC/MSAA, 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"> • For the MSAA evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

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); 	<p>NCSC 103: Reporting Timeline (2014-2016)</p> <p>NCSC 10: Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 24-26 (Appendix A: Individual Student Report)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 132-138 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 139-140 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p>NCSC 124: ADE November 2015 Examiner Newsletter; p. 7 (NCSC 2015 Reports)</p> <p>MSAA 9: TC User Guide 2016; pp. 72-75 (My Reports)</p> <p>MSAA 6: TC User Guide 2017; pp. 34-36 (My Reports)</p> <p>MSAA 7: Reports Letter to TCs 2016</p> <p>MSAA 8: Logging in the MSAA System</p> <p>MSAA 10: Student Report 2017</p> <p>MSAA also referenced NCSC 103: Reporting Timeline (2014-2016). See above.</p>	<p>NCSC 10 and 15: were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>An expanded timeline with additional important dates for Alternate Assessment would be helpful. Testing window dates (March-May) were included in the Examiner Newsletter (p. 7).</p> <p>Student reports were delivered through an online reporting portal as soon as the reports and data had been verified and approved for each administration.</p> <p>According to the narrative, reports in 2016 were available for a four week period throughout August and September.</p> <p>MSAA 8: The MSAA Reporting Portal will be open from August 19 – Sept 16, 2016. This seems like a short length of time, depending on a school’s calendar. The narrative says that in 2017, reports will be accessible by end of July 2017. It is not clear if there is a change in the how long the portal will be open in 2017.</p> <p>NCSC 124: AZ process is provided as an example of the reporting process.</p> <p>MSAA 10: Parent Cover Letter: If a parent needed the letter in a different format, it is unclear how they would be able to read the instructions in the letter. Contacting the state’s</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; ● 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>dept of education does not seem a very user friendly option. It may be more effective for the parent to contact the school rather than the state.</p> <p>No evidence is provided regarding individual student reports being available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide then State must):</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For the NCSC/MSAA evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. ● For the NCSC/MSAA, 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. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For the MSAA/NCSC evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration ● For the MSAA/ NCSC, 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. No new relevant information was presented. 		

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.