



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Diane Douglas  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Arizona Department of Education  
1535 West Jefferson Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

December 2, 2016

Dear Superintendent Douglas:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) 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. Therefore, as you know, the Department reinstated peer review of state assessment systems so that each State receives feedback from external experts on the assessments it is currently administering. We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in April 2016. 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 child's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide feedback on your State's recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated Arizona's submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system meet some, 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:

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (AzMERIT)  
**Partially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (AzMERIT)  
**Partially meets requirements.**
- Reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) in grades 3-8 and high school National Center and State Collaborative/Multi-State Alternate Assessment (NCSC/MSAA)  
**Partially 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.*

The Department conducted a peer review of this evidence in April 2016. The full notes from that peer review are provided to you as an attachment to this letter. The Department has determined that additional evidence is needed from Arizona regarding the State assessment system. A list of the specific items required is provided as an appendix to this letter.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

/s/

Ary Amerikaner  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary  
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Irene Hunting, Deputy Associate Superintendent, ADOE

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
<p><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the high school general assessments, documentation of the State’s policy that all students must take the same assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics in high school (grades 9-12). Alternatively, if the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) requires that all students take a complete set of the three high school assessments in each subject to address this requirement, documentation of the State’s policy that each of the assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics is required for each student at least once in high school. (The U.S. Department of Education (the Department) notes that the State is approved through the 2016-2017 school year through a waiver to permit middle school students taking an advanced course to take the high school test provided the student takes a more advanced assessment in high school.)</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information provided for element 1.3 will also address this element.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the high school grade span (grades 9-12), documentation of the procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested on each assessment and counted in the calculation of participation rate on each required assessment.</li> <li>• Participation rate data for the high school grade span (grades 9-12) that show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plan and timeline for following up on the issues identified in the alignment study for the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school.</li> <li>• Evidence that the AzMERIT covers the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including the State’s speaking and listening standards for <b>all grades</b> and the State’s writing standards for grades 3, 4, and 5.</li> <li>• Evidence to ensure that the State’s AA-AAAS tested the full breadth of ADE’s content standards, specifically the State’s supplemental academic content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics (e.g., writing in grades 3, 4, and 5).</li> <li>• ADE must provide evidence to support the NCSC/MSAA 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the AzMERIT in grades 3-8 and high school, given ADE’s plan to revise the item development process, documentation of technically sound procedures to develop and select items for 2016-2017 and beyond.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that ADE established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA similar to the AzMERIT guide to address technology-related contingency plans.</li> <li>○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</li> <li>● For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school, evidence of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>
<b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For the NCSC/MSAA and AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school, evidence that the State monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure the fidelity of test administration procedures.</li> </ul>
<b>2.5 – Test Security</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For the NCSC/MSAA, documentation of a process to prevent, detect, report, investigate, and remediate assessment regularities.</li> <li>● For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school, documentation that ADE has implemented policies and procedures to address test irregularities, and documentation that the policies have been implemented (e.g., summaries of reported allegations and steps the State took to investigate reports of allegations).</li> </ul>
<b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence that the State has policies and procedures in place for its statewide assessment system (i.e., including AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school and NCSC/MSAA) to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, in terms of: (1) policies and procedures to safeguard student privacy and data integrity at interfaces among the State, vendor, districts, and schools; and (2) policies and procedures to protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups (e.g., State, district and school report cards).</li> </ul>
<b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For the AzMERIT, evidence of alignment for the grades 4, 6, 7, 8 and all high school assessments that is technically sound and is designed specifically for the purpose of assessing test forms against a State’s content standards (e.g., evaluating how well the assessments match the content standards in four ways: categorical concurrence, depth of knowledge, range of knowledge correspondence, and balance of representation and analyzing more than one test form).</li> <li>● For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school, an analysis of the score implications for the inclusion of the academic content standards for listening in the technology-based versions of the AzMERIT assessments but not in the paper-based versions, including a review of these implications by the ADE’s technical advisory committee (TAC), and, depending upon the result of the analysis, a plan and timeline for addressing the impact of the assessments.</li> <li>● For the AzMERIT grades 3-8, as noted in element 2.1, the State must demonstrate its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards with respect to ADE’s supplemental writing standards in grades 3 through 5 and speaking and listening standards. Changes to any of these tests that result in addressing this concern may also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</li> <li>● For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates</li> </ul>

	<p>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>
<b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> <li>• For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school, evidence of a plan and timeline that demonstrates the State’s process to improve overall alignment between assessment and content standards so its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</li> </ul>
<b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1 – Reliability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> <li>• For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school, for the economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English learner subgroups, evidence of adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test reliability estimates of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>○ Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments for each student group; and</li> <li>○ Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school, evaluation of the results of its assessments that documents that they are accessible to all students and fair across student groups (e.g., results of the DIF analysis by all student groups, including students with disabilities, English learners, and economically disadvantaged students).</li> </ul>
<b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</li> </ul>
<b>4.4 – Scoring</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability;</li> <li>○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documentation that the model-data fit issue identified in item 3.3 has been resolved.</li> <li>● For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evidence of adequate quality control procedure for machine-scored constructed response items, including evidence of the accuracy of the scores.</li> <li>○ Evidence to indicate that the scoring procedures and protocols for the AzMERIT produce reliable results and facilitate valid score interpretations, specifically person-fit results.</li> <li>○ Evidence of inter-rater agreement for hand-scored mathematics items.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For AzMERIT 3-8 and high school, evidence that 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 (e.g., Test Characteristic Curves, Test Information Curves, Standard Error of Measurement Curves, etc.).</li> </ul>
<b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>
<b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For NCSC/MSAA, evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years.</li> </ul>
<b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Evidence of procedures in place 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 IEP teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards (AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school) and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (NCSC/MSAA).</li> <li>○ Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with disabilities assessed on the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school without accommodation(s) or with accommodation(s).</li> <li>○ Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities assessed on the AzMERIT 3-8 and high school.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>5.2 – Procedures for including English Learners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school and 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and</li> <li>○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>5.3 – Accommodations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For both the NCSC/MSAA and the AzMERIT 3-8 and high school, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for</li> </ul>

	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has a plan and policy to monitor that students are included in assessments and receive accommodations (both for the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school and NCSC/MSAA) that are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and</li> <li>○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA, documentation that the State has formally adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant disabilities in reading/language arts and mathematics.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the NCSC/MSAA and the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school, evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

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

## April, 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

Note: Peer review notes provide the combined recommendations of the individual peers to the U.S. Department of Education (Department), based on the statute and regulations 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 ARIZONA

Contents

**SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS . 3**

- 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students .... 3
- 1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards ..... 4
- 1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 5
- 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 6
- 1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)..... 8

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....9**

- 2.1 – Test Design and Development..... 9
- 2.2 – Item Development..... 10
- 2.3 – Test Administration ..... 11
- 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)13
- 2.5 – Test Security ..... 15
- 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy..... 17

**SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 19**

- 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 19
- 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 21
- 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure ..... 24
- 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables ..... 26

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER ..... 27**

- 4.1 – Reliability..... 27
- 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility..... 28
- 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum..... 29
- 4.4 – Scoring ..... 30
- 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms ..... 31
- 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment ..... 32
- 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance..... 33

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS ..... 34**

- 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities ..... 34
- 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 37
- 5.3 – Accommodations..... 38
- 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations ..... 39

**SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING . 40**

- 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students ..... 40
- 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting..... 41
- 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards ..... 42
- 6.4 – Reporting..... 43

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

**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><b>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</b></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>Arizona provided the following evidence in support of Critical Element 1.1.</p> <p><b>AZ 1201 Arizona Revised Statute 15-701.docx</b> Page 1: Section A Part 1</p> <p><b>AZ 1202 Arizona Revised Statute 15-701.01.docx</b> Page 1: Section A Part 1</p> <p><b>AZ 1203 AZ SBE minutes-6-28-10.pdf</b> Item 4 General Session Section B on Pages 4 through 6.</p> <p><b>AZ 1204 AZ SBE minutes-8-23-10.pdf</b> Item 4 General Session Section D on Page 5 through Page 6.</p> <p><b>AZ 1205 AZ CCRS 6-8 ELA Standards AZIntroduction_102813</b> on Page 3.</p> <p><b>AZ 1281 College and Career Guidance for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1206 AzMERIT Accommodations Guidance_2015.pdf</b> on Page 1.</p>	<p>Science is not the subject of this review.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</b></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>Arizona provided the following evidence in support of Critical Element 1.2.</p> <p><b>AZ 1203 AZ SBE minutes-6-28-10.pdf</b> Pages 4 through 6: Item 4 General Session Section B</p> <p><b>AZ 1204 AZ SBE minutes-8-23-10.pdf</b> Item 4 General Session Section D on Page 5 through Page 6.</p> <p><b>AZ 1282 CCSSO ASES Parent Booklet (AZ).pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1283 CCSS ASES Parent Brochure (AZ rev June 2014).pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1303 CCSS Application to Students with Disabilities.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1205 AZ CCRS 6-8 ELA Standards Introduction_102813</b> on Page 3.</p>	<p>Some information about stakeholder involvement in the development of the Common Core State Standards is included in the Board minutes and in the Introduction to the Standards. A summary of stakeholder involvement in the development of the Arizona additions is included in the August 23, 2010 Board minutes. However, demographic details were not provided about the participants.</p> <p>In the future, the state may want to collect information to demonstrate the standards were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.3 – Required Assessments</b></p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12);</li> <li>• Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12).</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for grade/subject combinations listed in left column</p> <p>AZ 1207 documents that the AzMERIT assesses students in grade 3-8 in reading, writing and math.</p> <p>AZ 1208 documents that AZ administers AzMERIT assessments for ELA 9, ELA 10 and ELA 11, and Algebra 1, Geometry and Algebra 2. It indicates that a student takes the assessment when enrolled in the appropriate course.</p> <p>AZ 1277 (Alt Asmt Participation Guidelines &amp; Eligibility Determination) documents that AZ administers NCSC in reading and math in grades 3-8 and 11.</p>	<p><b>Evidence addresses AzMERIT &amp; NCSC – AZ summary statement should address both.</b></p> <p>With the exception of students with a significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed with the NCSC assessments, AZ did not provide evidence of one assessment (or set of assessments) in reading/language arts and mathematics that is required for each student at least once in high school (grades 10-12).</p>
<p><b>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the exception of students with a significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed with the NCSC assessments, evidence that one assessment in each of reading/language arts and mathematics is required for each student at least once in high school (grades 10-12), or, for the set of assessments used to address this requirement, evidence that indicates that each of the assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics is required for each student at least once in high school (grades 10-12).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

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><b>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</b></p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system;</li> <li>• For English learners (EL):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment;</li> <li>○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column-SWD and EL</p> <p>AZ 1209 is an AZ Attorney General opinion from 2013 that states all districts must assess all pupils on statewide assessments.</p> <p>AZ 1210 is state statute that states every SWD with an IEP must participate in the State’s assessment system.</p> <p>AZ 1211 is state statute that documents that students placed in private facilities must take state assessments. AZ 1215 is slides that also state that private day schools must assess students on the state assessment.</p> <p>AZ 1212, p. 4 (AzMERIT Test Coordinator’s Manual) state that students in grades 3-8 take the EOG assessments. It also states that high school students take the EOC for the course in which they are enrolled. It also states that students with a significant cognitive disability will take NCSC assessments.</p> <p>AZ 1213, p. 2 (Gr. 3-8 Test Admin Manual) states all students in grades 3-8 take the EOG test. It also states that students with a significant cognitive disability will take NCSC assessments.</p> <p>AZ 1214 (EOC Test Admin Manual), pp. 2-3, state that AzMERIT EOC tests are for students enrolled in courses aligned with the first three English/math credits required for graduation. The tests are ELA 9, ELA 10, ELA 11 and Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra</p>	<p><b>Evidence addresses AzMERIT &amp; NCSC – AZ summary statement should address both.</b></p> <p>All students: AZ Attorney General opinion clearly states that all students must participate, as do key documents for the field (test coordinator’s manual, Gr. 3-8 test administrator’s manual, AzMERIT Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations, Alt Asmt Participation Guidelines &amp; Eligibility Determination). The state statute does mention allowed exceptions for SWD and ELs (see further below)</p> <p>SWD: State statute clearly states that all students must participate, as do key documents for the field (test coordinator’s manual, Gr. 3-8 test administrator’s manual, AzMERIT Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations).</p> <p>ELs: AZ Attorney General opinion clearly states that all students must participate, as do key documents for the field (test coordinator’s manual, Gr. 3-8 test administrator’s manual, AzMERIT Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations, Alt Asmt Participation Guidelines &amp; Eligibility Determination). In general, with the exception of the AzMERIT Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations document, these do not specifically reference ELs.</p> <p>It is not clear that all students in the high school grade span are required to take each of the assessments identified under Critical Element 1.3.</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 ARIZONA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	<p>2.</p> <p>AZ 1206 (AzMERIT Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations Guidance), p. 1 states that all students, including SWD and ELs, must be assessed.</p> <p>AZ 1100 (Tech Rpt) states that all students must be included, and that students in grades 3-8 enrolled in high school level courses also took the respective high school EOC test.</p> <p>AZ 1277 (Alt Asmt Participation Guidelines &amp; Eligibility Determination) clearly state that all students must participate in state assessments.</p> <p>AZ is an English only state (AzMERIT index).</p>	
<b>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With the exception of students with a significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed with the NCSC assessments, evidence that one assessment in each of reading/language arts and mathematics is required for each student at least once in high school (grades 10-12), or, for the set of assessments used to address this requirement, evidence that indicates that each of the assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics is required for each student at least once in high school (grades 10-12).</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
<p><b>1.5 – Participation Data</b></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>Prompts for Reviewers:                      --data disaggregated by student group: ELA/Math/Science                      --Shows students tested and students enrolled for each breakout                      --for end-of-course HS, procedures to ensure each student is tested and counted in participation rate along with data                      --includes grade level tests and AA-AAAS</p> <p>AZ has a double testing for high school waiver from ED [AZ 1216], pp. 39-40. AZ addresses calculation of participation rates for high school EOC tests (pp. 69-70), but the description of procedures for the calculation of participation rates is not sufficiently clear.</p> <p>Participation rate data for reading and math 2014-15 show rates above 95% for all students and all subgroups, and that about 1.1% of all students took the NCSC assessment.</p>	<p><b>Evidence addresses AzMERIT &amp; NCSC – AZ summary statement should address both.</b></p> <p>AZ addressed this requirement for grades 3-8 in reading/language arts and mathematics. Participation rates for grades 3-8 appear to be adequate.</p> <p>For its end-of-course assessments for high school students, AZ did not document that 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. As a result, staff could not determine whether participation rate data submitted by AZ for the grade 10 through 12 grade span show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system.</p>
<p><b>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the high school grade span (grades 10 -12), evidence that 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.</li> <li>Participation rate data for the high school grade span (grades 10 -12) that show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.1 – Test Design and Development</b></p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results;</li> <li>• Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results;</li> <li>• Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills);</li> <li>• If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1 Executive Summary</li> <li>○ Section 1.1 Evidence Based on Test Content on Page 2 through Page 5,</li> <li>○ Section 4 Item Development and Test Construction on Page 26 and Appendix A.</li> <li>○ Section 1.6 Summary of Validity of Test Score Interpretations on Page 14 through Page 15, and</li> <li>○ Section 2 Background of Arizona Statewide Assessments on Page 16 through Page 17.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1218 AZ SBE Adopted Essential Assessment Values_03-06-2014.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1219 Understanding AzMERIT Results November 2015.pptx</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1220 AzMERIT ELA Public Blueprint.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1247 AzMERIT ELA Construction Blueprints_112514.xlsx</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1221 AzMERIT Math Public Blueprint.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1222 AzMERIT ELA Review</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1248 AzMERIT Math Grade 3-8 Construction Blueprints_111414.docx</b></p>	<p>AzMERIT: The public test blueprints were not properly labeled for understanding; there was no label for the percentages in the minimum and maximum columns.</p> <p>The interpretation of the blueprint could be improved by providing more detail related to standards.</p> <p>AZ 1222: A third party, Student Achievement Partners, review of the 2015 and 2016 tests, along with ADE’s response (AZ 1223), address the inclusion of challenging content and use of higher-order thinking skills. AZ’s response did not address challenging content and use of higher-order thinking skills in depth.</p> <p>It would be helpful if AZ identified what they are doing in follow up with the recommendations by the Student Achievement Partners (SAP) to improve alignment and continue to demonstrate its intent to improve the assessment. The SAP alignment addressed CCSS only and not the AZ Supplemental.</p> <p>It is not clear that the full range of the State’s academic content standards is addressed with respect to speaking and listening.</p> <p>All content strands are listed in the blueprint.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a plan and timeline for follow up of the recommendations by the Student Achievement Partners (SAP) to continue to address the issues identified in the alignment study.</li> </ul> <p>Evidence that the full range of the State’s academic content standards is addressed with respect to speaking and listening for all grades and supplemental writing standards for grades 3,4,5 (writing multiple sentences).</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 ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.2 – Item Development</b></p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><b>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1 Executive Summary Page 1 through Page 2 in Paragraphs 5 through 8,</li> <li>○ Section 1.1 Evidence Based on Test Content on Page 2 through Page 5,</li> <li>○ Section 1.1.1 Arizona Review on Page 5,</li> <li>○ Section 4 Item Development and Test Construction on Page 26 through Page 43,</li> <li>○ Section 12.2.1 Production of Content on Page 126 through Page 127, and</li> <li>○ Section 12.2.5 Platform Review on Page 128.</li> </ul>	<p>AZ used UT’s items for 2014-15. Therefore, evidence of AZ’s reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards for 2015-16.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.3 – Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations;</li> <li>• Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments;</li> <li>• If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAS</p> <p><b>1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Section 5.2 Administration Procedures on Page 44 through Page 46, and</b></li> <li>○ <b>Section 5.3 Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations on Page 47 through Page 52.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1212 AzMERIT Spring 2015 Test Coordinator’s Manual.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1213 AzMERIT 3-8 Test Administration Directions.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1214 AzMERIT EOC Test Administration Directions.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1206 AzMERIT Accommodations Guidance_2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1252. AzMERIT S15 Training-Security Agreement Tracking.xlsx</b>  <b>AZ 1253 AzMERIT TIDE User Guide.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1254 AzMERIT Tech Specs Manual Spring 2015.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1255 AzMERIT S15 Test Security Agreement.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1256 AzMERIT S15 Test Security Agreement SCR-DTC.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1257 AzMERIT Testing Incident Report PBT.docx</b>  <b>AZ 1275 AzMERIT TA User Guide Sp_2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ1284 State Specific Guidance Page 2015 (updated 042315).pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1285 2015 Alternate Assessment Test Security</b></p>	<p>AZ 1100 provides an adequate overview of policies and procedures for standardized test administration. Accommodations guidelines appeared very general and may benefit from the state providing more specificity for teachers.</p> <p>Training needs to include instruction to TAs that students must take the practice test prior to administration to become familiar with computer administration prior to testing.</p> <p>Could not locate established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. Longer term test interruptions raise item security and validity issues.</p> <p>Does the student need to click within the area boundary functionality or does hovering over the response generate the final answer? Suggest that AZ check that click functionality is the only selection method available for the student and that hovering does not change the answer.</p> <p>It is not clear in the TA Manual on how to securely handle the test tickets.</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 ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>Agreement TEST COORDINATOR.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1286 2105 Alternate Assessment Test Security Agreement (test administrators).pdf</b></p>	
<p><b>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:            For the alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the AAS (if not provided by NCSC) similar to the AzMerit guide to address technology-related contingency plan.</li> <li>• Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration prior to testing; provide directions in the TA guide on how to provide the practice</li> <li>• Evidence of TA training to ensure consistency of administration across the districts and schools.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

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><b>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</b></p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p><b>AzMERIT:</b></p> <p>AZ states, “Arizona relies on the District Test Coordinators to monitor the test administration within their district and to report any test improprieties to the State. All District Test Coordinators and all Test Administrators sign test security agreements in which they agree to administer tests as directed in the various testing manuals. Additionally, AZ is able to monitor the test administration through AIR’s data forensic program.” [AzMERIT Index]</p> <p>AZ 1212, pp. 3-4 (AzMERIT Test Coordinator’s Manual) describes Test Coordinator’s responsibilities for test administration but not explicitly address monitoring of test administration. It outlines that Test Coordinator’s Manual, Test Admin Directions, and Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations Guidance must be followed.</p> <p>AZ 1256 (AzMERIT Test Security Agreement for DTC) requires DTCs to certify that all instructions in the Test Coordinator’s Manual and Test Admin Directions will be followed.</p> <p><b>NCSC-AZ:</b></p> <p>AZ 1287 [Notification Letter] is a template of a memo for notifying a district that the SEA (i.e., AZ) will monitor at least one NCSC test administration in the district to ensure validity and reliability. AZ 1288 [NCSC Observation Form] is the associated observation form. The form addresses</p>	<p><b>Evidence addresses AzMERIT &amp; NCSC – AZ summary statement should address both.</b></p> <p>For the AzMERIT, AZ indicated that the State relies on district test coordinators to monitor test administration within their districts, and provided evidence that all district test coordinators must sign test security agreements in which they commit to administer tests as directed in key documents for the assessments.</p> <p>For NCSC, AZ provided a template of a memo for notifying a district that the State will monitor at least one NCSC test administration in the district to ensure validity and reliability and provided the associated observation form. The observation form does not address ensuring that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity.</p> <p>Though evidence provided included a brief description of a State’s approach (i.e., that the State relies on district test coordinators to monitor test administration) guidance provided addressed primarily test administration as opposed to monitoring of test administration. Evidence such as sample protocols or expectations for monitoring (e.g., classroom observations), or state oversight of its approach, were not provided.</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 ARIZONA**

<b>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>	<b>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>
	considerations that do not directly address ensuring that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity.	
<b>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</b>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(NCSC-AZ) For assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school, evidence that 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.</li> <li>(AzMERIT) For assessments in grades 3 through 8 and high school, evidence that 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.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.5 – Test Security</b></p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration;</li> <li>• Detection of test irregularities;</li> <li>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ1284 State Specific Guidance Page 2015 (updated 042315).pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1285 2015 Alternate Assessment Test Security Agreement TEST COORDINATOR.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1286 2105 Alternate Assessment Test Security Agreement (test administrators).pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1289 Examiner Newsletter to TCs Feb. 2015.pdf</b> Page 8.</p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 5.2 Administration Procedures on Page 44 through Page 46,</li> <li>○ Section 5.4 System Security on Page 52 through Page 54,</li> <li>○ Section 5.4 Test Security on Page 54 through Page 56, and</li> <li>○ Section 5.5 Data Forensic Program on Page 56 through Page 60.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1212 AzMERIT Spring 2015 Test Coordinator’s Manual.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Test Security Section on Page 7 through Page 8,</li> <li>○ Testing Locations Section on Page 8 through Page 9,</li> <li>○ Test Administrator Training Section on Page 12 through Page 13,</li> <li>○ During computer-Based Testing (CBT) Section on Page 15,</li> <li>○ After Computer-Based Testing (CBT) on</li> </ul>	<p>There was no information provided on 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> <p>NCSC15. Each person was responsible for reporting violation and follow state procedures (pg. 98). There was no indication of a form to complete, or how this process was monitored for closure. This needs to be tied together.</p> <p>NCSC should have processes and procedures for preventing, detecting, reporting, investigating, and remediating assessment irregularities or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence.</p> <p><b>AzMERIT</b> It is not clear in the TA Manual on how to securely handle the test tickets.</p> <p>AZ1255 and 1256: The reports appear as if they have not been updated to integrate online training. They appear to be paper version only. The state needs to update testing security agreements to include online testing.</p> <p>Consequences for confirmed violations are listed at the district level and it is not clear what the state responsibility is within the system.</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 ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Page 15,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 3. Paper-Based Testing Information on Page 16 through Page 28.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1213 AzMERIT 3-8 Test Administration Directions.pdf</b> on Page 4 through Page 13.  <b>AZ 1214 AzMERIT EOC Test Administration Directions.pdf</b> on Page 5 through Page 14.  <b>AZ 1252. AzMERIT S15 Training-Security Agreement Tracking.xlsx</b>  <b>AZ 1253 AzMERIT TIDE User Guide.pdf</b> in Section VII. Working with Test Improprieties on page 37 through Page 45.</p> <p><b>AZ 1255 AzMERIT S15 Test Security Agreement.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1256 AzMERIT S15 Test Security Agreement SCR-DTC.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1257 AzMERIT Testing Incident Report PBT.docx</b></p>	
<b>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>For the alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of process and procedures for the prevention; detection of test irregularities; remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities if not provided by NCSC.</li> </ul> <p>For the AzMerit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a process for test security that defines the description and steps to take in the security procedures and the role of each agency.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</b></p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results;</li> <li>• To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools;</li> <li>• To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1261 AZ Student Data Collection-Protection.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1262 AZ Aggregated Data Requests.png</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4.1 Item Development Process on Page 27,</li> <li>○ Section 5.2 Administration Procedures on Page 44 through Page 46,</li> <li>○ Section 5.4 System Security on Page 52 through Page 54,</li> <li>○ Section 5.4 Test Security on Page 54 through Page 56, and</li> <li>○ Section 5.5 Data Forensic Program on Page 56 through Page 60.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1212 AzMERIT Spring 2015 Test Coordinator’s Manual.pdf</b> in the Test Security Section on Page 7 through Page 8.</p> <p><b>AZ 1213 AzMERIT 3-8 Test Administration Directions.pdf</b> in the Test Security Section on Page 4 through Page 5.</p> <p><b>AZ 1214 AzMERIT EOC Test Administration Directions.pdf</b> in the Test Security Section on Page 5 through Page 6.</p> <p><b>AZ 1258. ADED14-00004144 Statewide Arizona Assessment RFP.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ in Section C.4.5 Online Management System on Page 44 through Page 45, and</li> <li>○ in Section C4.5.1 Security Requirements on Page 45.</li> </ul>	<p>Assessment system RFP states security and confidentiality requirements. Vendor information is available, but it did not identify how the state interfaces with the vendor and LEAs.</p> <p>Did the RFP become part of the testing contract? Information provided by the state regarding data integrity and privacy is very general in nature and does not provide the level of specificity 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 ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>AZ 1259. AIR Initial Response to ADED14-00004144.pdf</b> in Section C.4.5.1 Security Requirements on C.4-33 through C.4-35.</p> <p><b>AZ 1260. AIR Final Offer for ADED14-00004144.pdf</b> in Section 18 Online Management System on Page 147 through 148.</p>	
<b>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</b>		
<p>X There was not sufficient evidence provided to support this element.</p> <p>Alternate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence (if not provided by NCSC) that 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 or clarification of which aspects should be addressed by state-specific evidence.</li> </ul> <p>AzMerit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of state policies and procedures to address privacy and integrity handled at the state level among the vendor, state, districts and schools to protect the data and understand responsibilities.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

**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><b>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity;</li> <li>• If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1 Executive Summary: Validity of AzMERIT Test Score Interpretations on Page 1 through Page 15,</li> <li>○ Section 2 Background of Arizona Statewide Assessment on Page 16 through Page 17,</li> <li>○ in Section 4 Item Development and Test Construction on Page 26 through Page 43, Section 9 Reliability on Page 84 through Page 96, and Section 10 Validity on Page 97 through Page 117.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1222 AzMERIT ELA Review_040115.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1223 ADE_ELA Response.docx</b>  <b>AZ 1224 AzMERIT 2016 ELA Overview_Final.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1233 AzMERIT Math Review_040915.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1234 ADE_Math Response.docx</b>  <b>AZ 1235 AzMERIT 2016 Math Overview_Final.pdf</b></p>	<p>SAP report did not demonstrate adequate alignment between the state assessment and the CCSS. We recognize that the state is working on improving the alignment and the goal should be to about 80% or higher for content alignment within grade-level standards (p.9).</p> <p>AZ 1233 and 1222 pg 9. Student Achievement Partners (SAP) conducted an alignment study; results were based on only one assessment within each grade span rather than at all grades.</p> <p>Was the alignment completed on the online version and not the paper version?</p> <p>Additional sample items with DOK to share publicly to show a range of cognitive would help the public to understand the assessment.</p> <p>Alignment study did not describe the participants and their qualifications.</p> <p>When supplemental writing standards in grades 3-4-5 are added to the test blueprint to assess the full range of the content standards, either the state submits a justification and a recommendation from their TAC, indicating the change had only minimal impact on the score interpretation or evidence for the revised assessments addressing reliability and validity. This refinement likely does not rise to the level of significant change. The technical analyses will likely not need to be submitted for peer review for this reason.</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 ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		When speaking and listening standards are added to assess the full range of the content standards, this will impact the score interpretation such that new evidence will need to be submitted and peer reviewed.
<b>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan and timeline that demonstrates the State’s process to improve overall alignment between assessment and content standards.</li> <li>• Description of the score implications of including listening on the online version of the assessments only. (TAC discussion results are suggested)</li> <li>• Provide justification/rationale for the alignment study conducted only one assessment within each grade span rather than at all grades.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS 1222.page 24 1224. page 14</p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.1 Evidence Based on Test Content on Page 2 through Page 5,</li> <li>Section 4.1 Item Development Process on Page 27 through Page 31,</li> <li>○ Section 4.5 Arizona Review of Base Year Test Items on Page 37 through Page 38,</li> <li>○ Section 4.6 Test Construction on Page 38 through Page 43,</li> <li>○ Section 10.1 Validity of AzMERIT Test Score Interpretation on Page 97 through Page 98,</li> <li>○ Section 10.2 Evidence Based on Test Content on Page 103 through Page 105,</li> <li>○ in Section 10.3 Evidence for Interpretation of Performance on Page 105 through Page 106,</li> <li>○ Section 10.4 Evidence Based on Internal Structure on Page 107 through Page 112, and</li> <li>○ Section 10.6 Evidence for Relationships with Conceptually Related constructs on Page 115 through Page 117.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1222 AzMERIT ELA Review_040115.pdf</b> <b>AZ 1223 ADE_ELA Response.docx</b> <b>AZ 1224 AzMERIT 2016 ELA Overview_Final.pdf</b></p>	<p>A plan that demonstrates its process to improve overall alignment between assessment and content standards so its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards in addition to 5-8-11 provided is needed.</p>

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><b>AZ 1233 AzMERIT Math Review_040915.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1234 ADE_Math Response.docx</b>  <b>AZ 1235 AzMERIT 2016 Math Overview_Final.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1225 AzMERIT ELA Item Specs Grade 3.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1226 AzMERIT ELA Item Specs Grade 4.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1227 AzMERIT ELA Item Specs Grade 5.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1228 AzMERIT ELA Item Specs Grade 6.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1229 AzMERIT ELA Item Specs Grade 7.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1230 AzMERIT ELA Item Specs Grade 8.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1231 AzMERIT ELA Item Specs Grade 9-10.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1232 AzMERIT ELA Item Specs Grade 11.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1236 AzMERIT Math Item Specs Grade 3.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1237 AzMERIT Math Item Specs Grade 4.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1238 AzMERIT Math Item Specs Grade 5.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1239 AzMERIT Math Item Specs Grade 6.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1240 AzMERIT Math Item Specs Grade 7.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1241 AzMERIT Math Item Specs Grade 8.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1242 AzMERIT Math Item Specs High</b></p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
	<p><b>School (Algebra).pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1243 AzMERIT Math Item Specs High School (Functions).pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1244 AzMERIT Math Item Specs High School (Geometry).pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1245 AzMERIT Math Item Specs High School (Number and Quantity).pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1246 AzMERIT Math Item Specs High School (Statistics and Probability).pdf</b></p>	
<b>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</b>		
<p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of a plan and timeline that demonstrates the State’s process to improve overall alignment between assessment and content standards so its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards in addition to 5-8-11 provided.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1 Executive Summary on Page 1 through Page 2,</li> <li>○ Section 1.3 Evidence Based on Internal Structure on Page 7 through Page 9,</li> <li>○ Section 1.4 ELA Results on Page 9 through Page 11,</li> <li>○ Section 1.4.3 Mathematics Content Model and Section 1.4.4 Mathematics Depth of Knowledge on Page 11 through Page 13,</li> <li>○ Section 1.5 Evidence for Relationships with Conceptually Related Constructs on Page 13 through Page 14,</li> <li>○ Section 1.6 Summary of Validity of Test Score Interpretations on Page 14 through Page 15,</li> <li>○ Section 4.4.3 Analysis of Differential Item Functioning on Page 36 through Page 37,</li> <li>○ Section 9.1 Estimating Reliability on Page 84,</li> <li>○ Section 9.2 Internal Consistency on Page 84,</li> <li>○ Section 9.3 Standard Error of Measurement on Page 84 through Page 89,</li> <li>○ in Section 9.5 Reliability for Sub-groups in the Population on Page 94,</li> <li>○ Section 9.6 Reliability for Subscales on Page 95 through Page 96,</li> <li>○ Section 10.1 Validity of AzMERIT Test Score Interpretation on Page 97 through Page 103,</li> <li>○ Section 10.4 Evidence Based on Internal Structure on Page 107 through Page 112,</li> <li>○ Section 10.5 Subscale Intercorrelations on Page 112 through Page 115, and</li> </ul> <p>in Section 10.6 Evidence for Relationships 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 ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Conceptually Related constructs on Page 115 through Page 117	
<b>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</b>		
_X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1.2 Evidence for Interpretation of Performance on Page 5 through Page 7,</li> <li>○ Section 1.5 Evidence for Relationships with Conceptually Related Constructs on Page 13 through Page 14,</li> <li>○ Section 7.2 Recommended Performance Standards on Page 70 through Page 72,</li> <li>○ Section 8.5 Linking AzMERIT to Other Scales for Performance Comparison on Page 82 through Page 83,</li> <li>○ Section 10.3 Evidence for Interpretation of Performance starting in Paragraph 3 on Page 105 through Page 106, and</li> <li>○ Section 10.6 Evidence for Relationships with Conceptually Related constructs on Page 115 through Page 117.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1101 AzMERIT Standard Setting Report Spring 2015.pdf</b> in the Introduction starting in Paragraph 4 on Page 3 through Page 4, in Benchmark Information on Page 17, and Appendix F.</p> <p><b>AZ 1264 ATI-Feasibility.pdf</b> especially Table 3 on Page 4.</p>	
<p><b>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.1 – Reliability</b></p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population;</li> <li>• Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments;</li> <li>• Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results;</li> <li>• For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement.</li> </ul>	<p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ in Section 9 Reliability on Page 84 through Page 96, and</li> <li>○ in Appendix B Standard Errors of Measurement.</li> </ul> <p>1100. Page 93, Appendix B decision accuracy and consistency</p>	<p>The percentages accurately or consistently classified at ELA or Math performance levels range between 0&gt;85 and 0&gt;98 (p.93). All subgroups were not represented in the analysis on page 102, table 9.5 EL, SWD, and Economically Disadvantaged are missing from the subgroup analysis.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  X  </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures of reliability for the State’s student subgroups for EL, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</b></p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 1 Executive Summary on Page 2,</li> <li>○ Section 1.1.1 Arizona Review on Page 5,</li> <li>○ Section 2 Background of Arizona Statewide Assessments on Page 16 in Paragraph 1,</li> <li>○ Section 4.1 Item Development Process on Page 27 through Page 31,</li> <li>○ Section 4.2 Item Review on Page 31 through Page 33,</li> <li>○ Section 4.3 Field Testing on Page 33 through Page 34,</li> <li>○ Section 4.4 Item Statistics on Page 34 through Page 37,</li> <li>○ Section 4.5 Arizona Review of Base Year Test Items on Page 37 through Page 38, Section 5.3 Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations on Page 47 through Page 52,</li> <li>○ Section 8.4 Equating Paper and Online Test Scores (Mode Comparability) on Page 81 through Page 82, and</li> <li>○ Section 10.1 Validity of AzMERIT Test Score Interpretations on Page 97 through Page 103.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1101 AzMERIT Standard Setting Report Spring 2015.pdf in Appendix I.</b></p>	<p>AZ1100: Page 13, 42, I12 describe the DIF analysis process but no results are provided.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State’s item development process includes 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</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</b></p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>Appendix B SEMs  <b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 9.3 Standard Error of Measurement on Page 84 through Page 89,</li> <li>○ Section 9.4 Student Classification Consistency on Page 89 through Page 93,</li> <li>○ Section 9.5 Reliability of Sub-groups in the Population on Page 94,</li> </ul> <p>in Section 9.6 Reliability for Subscales on Page 95 through Page 96, and in Appendix B Standard Errors of Measure</p>	
<p><b>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</b></p> <p>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 ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.4 – Scoring</b></p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4.1.2 Machine-Scored constructed-Response Item Development Tools on Page 30,</li> <li>○ Section 6.3 Interpretation of Scores on Page 67 through Page 68,</li> <li>○ Section 7 Performance Standards on Page 69 through Page 72,</li> <li>○ Section 8.1 Item Response Theory Procedures on Page 73 through Page 75,</li> <li>○ Section 8.3 AzMERIT Reporting Scale (Scale Scores) on Page 80 through Page 81,</li> <li>○ Section 9.6 Reliability for Subscales on Page 95 through Page 96,</li> <li>○ Section 10.5 Subscale Intercorrelations on Page 112 through Page 115,</li> <li>○ Section 11 Constructed Response Scoring on Page 118 through Page 123,</li> <li>○ Section 12.3 Quality Assurance in Document Processing on Page 129 through Page 130,</li> <li>○ Section 12.4 Quality Assurance in Data Preparation on Page 130, and in Section 12.6 Quality Assurance in Scoring and Reporting on Page 131 through Page 136.</li> </ul>	<p>Provide score implications of including listening because it was only included on the online version. (TAC discussion results are suggested)</p> <p>Peers could not locate person-fit results to review how irregularities were actually handled.</p> <p>There is a lack of data provided for the machine scorable Math CR results and no documentation of a process of quality control to ensure consistency of scoring.</p> <p>AZ may want to review the interrater reliability table on writing to consider additional training strategies to improve interrater reliability. Hand scorable CR for Math interrater reliability tables need to be provided.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Score implications of including listening on the online version only to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards. (from 3.1 too )</li> <li>• Person fit results were not provided to review how irregularities were addressed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards,</li> <li>• Provide documentation of a quality control process to ensure consistency of coring for math constructed-response items</li> <li>• Provide interrater reliability tables for the hand scorable constructed-response items.</li> </ul>		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</b></p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4.6 Test Construction on Page 38 through Page 43,</li> <li>○ Section 8.1 Item Response Theory Procedures on Page 73 through Page 75,</li> <li>○ Section 8.2 Establishing a Vertical Scale in ELA and Math on Page 75 through Page 79,</li> <li>○ Section 8.4 Equating Paper and Online Test Scores (Mode comparability) on Page 81 through Page 82,</li> <li>○ Section 12.1 Quality Assurance in Test Construction on Page 124 through Page 126,</li> <li>○ Section 12.2 Quality Assurance in Test Production on Page 126 through Page 129, and</li> <li>○ Section 12.5 Quality Assurance in Test Form Equating on Page 130 through Page 131.</li> </ul>	<p>AZ1100,Page 40; The description of the forms construction process was provided, but no results were provided.</p> <p>It is unclear how many forms were administered per content area and grade level.</p> <p>Provide results of the process described to demonstrate multiple forms yield consistent score interpretations.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence (e.g., TCCs, TICs, SEMCs, etc.) that test forms within a content area and grade level are comparable both within and across school years and yield consistent score interpretations.</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</b></p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments;</li> <li>• Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results.</li> </ul>	<p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 4.1 Item Development Process on Page 27 through Page 31,</li> <li>○ Section 5.2 Administration Procedures on Page 44 through Page 46,</li> <li>○ Section 5.3 Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations on Page 47 through Page 52,</li> <li>○ Section 8.2 Establishing a Vertical Scale in ELA and Math on Page 75 through Page 79,</li> <li>○ Section 8.3 AzMERIT Reporting Scale (Scale Score) on Page 80 through Page 81,</li> <li>○ Section 8.4 Equating Paper and Online Test Scores (Mode Comparability) on Page 81 through Page 82, and</li> <li>○ Section 11 Constructed-Response Scoring on Page 118.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1101 AzMERIT Standard Setting Report Spring 2015.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ in the Estimating Student Performance Data on Page 18 and on Page 19, and in Appendix I.</li> </ul>	<p>Listening comprehension is included in the online but not the paper version; however the difference in the number of items between the paper and online was quite small. If more items are added, causing the content of the online and paper versions to diverge more widely, additional analysis would be required.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</b></p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 8 Scaling and Equating on Page 73 through Page 75, and</li> <li>○ Section 9 Reliability on Page 84 through Page 96.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1265a Arizona TAC Meeting Minutes 2-18-15.docx</b>  <b>AZ 1265b Arizona TAC Meeting Minutes 7-22-15.docx</b>  <b>AZ 1265c Arizona TAC Meeting Minutes 2-01-16_Draft.docx</b></p>	<p>Arizona regularly engages its TAC in the development and review of its assessments with the goal of continually improving the assessments.</p>
<p><b>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards;</li> <li>• States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs;</li> <li>• Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment;</li> <li>• Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</li> <li>• Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities;</li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1277 Alternative Assessment Eligibility_Spring 2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1289 Examiner Newsletter to TCs Feb. 2015.pdf</b> on Page 9.</p> <p><b>AZ 1290 Mega Webinar ELA Roll-Out 2014 State-wide.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1291 Mega Webinar Mathematics Roll-Out 2012 State-wide.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1292 Transitioning to a New Alternate Assessment-Director’s Institute.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1293 Transitioning to a New Alternate Assessment-Leading Change.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1294 AZ Sample Items (NCSC) Overview 2015 FINAL 032515.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1278 Alternate Assessment Brochure.pub</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1277 Alternate Assessment Eligibility_Spring 2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1295 DSN Parent 9-18-13.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1296 Communicating with Parents for Administrators-and-Educators-10-3-14.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1297 FAQ for Parents 9-10-13.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1298 NCSC Background for Parents 9-10-13.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1299 NCSC Communicative Competence for Parents 9-10-13.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1300 NCSC College and Career Summary for</b></p>	<p>AZ 1296: Review the Resources for Parents provided by your state. The state or district should provide accessible versions and versions in other languages, as needed.</p> <p>AZ1206. While this document provides information on accommodations, it would be beneficial for the IEP team to have training to determine the types of accommodations available and useful both in assessment and instruction.</p> <p>What are the dissemination procedures for the accommodation guidelines? Peers were unclear on the dissemination procedures. Peers suggest that the accommodation guidelines be provided to all teachers.</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 ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</li> <li>• Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments);</li> <li>• The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Parents 9-10-13.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ1301 NCSC Diagram and Explanation for Parents 9-10-13.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1282 CCSS ASES Parent Booklet (AZ).pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1283 CCSS ASES Parent Brochure (AZ rev June 2014).pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1290 Mega Webinar ELA Roll-Out 2014 State-wide.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1291 Mega Webinar Mathematics Roll-Out 2012 State-wide.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1292 Transitioning to a New Alternate Assessment-Director’s Institute.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1293 Transitioning to a New Alternate Assessment-Leading Change.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1294 AZ Sample Items (NCSC) Overview 2015 FINAL 032515.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1311 NCSC Assessment Overview 2014.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Section 5.1 Eligibility on Page 44,</li> <li>○ Section 5.3 Testing Conditions, Tools and Accommodations on Page 47 through Page 52, and</li> <li>○ Section 10.1 Validity of AzMERIT Test Score Interpretations on Page 97 through Page 103.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1212 AzMERIT Spring 2015 Test Coordinator’s Manual.pdf</b> in the Students to be Tested Section on Page 4.</p> <p><b>AZ 1213 AzMERIT 3-8 Test Administration Directions.pdf</b> in the Students to be Tested Section on Page 2.</p> <p><b>AZ 1214 AzMERIT EOC Test Administration</b></p>	

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<b>Directions.pdf</b> in the Students to be Tested Section on Page 3. <b>AZ 1206 AzMERIT Accommodations Guidance_2015.pdf</b> <b>AZ 1277 Alternative Assessment Eligibility_Spring 2015.pdf</b>	
<b>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</b>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

## STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</b></p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s);</li> <li>• Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners;</li> <li>• Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</li> </ul>	<p><b>AZ 1277 Alternate Assessment Eligibility_Spring 2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ in Section 5.3 Testing Conditions, Tools, and Accommodations on Page 47 through Page 52, and</li> <li>○ in Section 10.1 Validity of AzMERIT Test Score Interpretations on Page 97 through Page 103.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1206 AzMERIT Accommodations Guidance_2015.pdf</b></p>	<p>NCSC did not provide 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 or clarification that these components should be addressed by state-specific evidence.</p> <p>AZMerit has specific accommodations provided for EL. AZ may want to include more specifics for all teachers in decision making for accommodation needs for the EL student.</p> <p>Guidance for regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners should be expanded and most effectively communicated.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedures for NCSC assessments (if not provided by NCSC) for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodations and guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners</li> </ul>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.3 – Accommodations</b></p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504;</li> <li>• Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL);</li> <li>• Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations;</li> <li>• Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1277 Alternate Assessment Eligibility_Spring 2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1289 Examiner Newsletter to TCs Feb. 2015.pdf</b>; on p 9.</p> <p><b>AZ 1284 State Specific Guidance Page 2015 (updated 042315).pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ in Section 5.3 Testing Conditions, Tools, and Accommodations on Page 47 through Page 52, and</li> <li>○ in Section 10.1 Validity of AzMERIT Test Score Interpretations on Page 97 through Page 103.</li> </ul> <p><b>AZ 1206 AzMERIT Accommodations Guidance_2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>ARIZONA specific evidence (bullet #2)</b>  <b>AZ 1277 Alternate Assessment Eligibility_Spring 2015.pdf</b></p>	<p>There was no evidence presented that the state has determined that the accommodations it provides are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments 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 and may want to check with TAC for suggestions.</p> <p>No evidence that AZ has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. AZ 1289 directs people to call the state but a more robust process could be provided.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  </u>X_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</li> </ul>		

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 ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</b></p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column — Addresses general assessments w or w/o accommodations and AA-AAAS; See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1287 Notification Letter (Consultants NCSC Observations) 2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1288 NCSC Observation Form for Consultants 2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1312 NCSC Updates, FAQ, Closed Tests, Uploading Students 031915.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b> in Section 5.3 Testing Conditions, Tools, and Accommodations on Page 47 through Page 52.</p>	<p>AZ 1287 informs the district there will be monitoring during the test administration. However, there is no reference in the letter to the review of accommodations or what will occur as part of the monitoring process. No policy was provided that reviewed the monitoring process and the disposition of results. There was no documentation that the accommodation was consistent with the IEP.</p> <p>Evidence that AZ monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that English learners are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations as appropriate was not located.</p>
<p><b>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Evidence that the state has a plan and policy to monitor that students are included in assessments and receive accommodations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations;</li> <li>• Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered;</li> <li>• Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice;</li> <li>• Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner;</li> <li>• Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.</li> </ul>		

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 ARIZONA**

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</b></p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;</li> <li>• The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply;</li> <li>• The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</li> </ul>	<p>Evaluate for all factors in left hand column—all tests and grades documented on cover sheet See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1279 Arizona State Board Agenda and Materials_8.24.15.pdf</b> on Page 3 Session 4 General Section C.</p> <p><b>AZ 1280 Arizona State Board Minutes_8.24.15.pdf</b> on Page 4 in Section 4C.</p> <p><b>AZ 1101 AzMERIT Standard Setting Report Spring 2015.pdf</b> in Appendix Q – Arizona State Board Agenda, Executive Summary, and Minutes <b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b> in Section 7 Performance Standards on Page 69 through Page 7.</p> <p><b>AZ 1101 AzMERIT Standard Setting Report Spring 2015.pdf</b> in Recommended Performance Standards and Impact Data on Page 27.</p> <p><b>AZ 1101 AzMERIT Standard Setting Report Spring 2015.pdf</b> in Appendix D – Performance Level Descriptors.</p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b> in Section 8.3 AzMERIT Reporting Scale (Scale Scores) on Page 80 through Page 81. <b>AZ 1101 AzMERIT Standard Setting Report Spring 2015.pdf</b> in Recommended Performance Standards and Impact Data on Page 27</p>	<p>The SEA adopted the academic achievement standards at the August 24, 2015 board meeting.</p> <p>AZ 1100 (p.6): AzMERIT test scores are reported with respect to <b>four proficiency levels</b>, demarcating the degree to which Arizona students have achieved the learning expectations defined by the ACCRS.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><u>  X  </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

<b>Critical Element</b>	<b>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</b>	<b>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</b>
<p><b>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</b></p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1101 AzMERIT Standard Setting Report Spring 2015.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1266 Arizona Administration Code 7-2-615-L.docx</b></p>	<p>Provides a summary of the statistical analyses containing evidence of the reliability of the cut scores and the validity of recommended interpretations.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</b></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1101 AzMERIT Standard Setting Report Spring 2015.pdf</b> in Introduction on Page 1 through Page 4.</p> <p><b>AZ 1100 AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report.pdf</b> in Section 8.5.2 Identifying the location of the ACT College-Ready Cut on AzMERIT on Page 83.</p> <p><b>AZ 1267 AzMERIT Performance Level Descriptor Development Report.pdf</b></p>	<p>The standard setting process addresses critical element 6.3.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</b></p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA**

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><b>6.4 – Reporting</b></p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration;</li> <li>• The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results;</li> <li>• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;</li> <li>○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);</li> <li>○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;</li> <li>○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>See NCSC Consortium Notes for AA-AAAS</p> <p><b>AZ 1217 Arizona EDFacts Participation Submission.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1313 DI 2015 Overview FINAL.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1314 Alternate Assessment Update Talk with ADE 103015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1304 NCSC Parent Overview Booklet Gr 5.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1305 NCSC Parent Overview Booklet Gr 6.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1306 NCSC Parent Overview Booklet Gr 7.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1307 NCSC Parent Overview Booklet Gr 8.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ1308 NCSC Parent Overview Booklet Gr 11.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ1309 NCSC Parent Overview Booklet Gr 3.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1310 NCSC Parent Overview Booklet Gr 4.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1274 Nov 2015 Examiner Newsletter on Page 7.</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1274 Nov 2015 Examiner Newsletter on Page 2.</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1268 AzMERIT Reporting Guide Spring 2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1219 Understanding AzMERIT Results November 2015.pptx</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1269 AzMERIT Family Report Guide Spring 2015.pdf</b></p> <p><b>AZ 1270 AzMERIT Sample Report ELA Grade 3.pdf</b></p>	<p>The SEA did not describe process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>Every effort should be made to get the scores to the parents and teachers before the end of the school year for both online and paper reports.</p> <p>The confidence band information from NCSC was not carried over into the AZ parent report and this may provide additional information to parents.</p> <p>AZ did not specify or provide evidence on how the “do not test”, “invalidated”, and “closed” tests are addressed in reporting.</p> <p>Will AZ allow the rolling data to be sent into TIDE? If so, be aware that there is a rolling comparison to district and state so this changes over time, but will have complete comparisons when the final results are posted.</p> <p>State and district reports were not provided but peers located them online.</p> <p>AZ addresses curriculum and instruction issues as part of the reports which is a good feature.</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 ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</li> </ul>	<p><b>AZ 1271 AzMERIT Sample Report Math Grade 6.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1272 AzMERIT Sample Report EOC ELA Grade 9.pdf</b>  <b>AZ 1273 AzMERIT Sample Report EOC ELA Algebra I.pdf</b></p>	
<p><b>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of the State's process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration for the AzMERIT and for NCSC (if not provided by NCSC).</li> </ul>		

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

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

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



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

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

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

Contents

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

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

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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