



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

June 29, 2018

Dear Superintendent Douglas:

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

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

- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in grades 3-8 (AzMERIT)
Substantially meets requirements
- Reading/language arts and mathematics general assessments in high school (AzMERIT)
Substantially meets requirements

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

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

- Reading/language arts and mathematics alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards (NCSC/MSAA) in grades 3-8 and high school **Substantially meets requirements**

The assessments that **substantially meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB**, mean that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that ADE may be able to provide this additional information within one year. The specific list of items required for ADE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because the State has not fully satisfied the condition placed on the State's Title I, Part A grant award related to its State assessment system, the Department is continuing to place a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, ADE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. ADE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation within 30 days of the receipt of this letter. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action.

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

Please note that the assessment requirements for the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The ADE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA will apply to State assessments.

Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that while the MSAA assessment substantially meets most of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff have carefully reviewed ADE evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the ADE must also provide evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards (AAAS) ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. This requirement is noted under Critical Element 6.3 in the enclosed list of items.

Page 3 – The Honorable Diane Douglas

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 Kimberly Light of my staff at: OSS.Arizona@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jason Botel

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary

Enclosures

cc: Audra Ahumada, Deputy Associate Superintendent, ADE

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
1.3 – Required Assessments	For the AzMERIT high school general assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence 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.
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	For the AzMERIT high school general assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information provided for element 1.3 will also address this element.
1.5 – Participation Data	For the AzMerit high school general assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence 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. Evidence of 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.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	For the AZMerit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of how the results of the AzMERIT alignment study will be used to improve alignment by providing a plan and timeline to address the identified issues, including the coverage of the full range of the State’s standards for writing and listening by the assessments.
2.3 – Test Administration	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	For the AzMERIT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of how the results of the AzMERIT alignment study will be used to improve alignment by providing a plan and timeline to address the identified issues, including the coverage of the full range of the State’s standards for writing and listening by the assessments..
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide evidence that item response theory assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
4.1 – Reliability	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the reading/language arts tests (with operational constructed response writing items) demonstrate appropriate reliability.
4.4 – Scoring	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; and ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	For the entire assessment system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 MSAA) that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; ○ Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; ○ Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; ○ Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s individualized education plan team or 504 team for children with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and ○ Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards (additional requirement under section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA)	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards (AAAS) ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, as specified in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. ADE should provide this evidence by December 15, 2020.
6.4 – Reporting	For the MSAA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes for the NCSC/MSAA Assessment Consortium RESUBMISSION

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 and 2017 Peer Reviews)



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

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

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

Contents—NOTE—The items shown below represent areas from the 2017 consortium peer review where additional evidence was requested

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	3
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	4
2.3 – Test Administration	7
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	5
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	7
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	8
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	10
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	11
4.1 – Reliability.....	11
4.4 – Scoring	12
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	13
5.3 – Accommodations.....	16
6.4 – Reporting.....	19

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAА ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: State 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.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAА ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>MSAA Timeline for adding in writing item samples to the MSAA PowerPoint by February 2018 and Practice site by June 2018.</p>	<p>Final slide on PowerPoint: Display new sample writing items to practice site June 2018.</p> <p>Evidence is not sufficient to meet the outstanding requirement.</p> <p>After the sample writing items are added to the practice test, MSAA should provide evidence that this work was done, and describe how the sample items reflect the different components of the writing assessment.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans. ○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing. <p>Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing.		
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include evidence of a policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing. 		

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.

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAА ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>MSAA Graphics Resizing Change Order 2017</p>	<p>MSAA scrolling issue evidence (validity based on internal structure)--change orders and an amendment to the MSAA contract with Measured Progress were created to address the scrolling issue. The peers noted how timely this issue was addressed by the MSAA.</p> <p>The change order generally indicates how the MSAA addressed answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling, but no evidence details the impact(s) of the implemented change orders.</p> <p>The MSAA may wish to consider pilot studies to address impact before full consortium implementation.</p> <p>While the change order was submitted, it is not clear exactly how this will impact dimensionality. Evidence must be provided that illustrates and provides data regarding the impacts after the change order has been implemented. The MSAA must submit evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104 and MSAA11. 		
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality are met. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: For the MSAA/ NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the MSAA/ NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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 align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p> <p>MSAA indicated that constructed response writing items were field tested in 2017 and will be operational in 2018.</p> <p>When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability. 		
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When MSAA implements constructed response operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State did not provide evidence in the February 2018 submission for this critical element.</p>	<p>No relevant evidence located.</p> <p><i>Arizona Specific Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) Policies – this document mentions training, but does not specify if the training includes training for scoring.</i></p> <p>It is unclear if these policies are just for AZ or for all MSAA states.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, evaluation of inter-rater reliability; and ○ Documentation that the model-data fit issue identified in item 3.3 has been resolved. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability. 		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence of documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols designed to produce reliable results and facilitate score interpretations for constructed-response items in reading/language arts and mathematics and also operational writing items. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate procedures and criteria for ensuring and documenting inter-rater reliability; ○ Clear scoring rubrics, comprehensive instructions for raters, adequate training of raters, and evaluation of inter-rater reliability. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>Accommodation Guidelines: <i>Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment</i> July, 2017</p> <p>C.E. 5.3 MSAA AZ Accommodation Reliability from 2017</p>	<p>The Accommodations Guidelines provide discussion about the importance of accommodations not altering the construct being tested (p. 8) and about the difference between accommodations and modifications (p. 10-11).</p> <p>ADE provided a table of reliability based on all students, those using assistive response, scribe, and sign for each grade level. There was no discussion provided how this data ensures that the accommodations used do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. However, the peers evaluated the data and determined that this data addressed this critical element.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For both the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available. For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. 		
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; • The State follows a process and timeline for 	<p>C.E. 6.4 MSAA Student Report 2017_2018 New Message 101617. See mock-up of last sentence. The letter will now state “If you require this letter or child’s report in a different format, please contact your child’s teacher or school”.</p> <p>C.E. 6.4 MSAA 2017 MSAA Test Administration Manual (TAM)3.3.17 (with Alternate Format Updates 101617)</p>	<p>There was no evidence located related to the process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.</p> <p>Evidence was provided to verify that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration.		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the NCSC/MSAA evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. • For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration • Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand. No new relevant information was presented. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT
CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION -- COMBINED(NCSC/MSAA)

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems
August 2017 State Assessment Peer
Review Notes for the NCSC/MSAA
Assessment Consortium
RESUBMISSION

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

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

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

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

2.1 – Test Design and Development	4
2.3 – Test Administration.....	8
2.5 – Test Security	5
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	7
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	9
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....	11
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables.....	14
4.1 – Reliability.....	16
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	18
4.4 – Scoring.....	19
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	20
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	22
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	24
5.3 – Accommodations	27
6.4 – Reporting	31

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAА ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSA A ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 82 (Chapter 3, Study #5, Vertical Coherence)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 72-75 (Relationship of the CCCs to Grade-level CCSS Academic Content Standards: Alignment Question #1)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 65 (English Language Arts)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 28-29 (Adoption of Prioritized Academic Grade-Level Content)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 25-30 (Item Development)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 64 (Table 2-15b)</p>	<p>NCSC 15: The Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer preview. At the time the technical manual was constructed, writing items were not part of the operational test.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 28. The writing panelists indicated that the focal KSAs/Essential Understandings provided some evidence of the writing claim but fell short of providing full evidence in support of it.</p> <p>Of the three content areas, only writing panelists indicated that many of the focal KSAs/Essential understandings at higher grades represented skills identical to those at the lower grades.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 83. The results from the Mathematics, Reading, and Writing Relationship Studies indicated that the prioritized academic grade-level content targets and their alignment to intended college and career ready standards was strong with regard to content centrality, performance centrality, and DOK.</p> <p>Results of the End of the Test Survey (EOTS) were not located in NCSC 15.</p> <p>While the NCSC Coordinated Peer Review Response lists “Balancing reading and writing items” as part of the process described on pgs.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAА ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015. Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade. It is unclear if Tier 2 writing prompts been included as part of operational tests.</p> <p>MSAA 5: BAFO Measured Progress for MSAA; p. 5. “We recommend, and our best and final offer reflects, that the first operational writing test be administered in Spring 2018 rather than in Spring 2017. In Spring 2017, we recommend field testing additional writing prompts”. It is unclear if this is the final plan for the operational plan for writing.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: “State must provide evidence to support the NCSC test design criteria for the writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4”</p>		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State must provide evidence to support the MSAA/NCSC test design criteria for the operational writing portion of the reading/language arts AA-AAAS. This will also impact evidence for related critical elements in sections 3 and 4. No new relevant information was presented. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 13 (Sample Test Items)</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17, 19, 24 (Test Administration Training Requirements)</p> <p>NCSC 8: System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 65-67 (Keyboard-Only Navigation Shortcuts, Technology Requirements)</p> <p>NCSC 9: System User Guide for Test Coordinators; pp. 72-73 (Technology Requirements)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 94-95 (Administration Support, NCSC Service Center, Additional Supports)</p> <p>MSAA 3: Test Administration Manual 2016; pp. 7, 36 (MSAA Technical Support, State Specific Information) p. 12 (Sample Test Items)</p>	<p>NCSC 1, 8, 9, and 15: The Test Administration Manual 2015, the System User Guide for Test Administrators, the System User Guide for Test Coordinators were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>NCSC 1:p. 13, 16. Availability of sample items does not ensure that all students are familiar with the item format and online functionality. As a starting point, TAs are asked to review and complete the sample items with students Additionally, a policy statement and possibly some systematic documentation may be warranted.</p> <p>NCSC 1: p.19. TCs must complete the NCSC Online Test Administration Training for Test Coordinators, including NCSC accommodations.</p> <p>NCSC 15:pp.94-95. Numerous examples of test administrative support and technical support through the NCSC Service Center during test administration were provided It appears that TAs and students do not have access to sample items in writing.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 95. The Tip Sheet described on of might be meeting this need. The tip sheets developed in each year should probably be aggregated and given out at the beginning of the next year to help alert folks to commonly</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>MSAA 1: EOTS Data 2016 (Accessibility Features, Barriers)</p> <p>MSAA 2: EOTS Data 2017 (Accessibility Features, Barriers)</p> <p>MSAA 3: p.7, 36. Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans.</p>	<p>occurring issues. This meets the needs of the troubleshooting guide.</p> <p>MSAA 3: p. 12-14. In the narrative, it states TAs and students can access multiple sample items for both ELA and math. The actual wording is “for both reading and math.” The examples given on pgs 13-14 are for reading and math, but none are provided for writing.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the NCSC/MSAA assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA to address technology-related contingency plans. ○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing. ○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools. 		
<p>Section 2.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA/NCSC assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration in writing (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 16-17 (Responsibilities for Test Administrators)</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; p.13 (Open Response: Foundational Reading)</p> <p>NCSC 123: Architecture and Technology System Requirements; pp. 53-56; 64-69 (Component Transport; Security)</p> <p>MSAA 3: Test Administration Manual 2016 p.12 (Open Response: Foundational Reading)</p> <p>MSAA 4: Test Administration Manual 2017 (TAMs from the past two administrations in comparison with each other)</p> <p>MSAA 11: MSAA Technical Report 2016; Appendix O - Tables O1-O3 (MSAA Participation Rates by Subgroup)</p> <p>MSAA 15: System Testing Data Validation for 2016-17 (Slides 1-3)</p> <p>MSAA 5: BAFO Measured Progress for MSAA; pp. 19-20 (FERPA)</p>	<p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015 was previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>NCSC noted that individual states handle investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. Training modules 1 and 2 were dedicated to testing irregularities and testing integrity.</p> <p>NCSC 5: p. 31. TAs must follow their state procedures. Pages 33-36. The peers noted the quiz for TAs regarding inappropriate test practices is low level and an educator could likely pass it without taking the training.</p> <p>Note: While states have specific responsibility in test security, the underlying architecture responsibility is with NCSC. States using NCSC will need to be aware of their responsibility as part of Test Security.</p> <p>MSAA 4: Since the Early Stopping Rule seems to be the main cause of irregularities in the past, the MSAA work on this is designed to help prevent this irregularity. It is noted that the decision needs to be made by TC instead of TA which helps in the process of prevention.</p> <p>MSAA 4: p. 39 indicates procedures for reporting assessment irregularities. The 2017 TAM includes a section entitled “Test Security and Test Irregularities” the 2016 TAM did not provide such a section. Three topics are</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		addressed: security requirements for administering the MSAA; examples of test irregularities that could impact a secure test administration; and how to monitor and report test irregularities.
Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide then State must): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the NCSC/MSAA, documentation of a process to prevent, detect, report, investigate, and remediate assessment regularities. 		
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
<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 MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See element 2.1</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of the State’s content standards (writing). Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards. This will also effect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the MSAA/ NCSC as noted in element 2.1, evidence that demonstrates its assessments measure the full breadth and depth of 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>the State’s writing (ELA) content standards. Following that, the State will need to document adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, including evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards for writing. This will also affect other critical elements in sections 3 and 4.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>No evidence was provided.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>See 3.1 comment NCSC/MSAA may consider cognitive lab or observational data to address validity evidence for this critical element.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the MSAA/NCSC, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 179-183 (Dimensionality Analyses)</p> <p>NCSC 104: Exploring Dimensionality within the 2015 NCSC Operational Administration Data 12-16; pp. 5-10 (Exploratory Factor Analysis), pp. 15-20 (Dimensionality Review Workshops; Further Investigation; Discussion)</p> <p>NCSC 15-B: Appendix 2_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 2-K update pp. 2-3 (Table B1; B2)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 123-124 (Calibration; Item Response Theory Results)</p> <p>NCSC 15-F: Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-A – 6-L)</p> <p>MSAA 12: MSAA Fall 2016 TAC Meeting Minutes_09222317_Final Draft SECURE; pp. 6-7 (Additional Analysis into how Student Answer Choice Affects Dimensionality by Measured Progress)</p> <p>MSAA 13: MSAA Spring 2017 TAC Meeting Minutes_022817_Draft SECURE; pp. 6-8 (New Research on Student Answer Choice Affects Dimensionality by Measured Progress) , p. 8 – 2nd paragraph, last sentence (TAC’s Evaluation of Dimensionality of the</p>	<p>NCSC 104: p.6. The Center for Assessment essentially confirmed results from 2015 Technical Manual. All grade/content combinations showed two dimensions except ELA at third and fourth grade.</p> <p>NCSC 104: p. 20. The quantitative and qualitative (review committee) results suggested that some students favor a particular response option and that this favoritism is reflected as multidimensionality on certain forms. It was suggested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Future form development and revision carefully consider the balance of the number of correct responses per selected response option, particularly in math. 2. Students’ preferential selection of a given response option be studied further, potentially using qualitative means. Such behavior, if undesirable, could be corrected through revisions to the test administration procedure. <p>It is unclear whether the above two suggestions were implemented and if so, whether they worked. It is recommended that the current data be factor analyzed.</p> <p>NCSCS 104: makes the case that the tests, as a whole, function unidimensionally even though there with a few students with an aberrant item selection behavior. NCSC refers to Test Characteristic Curves (TCC), Test Information Function (TIF) curves, and Conditional Standard Error of Measurement (CSEM) curves, and the IRT model fit analyses as 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 MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Operational Test)</p> <p>MSAA 14: 2016 R9 Stringer Counts SECURE Table</p> <p>MSAA 11: Technical Report 2016. Page 36.</p>	<p>MSAA 12 – Study done by Measured Progress found similar results to those found by the Center for Assessment (NCSC). In fall 2016 these two organizations will work together to coordinate their analyses and make recommendations.</p> <p>MSAA 12: The TAC suggested training issues and adjustments in TAM, in addition to more analyses. TAC speculated on system display and scrolling issues as a high priority.</p> <p>MSAA 11: p.36. “There were also issues that the survey uncovered that will take thoughtful, long-range planning to resolve. One of these issues is how students and teachers scroll to see the entire test item in the online platform. Currently, the item display is such that the whole item cannot be seen on the screen. This has proven difficult to fix as it requires code changes and changes to the APIP for each item. Another issue raised by the teachers is the lack of familiarity and reliability with the contexts and scenarios used in the writing prompts and other items.”</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, additional evidence that supports the internal structure of the tests, specifically a plan and timeline for documenting how the test meets item response theory (IRT) assumptions of test unidimensionality.</p>		
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of how NCSC will address answer choice presentation and impact of scrolling in the administration of the test as evidenced by NCSC 104 and MSAA11. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 124-128; 171-177 (Item Response Theory Results; Chapter 8)</p> <p>NCSC 15-F: Appendix 6_2015 Tech Manual Appendix 6-F</p> <p>NCSC 15-I: Appendix 8_2015 Tech Manual Appendices 8-A and 8-B</p>	<p>NCSC 15, 15-F and 15-I: Test Administration Manual 2015 plus the two appendices were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Statistical tables show ELA and Mathematics, but not Writing.</p> <p>NCSC 15-F: p.5, Appendix 6. Example item-level fit plots for Tier 1 Writing Prompt I items were presented. The purpose seemed to be determining whether combined or single item scores should be used, reporting reliability for Writing.</p> <p>ELA scores used in the various statistical analyses contained between 19% and 22% writing items.</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 187. Tier 2 writing prompts were field tested in ELA in each grade this year to enable further research and examination of results. Further development is in progress with the intention of including Tier 2 writing prompts in the overall ELA score for students in the future. Writing SRs and Tier 1 prompts were included in the overall ELA score for 2015.</p> <p>It is unclear if there will be writing reliability data independent of ELA. The TAC meeting discussion reviewed the writing issue, but did not provide any guidance.</p> <p>All data provided in evidence relates to field test writing items. No new evidence about operational items was presented.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If MSAA implements CR operational writing items, appropriate studies must be conducted to determine reliability. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>NCSC 15: p. 19. To allow the widest possible range of students to demonstrate what they know and can do and to be able to make valid inferences about the performance of all students who participate in an assessment, universally designed assessments are developed from the beginning with an eye toward maximizing fairness.</p>	<p>See Element 2.1.</p> <p>The use of UDL (Universal Design for Learning) is designed to meet the full continuum.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the NCSC/MSAA, see explanatory note for writing items in 3.1.</p>		
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; pp. 9, 24 (Overview of NCSC AA-AAS; Accommodations)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 67-68 (Table 2-16; Table 2-17)</p> <p>MSAA: No new evidence. See Security 2.5.</p>	<p>NCSC 1 and 15: The Test Administration Manual 2015 and the Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015 were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>The use of a paper-based presentation of test item/s is a state-specific policy. (P.9 and Appendix A).</p> <p>NCSC 15: p. 13. NCSC created and adopted policies for accessibility and item features that resulted in flexible assessment design and delivery (computer vs paper based). On p. 89, they refer to paper version of items as an accommodation.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For NCSC/MSAA, evidence either that paper versions of the assessments are an accommodation or an analysis of the comparability of the meaning and interpretation of the assessment results across the technology-based and paper-based versions of the assessments.</p>		
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>NCSC 17: Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies; pp. 1-15</p> <p>NCSC 106: Final Project Meeting Agenda</p> <p>NCSC 107: Final Project Meeting Evaluation</p> <p>NCSC 109: Estimating and Evaluating Student Growth</p> <p>NCSC 110: Evaluating Precision of NCSC Scores</p> <p>NCSC 111: Future Test Development</p> <p>NCSC 112: Item Difficulty Study</p> <p>NCSC 113: Managing Assessment Assets</p> <p>NCSC 116: Part Perf analysis as of 12-20-16</p> <p>NCSC 117: Part Rate Follow-up as of 12-26-</p> <p>NCSC 118: UKY Communication White Paper Final</p> <p>NCSC 119: UKY Communicative Competence Policy Brief Final</p> <p>NCSC 120: UKY On-line Learning Final</p> <p>NCSC 121: UNCC 4 Studies 9-16</p> <p>NCSC 122: UNCC How Teach Standards 9-16</p> <p>MSAA 12: MSAA Fall 2016 TAC Meeting</p>	<p>NCSC 17: The Post-Operational NCSC Research Studies was previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>Writing scores were not analyzed independent of ELA.</p> <p>12 research reports documenting NCSC support for studies to do ongoing research for evaluating and improving the assessment system. The evidence provided are final reports. It is unclear if there are plans to do more research in the future. In NCSC 107, members indicated in using the information provided from studies to improve the system for the future.</p> <p>MSAA 12: The University of North Carolina at Charlotte conducted four studies to examine the effectiveness of the curriculum and instructional materials of students who participated in the National Centers and States Collaborative assessment system.</p> <p>The MSAA TAC minutes present evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Minutes_09222317_Final Draft SECURE; p. 1 (TAC Membership) p. 3 (Tier Difficulty Study) p. 4 (Precision of Cut Scores Study) p. 4 (Options for Growth Modeling Study) p. 5 (Dimensionality Study) p. 7 (Stage Adaptive Study) p. 7-8 (Stage Adaptive Study) pp. 8-11 (Writing Prompts and Rubrics)</p> <p>MSAA 13: MSAA Spring 2017 TAC Meeting Minutes_022817_Draft SECURE; pp. 4-5 – paragraphs 1-3 on page 5 (Monitoring) pp. 5-8 – Dimensionality Studies (Maintaining) pp. 10-11 – Font and Graphic Size Change (Improving Student Interaction) pp. 8-10 – Change to Stage-adaptive Administration pp. 11-13 (Increasing the Breadth of the Writing Prompts)</p>	
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p>		
<p>For NCSC/MSAA, evidence of a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of the assessments for future years</p>		
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP teams on participation decisions</p>	<p>See 5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>NCSC 2: p. 3-3. If ELLs have an IEP that calls for the alternate assessment, they will be included in this test. Accommodations will be determined for ELLs in the same way they are determined for all students taking this assessment.</p> <p>NCSC 15-B, p. 6-7 accommodation “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.3.)</p> <p>It would be helpful if this is accommodation is communicated for TA use. Clarification should be provided to TAs regarding the accommodations listed as allowed.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must): For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and o Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 		
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: For the MSAA/NCSC evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities (SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; pp. 3-4 (Introduction; Description of the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]; Participation Decisions)</p> <p>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 5 (Do Not Use the Following as Criteria for Participation Decisions)</p> <p>NCSC 2: Guidance for IEP Teams on Participation Decisions; p. 8 (How do I know if the [NCSC Alternate Assessment] is appropriate for an ELL with an IEP whose language proficiency makes it difficult to assess content knowledge and skills?) Participation Decisions Document; pp. 52-63 (Student Profile Example C) pp. 12-18 (Appendices A-C)</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 23 (Table 11. NCSC Assessment Features) p. 24 (Accommodations) pp. 44-56 (Assessment Features)</p> <p>NCSC 5: Test Administration Training for Test Administrators; p. 66 (What are test accommodations?)</p> <p>NCSC 8: System User Guide for Test Administrators; pp. 18; 26-28 (Accommodations: Before Test & After Test)</p> <p>NCSC 15-B: Appendix 2; 2015 Tech Manual</p>	<p>NCSC 1, 2, 5, 8, 15-B, 15, and 15-F: were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>NCSC 2: p. 7. “An ELL should be considered for the alternate assessment if (a) his/her intellectual functioning indicates a significant cognitive disability using assessments in his/her home language as appropriate, and (b) he/she meets the other participation guidelines for the [NCSC Alternate Assessment]”. Frequently Asked Questions</p> <p>NCSC 5: pgs. 23-24. All accessibility features and accommodations listed in each student’s IEP are applicable to each eligible participant, including English Learners. Accessibility features are also listed in the training for TA.</p> <p>NCSC 5: p. 66. Each state in the NCSC consortium has its own process by which unique/non-traditional accommodations are processed for approval</p> <p>NCSC 5: p. 66. “Accommodations are changes in the materials or procedures of the assessment that do not alter the construct being measured.” “If a student requires an Accommodation for the assessment that is not currently in his/her IEP, please see TAM, Appendix A. State Specific Information.” The accommodations were designed to remove construct-irrelevant barriers related to individual characteristics that would interfere with the measurement of the target construct.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Appendix 2-B update 2.pdf; ELA Appendix C</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; p. 88 (Documentation of Accommodations)</p> <p>NCSC 1: Test Administration Manual 2015; p. 34 (Accommodations: After Test)</p> <p>NCSC 15-F: Appendix 6; 2015 Tech Manual (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p>NCSC 101: NCME 2016 Accessibility Presentation; (Appendix 6-L – Accommodation Freqs-2.pdf)</p> <p>NCSC 102: NCME 2016 Accessibility Handout); Accessibility: Consideration of the Learner, the Teacher, and Item Performance</p>	<p>NCSC 15: p. 61. Recommendations for areas of further study included the use of accommodations. It is not clear if further study was completed. If so, what were the results.</p> <p>In NCSC 15-B, p. 6-7. the accommodation “All key information in dominant language is also available in prevalent first languages for second language learners” is listed as “allowed.” But this does not appear in any of the materials for TAs. (This is also pertinent for Critical Element 5.2.)</p> <p>Several studies are cited, but none seem to address the question of whether the accommodations provided allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (if MSAA does not provide, then State must):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For both the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available. For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 		
<p>Section 5.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the MSAA evidence that the accommodations provided do not alter the construct being assessed, and allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the 	<p>NCSC 103: Reporting Timeline (2014-2016)</p> <p>NCSC 10: Guide for Score Report Interpretation; pp. 24-26 (Appendix A: Individual Student Report)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 132-138 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p>NCSC 15: Operational Assessment Technical Manual 2015; pp. 139-140 (Chapter 7: Standard Setting)</p> <p>NCSC 124: ADE November 2015 Examiner Newsletter; p. 7 (NCSC 2015 Reports)</p> <p>MSAA 9: TC User Guide 2016; pp. 72-75 (My Reports)</p> <p>MSAA 6: TC User Guide 2017; pp. 34-36 (My Reports)</p> <p>MSAA 7: Reports Letter to TCs 2016</p> <p>MSAA 8: Logging in the MSAA System</p> <p>MSAA 10: Student Report 2017</p> <p>MSAA also referenced NCSC 103: Reporting Timeline (2014-2016). See above.</p>	<p>NCSC 10 and 15: were previously submitted for peer preview.</p> <p>An expanded timeline with additional important dates for Alternate Assessment would be helpful. Testing window dates (March-May) were included in the Examiner Newsletter (p. 7).</p> <p>Student reports were delivered through an online reporting portal as soon as the reports and data had been verified and approved for each administration.</p> <p>According to the narrative, reports in 2016 were available for a four week period throughout August and September.</p> <p>MSAA 8: The MSAA Reporting Portal will be open from August 19 – Sept 16, 2016. This seems like a short length of time, depending on a school’s calendar. The narrative says that in 2017, reports will be accessible by end of July 2017. It is not clear if there is a change in the how long the portal will be open in 2017.</p> <p>NCSC 124: AZ process is provided as an example of the reporting process.</p> <p>MSAA 10: Parent Cover Letter: If a parent needed the letter in a different format, it is unclear how they would be able to read the instructions in the letter. Contacting the state’s dept of education does not seem a very user friendly option. It may be more effective for the parent to contact the school rather than the</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR THE MSAA ASSESSMENT CONSORTIUM RESUBMISSION

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

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

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

February 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes RESUBMISSION

(follow up on evidence requested from 2016 and 2017 Peer Review)



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Contents—NOTE—The items shown below represent areas from the 2017 consortium peer review where additional evidence was requested

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT.....	3
1.3 – Required Assessments	4
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	7
1.5 – Participation Data	9
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	10
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	11
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	14
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	16
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	17
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	19
4.1 – Reliability.....	20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	22
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	23
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	24

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 RESUBMISSION

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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 align="center">1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>No additional evidence provided.</p>	<p>No additional evidence provided.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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.)</p> <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: 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.</p>		
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> x </u> 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 ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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>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.</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 RESUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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 align="center">1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>No additional evidence provided.</p>	<p>No additional evidence provided.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: Information provided for element 1.3 will also address this element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: Information provided for element 1.3 will also address this element.</p>		
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Information provided for element 1.3 will also address this element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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 align="center">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>No additional evidence provided.</p>	<p>No additional evidence provided.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. 		
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>The State provided the below evidence.</p> <p>December 8, 2017 Final Report. Alignment Analysis of the 2017 Arizona Statewide Achievement Assessment for English Language Arts and Mathematics (AzMERIT) and 2016 Arizona Grade Level Standards, Grades 3-11. ELA grades 3-11 and Mathematics grades 3-8, Algebra I EOC, Geometry EOC, and Algebra II EOC.</p> <p>Copy of AZ2028- AzMerit ELA_Grade 6 Initial Form Selection SP15</p>	<p>Page 9. Table 1 Summary of AzMERIT alignment study results by subject area, grade, and test form.</p> <p>The ADE provided an alignment study that addressed the issues identified previously. However, the state did not identify how it will address the issues that were identified in the alignment study.</p> <p>Since Listening, Speaking, and Writing are all wrapped into the ELA data, it is not clear how well represented the Listening, Speaking, and Writing standards are distributed across the ELA assessment. The alignment study does not directly address how the <i>Balance of Representation</i> criterion might match the expectations, but the expectations might be quite low for the representation of the Listening, Speaking, and Writing standards.</p> <p>The state did not provide evidence 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 (e.g., writing in grades 3, 4, and 5).</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan and timeline for following up on the issues identified in the alignment study for the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school. • Evidence that the AzMERIT covers the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including the State’s speaking and listening standards for all grades and the State’s writing standards for grades 3, 4, and 5. • 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). 		

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the AzMERIT covers the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including the State’s speaking and listening standards for all grades and the State’s writing standards for grades 3, 4, and 5. • 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 (e.g., writing in grades 3, 4, and 5). 		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of how the results of the AzMERIT alignment study will be used to improve alignment by providing a plan and timeline to address the identified issues. • 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 (e.g., writing in grades 3, 4, and 5). 		

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>The State provided the below evidence:</p> <p>ADE Webpage. Read Me Data Dictionary.</p> <p>Example of Public Reporting from the ASE website; 2017 AzMERIT and MSAA assessment combined results</p> <p>Picture of ADE webpage Statement of N count restriction for reporting. references Research and Accountability, FERPA and the use of the * symbol</p>	<p>It appears that the evidence has been provided to address this element.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (for MSAA, if not provided by consortium, State must provide):</p>		
<p>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).</p>		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p>		
<p>Evidence that the State has policies and procedures in place for its statewide assessment system to protect personally identifiable information related to defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups (e.g., State, district and school report cards).</p>		
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
__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 RESUBMISSION

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>The State provided the below evidence.</p> <p>December 8, 2017 Final Report. Alignment Analysis of the 2017 Arizona Statewide Achievement Assessment for English Language Arts and Mathematics (AzMERIT) and 2016 Arizona Grade Level Standards, Grades 3-11. ELA grades 3-11 and Mathematics grades 3-8, Algebra I EOC, Geometry EOC, and Algebra II EOC.</p> <p>Copy of AZ2028- AzMerit ELA_Grade 6 Initial Form Selection SP15</p>	<p>No discussion provided by ADE on how the results will be used to improve the alignment study with a plan and timeline to address the identified issues.</p> <p>See 2.1</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

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"> 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. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 speaking and listening standards. 		
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of how the results of the AzMERIT alignment study will be used to improve alignment by providing a plan and timeline to address the identified issues. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>The State provided the below evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AzMerit CSEM at cut scores for ELA and Math • AzMerit SEM by Subgroups 	<p>Conditional standard error of measurement was provided for the State’s assessments for each student group.</p> <p>Most reliability coefficients are good; a few (LEP, Special Education) fall below 0.80.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability estimates of the State’s assessments; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments for each student group; and • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results. <p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For 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"> ○ Conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments for each student group. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>The State provided the below evidence. ADE provided the following written information on the review process and tables to as evidence of its design, development and analysis of its assessments: Arizona DIF Review Process AzMerit 2017 Bias Review Results_ELA AzMerit 2017 Bias Review Results_Math AzMerit 2017 DIF Results_ELA AzMerit 2017 DIF Results_Math AzMerit_2017 ELA Community Data Review_Stats Added AzMerit_2017Math Community Data Review_Stats Added</p>	<p>Results of the July 2017 DIF analyses by all student groups were provided and appear acceptable.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p>		
<p>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).</p>		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017Peer Review:</p>		
<p>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 July 2017 DIF analysis by all student groups, including students with disabilities, English learners, and economically disadvantaged students).</p>		
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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
------------------	--	--

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>The State provided the below evidence.</p> <p>Evidence forms provided by ADE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observation/Monitoring Plan 2017-2018 for 10 LEAs during AzMERIT and AIMS Science and MSAA. • AzMERIT Administration Observation Form <p>Accommodation Guidelines July 2017 <i>Selecting, Administering, and Evaluating Accommodations for Instruction and Assessment</i></p> <p>Copy of AZ 2018 AzMerit Accommodations Usage by Subgroup 2016</p>	<p>The Observation/Monitoring Plan 2017-2018 is a list of the ten LEAs to be visited during a particular week but without any process, procedure, or inclusion in an administrative manual or Letter to LEAs to indicate its occurrence.</p> <p>A letter to the LEAs alerting them to the occurrence of the visit should include the purpose of the visit, what will occur during the visit, and what information needs to be available for the visit (e.g., copies of the students’ IEPs). The information in this letter should be sent to all LEAs early in the process letting them know that random site visits will be occurring, and they will be informed whether they will be included. That way, all LEAs should be somewhat prepared in case they are chosen that year.</p> <p>There is a list of universal tools and accommodations used during assessment for the observer to check off. However, there is no indication if these tools/accommodations were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures <p>In addition, states have the accommodations recorded for all online testing through the online test system. So, the state doesn’t need a small sampling of what accommodations have been used for the observation sites when they know what accommodations are being used statewide. They need a process to document whether the above three</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>bullets have been followed for the students being observed. These are aspects of accommodations that can be determined best by onsite visits.</p> <p>It is suggested that a summary of the onsite be provided to verify the procedures were followed with the results of the observations as well as any follow up required to address issues identified during the monitoring.</p> <p>The ADE may consider two levels of summaries and follow-up recommendations: (1) A statewide summary across all the visited sites, noting trends and patterns observed across the sites and recommendations that should be implemented statewide to address these observations, and (2) a summary for each site visit with recommendations to be sent to each individual site and LEA along with their specific summary.</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 		
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2017 Peer Review: 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 MSAA) that are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 		
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</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 (both for the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school and MSAA) that are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

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

August 2017 State Assessment Peer Review Notes RESUBMISSION (follow up on evidence requested from 2016 Peer Review)



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT.....	3
1.3 – Required Assessments	4
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	7
1.5 – Participation Data	9
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS	10
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	11
2.2 – Item Development.....	15
2.3 – Test Administration	18
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration.....	20
2.5 – Test Security	22
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	14
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....	16
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	17
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	33
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER	19
4.1 – Reliability.....	20
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	22
4.4 – Scoring	42
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms	45
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS	23
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	48
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs.....	52
5.3 – Accommodations.....	55
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	24
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING .	60
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	61
6.4 – Reporting.....	64

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 RESUBMISSION

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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 align="center">1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>AZ 2019_Arizona’s 2017 A-F Letter Grade Accountability System pp. 4-29 (Arizona State Board of Education approved Accountability Business Rules) AZ 2020_Arizona Administrative Code Title 7 Chapter 2 Section 7.2.302.1a and .1c p. 11 (Minimum Course of Study and Competency Requirements for Graduation from High School) AZ 2021_HS Participation Study pp. 1-4</p>	<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AZ2019 - AZ’s response does not make it clear that students are required to take the same assessments, but rather, students can take the Algebra 1, Algebra 2, or geometry assessment. The request from 2016 peer review for ADE to document that all students must take the same assessment in R/LA and mathematics in high school is not satisfied by the States response.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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.)</p>		
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x<u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: For the high school general assessments, documentation of the State’s policy that all students must take the same assessment in</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 RESUBMISSION

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>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.</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 RESUBMISSION

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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 align="center">1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>AZ 2019_Arizona’s 2017 A-F Letter Grade Accountability System pp. 4-29 (Arizona State Board of Education approved Accountability Business Rules) AZ 2020_Arizona Administrative Code Title 7 Chapter 2 Section 7.2.302.1a and .1c p. 11 (Minimum Course of Study and Competency Requirements for Graduation from High School) AZ 2021_HS Participation Study pp. 1-4 ○ AZ1277</p>	<p>see comments regarding high school testing in element 1.3 above. Until the State can establish that it meets the requirement for high school testing, it cannot assure that all secondary school students are included in the State’s assessment system.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: Information provided for element 1.3 will also address this element.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: Information provided for element 1.3 will also address this element		

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 RESUBMISSION

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 align="center">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>AZ 2019_Arizona’s 2017 A-F Letter Grade Accountability System pp. 4-29 (Arizona State Board of Education approved Accountability Business Rules) AZ 2020_Arizona Administrative Code Title 7 Chapter 2 Section 7.2.302.1a and .1c p. 11 (Minimum Course of Study and Competency Requirements for Graduation from High School) AZ 2021_HS Participation Study pp. 1-4</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 for Grades 3-8.</p> <p>However, since the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, there is not 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 the corresponding data.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. 		
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
------------------	--	--

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>AZ 2012 AZTAC May2017X ADE plans to conduct WAT alignment analyses in each grade and subject. TAC recommends examining alignment between 2016 AzMERIT and the 2010 AZ Academic Standards. P. 5.</p> <p>AZ 1201 and AZ 1202: specifically require all schools to incorporate the academic standards (including speaking) adopted by the State Board of Education into their course of study.</p> <p>AZ2010: Writing Prompts used at each grade level</p> <p>AZ 2001: Standards for grades 3-5 Writing–these are the standards added to the CCSS. The base of these additional standards is for students to “produce clear coherent functional writing... in which the development and organization are appropriate to the task and purpose.”</p> <p>AZ 2009: Writing Rubric for grades 3-5</p> <p>For State’s AA-AAAS:</p> <p>AZ 2046: MSAACCCs for Writing</p>	<p>AZ 2012: p. 5. TAC notes indicate ADE plans alignment study between 2016 AzMerit and the 2010 Standards. The narrative (page1) provides a general plan and timeline for fall 2017 alignment study between the new standards and current test.</p> <p>The full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards is not assessed.</p> <p>No information was provided that AzMERIT covers the full range of the State’s academic content standards for writing standards in grades 3, 4, and 5.</p> <p>In state Narrative, p.1 – Listening accounts for only 2 of the 50 points in ELA. AZ did not identify how they are addressing depth and breadth of the listening and speaking standards.</p> <p>In state narrative, p. 2: During the standards review process, led by Arizona’s K-12 Standards unit and supported by the Assessment unit, it was determined that the 2016 Speaking standards (grades 3-12) would not be assessed on the State-wide ELA Assessment, due mostly to logistical factors.</p> <p>Although AZ 2040 is encouraging LEAs to include speaking and listening in their balanced assessment framework, it appears the</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>full range of these standards is not addressed in the state assessment.</p> <p>AA-AAAS: In narrative: “NCSC/MSAA, has identified priority content connectors which specify the reduced number of standards that will be taught to students with significant cognitive disabilities and assessed within the Alternate Assessment framework. While these Core Content Connectors (CCCs) for Grades 3 through 5, presented in this evidence do not specifically address Arizona’s additional writing standards (AZ.3.W.4a, AZ.4.W.4a, and AZ.5.W.4a), they clearly address the need for students to produce writing that 1) is clear and coherent, 2) is appropriate to the specific task, 3) appropriate to the specific purpose, and 4) is appropriate for a specific audience. These CCCs directly reflect the additional standards Arizona added to the 2010 ELA standards.”</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan and timeline for following up on the issues identified in the alignment study for the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school. • Evidence that the AzMERIT covers the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including the State’s speaking and listening standards for all grades and the State’s writing standards for grades 3, 4, and 5. • 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). 		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the AzMERIT covers the full range of the State’s academic content standards, including the State’s speaking and listening 		

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	standards for all grades and the State’s writing standards for grades 3, 4, and 5.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (e.g., writing in grades 3, 4, and 5). 	

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>AZ 1100: AzMERIT 2015 Annual Technical Report; pp. 26-43 (Item Development & Test Construction)</p> <p>AZ 2026: AzMERIT Grade 4 Math Item Specifications; pp. 1-43 (Sample Math Item Specifications)</p> <p>AZ 2027: AzMERIT Grade 9-10 ELA Item Specifications; pp. 1-40 (Sample ELA Item Specifications)</p> <p>AZ 2028: AzMERIT ELA Grade 6 Initial Form Selection SP 15; Tables in Tabs (Evaluation, Test Summary Statistics, Blueprint Check, Graph, Bank)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 88-99 (5.1-Item Development Process; 5.2-Item Review, 5.3-Field Testing; and 5.4 -Item Statistics pp. L1-L8-(prep for 2016 form construction, pp. 100-102 (Test Construction, pp. M1-M18 (Spring 16 Operation Test Form).</p> <p>AZ 2012: AZTAC May2017: p. 5</p>	<p>AZ1100 does not directly apply to the development and selection of items 2016-2017.</p> <p>AZ 2003: p. 94. “These items were also reviewed for alignment to the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards (ACCRS) by Arizona content experts and educators prior to field-testing in spring 2015 and subsequent operational test administration in spring 2016. In subsequent years, test forms will be constructed using items developed directly with Arizona, meaning ADE and Arizona educator committees and parent/community committees’ act as reviewers throughout the item development cycle.”</p> <p>The technical report describes adequate procedures for item development, item review, field testing, statistical analyses of items, and test construction. These procedures appear sound.</p> <p>The technical manual appears to adequately address the concerns the peers had in the past review.</p> <p>.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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.</p>		
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>AZ 2023: AzMERIT 2017 District Test Coordinator Manual; p. 3 (Responsibilities of the District Test Coordinator - During Testing: Additional Responsibilities for Computer-Based Testing) pp. 9-10 (Test Improperities)</p>	<p>AZ 2023: State response provided the documentation of the contingency plan for the AzMERIT.</p> <p>See MSAA notes regarding training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools and regarding practice opportunities for students.</p> <p>See the MSAA note about tip sheets for troubleshooting guide information.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (for MSAA, if not provided by consortium, State must provide):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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"> ○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the NCSC/MSAA similar to the AzMERIT guide to address technology-related contingency plans. ○ Evidence of policy that students have the opportunity to practice and become familiar with computer administration (including the assessment delivery devices, accessibility tools and features available for students, and item formats) prior to testing. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of training to ensure consistency of administration across districts and schools. ● For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school, evidence of established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence that ADE established and communicates to educators clear, thorough, and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of the MSAA assessments that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of a troubleshooting guide for the MSAA similar to the AzMERIT guide to address technology-related contingency plans. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

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 align="center">2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AZ2032 provided scenarios and possible solutions ○ AZ2003 Secure browsers; Testing Coordinators work with Technology Coordinators to ensure secure browsers and to resolve technical issues ○ Test Administrators conduct training test sessions using sample questions prior to testing and all those administering the assessments had to qualify before they could administer the AzMERIT online 	<p>Evidence indicates 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.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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.</p>		
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p><u> </u>x_ No additional evidence is required.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>AzMERIT</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 117-121 (Data Forensics Program) AIR’s Forensic Analysis report -- how the state acted upon or plans to act upon the outcomes of the analyses.</p> <p>AZ 2029: AzMERIT Testing Incident Analysis SP16; Tables in Tabs (Improprieties, Invalidations)</p> <p>AZ 2024: AzMERIT TIDE Users Guide 2017; pp. 54-60 (Managing Test Improprieties)</p> <p>AZ 2025: AzMERIT PBT Incident Report Form 2017; p. 1 (Testing Incident Report – Paper Based Tests Only)</p> <p>AZ 3038: AzMERIT 3-8 TAD 2015 p. 10 (Students who leave the room during testing)</p> <p>AZ 2039: AzMERIT 3-8 TAD 2016 p. 8 (Breaks During Test Session) p. 29 (Day 1 – ELA Writing Grades 3-8 Test) p. 33 (Day 2 – ELA Reading Grades 3-8 Test Part 1) p. 36 (Day 2 – Math Grades 3-6 Test Part 1) p. 39 (Day 2 – Math Grades 7-8 Test Part 1) p. 42 (Day 3 – ELA Reading Grades 3-8 Test</p>	<p>AzMERIT</p> <p>There is evidence that the state is addressing policies and procedure related to test irregularities and their documentation.</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016, p. 121. For online administrations, quality assurance (QA) reports are generated during and after the test windows. These are geared toward detection of testing irregularities that may indicate possible cheating, aggregating unusual responses at the student level to detect possible group-level testing anomalies.</p> <p>The Data Forensics Program includes impressive methods of detecting test irregularities during the testing window as well as following testing (e.g., person fit statistics). No results of the above analyses were presented.</p> <p>AZ 2024: AzMERIT TIDE Users Guide pp. 54-60. Procedures to manage improprieties (invalidate a test) seem appropriate, no summary data were presented as confirmation of the process.</p> <p>AzMERIT Test Invalidations Spring 2016 and AzMERIT Test Improprieties SP 2016 data were provided and used in addition to the Data Forensics Program.</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Part 2) p. 45 (Day 3 – Math Grades 3-6 Test Part 2) p. 48 (Day 3 – Math Grades 7-8 Test Part 2)</p> <p>NCSC/MSAA</p> <p>AZ 2034: AZ Alternate Assessment TA Security Agreement 2016; p. 1 (Test Administrator Security Agreement)</p> <p>AZ 2035: AZ Alternate Assessment TC Security Agreement 2016; p. 1 (Test Coordinator Security Agreement)</p> <p>AZ 2036: AZ State Specific Information MSAA 2016; pp. 1-3 (Arizona contact and specific test security information)</p> <p>AZ 2037: MSAA Irregularity Reporting Example; p. 1 (E-mail from TC reporting a testing irregularity)</p>	<p>AZ 3038: AzMERIT 3-8 TAD 2015. All Test Administrators and Proctors must be trained in proper test security procedures, must sign a test security agreement, and must adhere to test security procedures. Unethical acts were listed. (p. 4).</p> <p>In state narrative: Arizona reviews its training for both DTC and TA prior to each administration with an eye to test irregularities identified during the previous administration. One example of a major modification was made between AzMERIT’s inaugural administration (Spring 2015) and the following spring’s regarding guidance about giving breaks for students.</p> <p>MSAA AZ 2034: Test security agreements (Test Administrators and District Test Coordinators) seem appropriate. It includes conditions to ensure the correct administration of the tests and participation in training activities prior to administering the tests. (p. 1).</p> <p>A comprehensive guide to outline in one document the process used for detecting, preventing, reporting, investigating, and</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		remediating assessment irregularities could be created based upon the information available in a number of documents created in response to the 2016 and 2017 administrations of the MSAA.
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (for MSAA, if not provided by consortium, State must provide):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the NCSC/MSAA, documentation of a process to prevent, detect, report, investigate, and remediate assessment regularities. • 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). 		
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 113-114 (System Security) pp. 114-117 (Test Security)</p> <p>AZ 2023: AzMERIT 2017 District Test Coordinator Manual; pp. 10-12 (AIR’s Testing Systems)</p> <p>AZ 2030: ADE Security Policy Manual pp. 1-157 (Arizona’s IT Security Protocols)</p> <p>AZ 2031: ADE Data Policies and Procedures: pp. 5 (Confidentiality - Student Records) pp. 6 (Protection of Confidential Records in Aggregated Reports) pp. 11 (Violations of this Policy)</p>	<p>AzMERIT</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report: 9 different network providers, providing multiple, redundant data routes. (p.113).</p> <p>All systems encrypt data at rest and in transit. (p.113).</p> <p>Physical security: 24-hour surveillance of both the interior and exterior of its facilities. All access is keycard controlled, and sensitive areas require biometric scanning. (p.114).</p> <p>Security and access logs are regularly audited for login failures. (p.114).</p> <p>Systems implement sophisticated, configurable privacy rules that can limit access to data to only appropriately authorized personnel (FERPA) (p.114).</p> <p>Psychometricians monitor the quality and performance of test administrations statewide through a series of quality assurance (QA) reports. (Data Forensics). (p.114).</p> <p>Policies seem to be in place to secure the test data as it passes among the stakeholders.</p> <p>The state has not identified evidence that</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>personally identifiable student data is adequately protected in terms of defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups.</p> <p>Testing platform includes four systems: Test Information Distribution Engine (TIDE); Test Delivery System (TDS); Data Entry Interface (DEI); and Online Reporting System (ORS). Taken together, the platform appears to safeguard student privacy and data integrity at interfaces among the State, vendor, districts, and schools.</p> <p>AZ 2031: Policy: Student data shall remain confidential and may only be disclosed under very limited circumstances as permitted by federal law, state law and this policy. 20 U.S.C. 1232 g and A.R.S. § 15-1043. (p. 5).</p> <p>AZ 2031: The pages addressing protection of confidential records in aggregated reports and violations of this policy are adequate. (pp. 6 and 11).</p> <p>MSAA – see comments on MSAA notes.</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (for MSAA, if not provided by consortium, State must provide): 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).</p>		
<p>Section 2.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has policies and procedures in place for its statewide assessment system to protect personally identifiable information related to 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). 		

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 RESUBMISSION

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>AZ 2012: AZTAC May 2017 notes final draft; pp. 5 (Guidance on how to address Critical Element 3.1- Listening)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 24-27 (Evidence Based on Internal Structure) These pages document that the unidimensional structure of the AzMERIT ELA tests is an indication that the student scores are not affected by the addition of the two listening items included on each of the online assessments. These two listening items per test are always associated with a reading passage and in the paper version are replaced by items with a similar difficulty, generally associated with that same passage.</p> <p>AZ 2002: Arizona’s English Language Arts Standards 2016 – Speaking 3 - 12 pp. 1-4 (2016 Speaking Standards) AZ 1202: Arizona Revised Statute 15-701.01 B. (Prescription of curricula and criteria for graduation) AZ 1201: Arizona Revised Statute 15-701 C. (Prescription of curricula and criteria for promotion) AZ 2001: Arizona’s College and Career Ready Standards 2010 – ELA Grades 3-5; p. 20 (Production and Distribution of Writing)</p>	<p>See Critical Element 2.1 regarding future alignment studies. Arizona is in the process of procuring a vendor to perform Webb Alignment Studies between each of the 2017 online assessments, grades 3-8 and EOC and the Arizona State Standards.</p> <p>AZ 2003: Pages 18-22. ELA Grades 3-5 Writing standards appear comprehensive.</p> <p>The evidence provides support that the 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.</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>AZ 2040: Arizona’s Balanced Assessment Framework; pp. 1-8 (Comprehensive Standards-Based Assessment Framework)</p> <p>AzMERIT AZ 2009: Writing Prompt Rubric Grades 3-5 Informative-Explanatory; pp. 1-2 (AzMERIT Rubric) AZ 2020: AzMERIT Writing Prompt Info_2016 Table</p> <p>MSAA AZ 2046: MSAA CCCs for Writing MSAA Content Core Connectors for Grades 3-5 Writing</p>	
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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. • 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. 		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the 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. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

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"> 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 speaking and listening standards. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>See Critical Element 3.1.</p> <p>AZ 2012: AZTAC May2017, Page 5:</p>	<p>See Critical Elements 2.1 and 3.1 regarding future alignment studies. Arizona is in the process of procuring a vendor to perform Webb Alignment Studies between each of the 2017 online assessments, grades 3-8 and EOC and the Arizona State Standards.</p> <p>The depth of knowledge dimension of the future alignment study will address this 2016 finding. Confirmatory findings of the alignment study will provide adequate evidence that the assessments tap the intended cognitive processes.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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.</p>		
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 69 (Internal Consistency Reliabilities - Overall) P 69 – internal consistency for overall groups by grade level</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 81-83 (Internal Consistency Reliabilities – by Subgroup) pp69-73, F-1, I-1 Standard Error of Measurement - Overall pp. 11-12 (Standard Error of Measurement at Performance Level Cuts)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 73-75 (Student classification reliability statistics- All students) p. 76-81 – Table 4.6.6.2 (Student classification reliability statistics- Student subgroups) p. 73 – Accuracy and Consistency of classification by grade p. 76 – Accuracy and consistency of classification for sub-groups p. 82 – Internal consistency reliability for sub-groups</p>	<p>Overall reliability coefficients were provided for the three required subgroups: economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English learner.</p> <p>AZ 2003: pp. 69-73, F-1, I-1 Overall Standard Errors of Measurement for ELA and Math are presented, but not by subgroup.</p> <p>Classification accuracy and consistency estimates were presented by subgroup for each test/grade level.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability estimates of the State’s assessments; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments for each student group; and • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment 		

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
results.		
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments for each student group. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 32-34 (Measurement Invariance Across Subgroups)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 34-35 (Differential Mode Effects Across Subgroups)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. B1-B36 (Global Model Fit Indices of Scalar Invariance)</p> <p>AZ 2008: AzMERIT 2017 Community Data Review Training Training; pp. 1-22 (Expansion of Community Involvement to Data Review)</p>	<p>AZ 2003: Page 34. Acceptable fit indices of the scalar invariance model to the data, ELA and MATH test scores have the same measurement structure across subgroups.</p> <p>Subgroups included: gender, ethnicity, students with disabilities, students who have an economic disadvantage, student still learning English, and those who took an accommodated test form.</p> <p>AZ 2003: Page 33. When factor loadings and intercepts/thresholds are invariant across groups, scores on latent variables can be validly compared across the groups.</p> <p>AZ2003, pages 98-99 provided a description of DIF study to be completed but the results of DIF study not yet available.</p> <p>AZ 2008: AzMERIT 2017 Community Data Review Training; pp. 1-22 Provides the training materials for the DIF study scheduled for July 2017.</p> <p>AZ2003: Pages 34-35. Results indicated that mode (paper versus online) effects were more pronounced for special education students relative to general education population. Especially for the high school EOC tests, AzMERIT tests were more difficult for special education students when administered on paper</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>than online.</p> <p>Mode effects were more pronounced for low income students with respect to the math assessments. Math tests were generally more difficult for low income students when administered online than on paper.</p> <p>Mode effects were also more pronounced for LEP students than for the general education population in math but not ELA. However, the direction of this effect was not consistent across grades. Online math tests were more difficult than paper for LEP students in the lower grades, while paper math tests were more difficult than online tests for LEP students in the higher grades. (PP. 34-35).</p> <p>It is not clear whether the numerous mode interactions can be simply attributed to large sample sizes particularly using an alpha level of $p < 0.0001$.</p> <p>The state and TAC should review these findings for other reasons for the interaction results that may have instructional implications.</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the 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).</p>		
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: 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 July 2017 DIF analysis by all student groups, including students with disabilities, English learners, and economically disadvantaged 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 ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 150 (Explicit Rubrics)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 150-162 Machine Scoring pp. 162 Hand Scoring</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 162-165 (Hand Scoring)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. 86-87 (Rater Effects)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. J1-J7 (Writing Prompt Rater Agreement Report)</p>	<p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016. The reading components of the ELA assessments, both online and paper, and the math assessments administered online are machine-scored in their entirety. (p. 149).</p> <p>The statistical rubrics used to develop the scoring models measure were presented, but no data were provided.</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016. pp. 153-158. Exhibit 10.1.2.1 (Summary of Human and Machine Scores for Spring 2016 Writing Prompts) includes the following indicators: percent exact agreement, Pearson’s correlation, a quadratic weighted kappa statistic, and the standardized mean difference between the scores.</p> <p>On AzMERIT Technical Manual: Page 119, the state described “the QA report includes a list of the flagged aggregate units with the number of flagged students in the aggregate unit (e.g., test session, test administrator, school)” but the results were not provided. Even though the person fit results were not located, the overall evidence supports reliable results.</p> <p>Agreement rates for scores assigned to hand written responses were higher than achieved for responses made online. One possible</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>reason for this effect is that paper scoring was conducted following scoring of online responses so that by the time of paper scoring, readers were better synced. (pp. 87, J1 –J7).</p> <p>In the state narrative, page 29 and AZ 2003, page 165, “for the few math items on paper tests that needed to be hand scored, when the two readers were not in exact agreement, the response was sent to a Team Leader or Scoring Director to assign the student’s score. In all other cases, the first reader’s score became the official score. This process caused an official Rater Reliability Statistic to be moot and therefore, it is not presented.”</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: For the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate quality control procedure for machine-scored constructed response items, including evidence of the accuracy of the scores. • Evidence to indicate that the scoring procedures and protocols for the AzMERIT produce reliable results and facilitate valid score interpretations, specifically person-fit results. • Evidence of inter-rater agreement for hand-scored mathematics items. 		
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report pp. 88-99; (5.1-Item Development Process; 5.2-Item Review, 5.3-Field Testing; and 5.4 -Item Statistics)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report pp. L1-L8 (Data Review Training Slide)</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Annual Technical Report; pp. M1-M18 (Spring 16 Operation Test Form) P. 146 – online vs. paper</p>	<p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 Narratives for item development and test construction, item development, item writing, item review, field testing, processes sound appropriate.</p> <p>In spring 2016, pre-equated item parameters were used to score student test records for the math assessments.</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016 For ELA, since six new writing tasks were being administered in the ELA assessments at each grade, the ELA items were recalibrated, and the equating constant necessary to place the common items back to the reference scale was identified and applied to the recalibrated item parameters, placing all test items on the base year AzMERIT scale. Mean equating was used to compute the linking constant, and all operational reading items were included in the computation. (p. 134). This appears to be an appropriate way to incorporate the six new writing tasks.</p> <p>AZ 2003:p. 166. The form construction process is managed through AIR’s FormBuilder software which automates important form construction activities to ensure development of equated test forms.</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<p>AZ 2003: The Test Characteristic Curve differences between the Spring 2015 forms and the Spring 2016 provide support for comparability of form development across years.</p> <p>It was noted that the TCC differences for AZ G09E SP15 Prop. - AZ G09E SP16Prop and particularly AZ G07M SP15 Prop. - AZ G07M SP16Prop. (pp. M1-M18). ADE should continue to monitor the out-of-range forms.</p> <p>AZ 2003: AzMERIT 2016, page 146. Scott (2015) first identified which Arizona schools elected to administer AzMERIT online and which on paper. Following the spring 2015 administration of AzMERIT, ADE examined the performance of schools participating online and on paper, and again found performance on the AzMERIT to be comparable between the two sets of schools.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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.).</p>		
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

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
-------------------------	---	---

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools 	<p>AZ 1277: Alternate Assessment Eligibility Spring 2015: pp. 1-5 (Documentation of Eligibility to Participate in NCSC)</p> <p>AZ 1206: AzMERIT Accommodations Guidance 2015; pp. 1-8.</p> <p>AZ 2011: Arizona Accommodation Manual 2017-2018: pp. 2-15 (Steps for selecting and evaluating accommodations)</p> <p>AZ 2011: Arizona Accommodation Manual 2017-2018; pp. 16-22 (Accommodation Guidance for AzMERIT)</p> <p>AZ 2011: Arizona Accommodation Manual 2017-2018; pp. 23-28 (Accommodation Guidance for MSAA) pp. 16-22 – Section 2.</p> <p>AZ 2011: Arizona Accommodation Manual 2017-18, pages 20-23 seems to address this issue.</p>	<p>AZ 1277: Alternate Assessment Eligibility Spring 2015. The decision tree and guidelines appear to apply only to NCSC participation.</p> <p>AZ 1206: AzMERIT, Page 8. Students with disabilities may use any of the universal test administration conditions and any of the listed accommodations, as designated in their IEP or 504 plans.</p> <p>AZ 2011: p. 5 explains differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>AZ2011: p. 20. Students who are not proficient in English, as determined by the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA), may use, as appropriate, any of the Universal Test Administration Conditions and any of the EL accommodations. EL accommodations are listed.</p> <p>AZ 2011: MSAA Accommodations are listed in a table. (pp. 27-28).</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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). • Selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities assessed on the AzMERIT 3-8 and high school. 		
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>AZ 2012: TAC May 2017 – p. 5</p> <p>AZ 2011: p. 6 and p. 20</p>	<p>Also see notes for 5.1 and for MSAA.</p> <p>AZ 2012 AZTAC May2017, p. 5: It is suggested that ADE expand guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners as recommended by the TAC.</p> <p>AZ 2011: p. 6. English Learners may not have a formal individualized plan (ILLP) detailing specific needs, but are accommodated in instruction and eligible to receive designated testing accommodations during standardized testing. English Learners who also have identified disabilities are eligible for both EL accommodations and those designated</p> <p>AZ 2011: Page 20. For an English Learner or a Fluent English Proficient Year 1 or Year 2 student, accommodations are intended to allow the student the opportunity to demonstrate content knowledge even though the student may not be functioning at grade level in English. Students who are not proficient in English, as determined by the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA), may use, as appropriate, any of the Universal Test Administration Conditions and any of the EL accommodations listed.</p>

Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (for MSAA, if consortium does not provide then State must):

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); and ○ Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 		
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>AZ 2012: AZTAC May2017, p. 5:</p> <p>AZ 2011: p. 6:</p> <p>AZ 2011: pages. 20 –21</p> <p>Lists accommodations available for ELs.</p>	<p>See Critical Element 5.1 and 5.2.</p> <p>See NCSC and MSAA notes for 5.3.</p> <p>AZ 2011: p. 6</p> <p>State legislation requires the participation of students with disabilities in state and local assessments, affording assessment accommodations to the extent that the changes made do not violate the construct being measured.</p> <p>The May 2017 TAC (AZ 2012) notes refer to a DIF analysis focused on accommodations vs. no accommodations, but this is not found in the 2016 Tech Report, nor referenced in the state narrative.</p> <p>One DIF study AZ 2016 - was done with ELs and the glossary accommodation.</p> <p>AZ 2011: Arizona Accommodation Manual 2017-18 seems to address the concerns about the accommodations being appropriate and effective. It also addresses accommodations for English learners (pages 20-23).</p> <p>AZ 2011: p. 20. If a student with a disability requires an accommodation not listed, call the Assessment Unit at 602-542-5031 for guidance.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review (for MSAA, if consortium does not provide, then State must):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For both the NCSC/MSAA and the AzMERIT 3-8 and high school, evidence that the accommodations provided (1) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (2) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (3) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations. • Evidence that appropriate accommodations for English learners are available. • For the NCSC/MSAA, evidence that the State has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 		
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>AZ 2013: Reading Accommodations Effectiveness; pp. 1-24 (Accommodation Effectiveness on Arizona’s Reading Assessment)</p> <p>AZ 2014: NCME 2016 Presentation; pp. 1-14 (NCSC Evaluation PowerPoint)</p> <p>AZ 2015: NCME 2016 Presentation pp. 1-5 (NCSC Evaluation Associated Handout)</p> <p>AZ 2016: NCSC AzMERIT Accessibility p. 1-12 (Glossary Accommodation Study)</p> <p>AZ 2013: Reading Accommodations Effectiveness –AERA 2016 presentation</p> <p>AZ 2016: DIF study. With ELs and glossary accommodation</p> <p>MSAA AZ 2014 AZ 2015</p> <p>AZ 2017: MSAA Accommodation Usage by Subgroup 2016 Table</p> <p>AZ 2018: AzMERIT Accommodations Usage by Subgroup 2016; Tables in Tabs</p>	<p>In state narrative:</p> <p>Arizona indicated it has been monitoring and evaluating the use and effectiveness of accommodations for years. As evidence, research on various assessments presented at multiple nationally recognized conferences was provided. However, this evidence is not systematic or comprehensive and does not address the five bullets of this element.</p> <p>The state should construct and implement a comprehensive monitoring plan for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners. As such, some of the presented studies may fit into a coherent plan.</p> <p>Information supporting this element may be available within the monitoring procedures used by the state special education division.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: Evidence that the State has a plan and policy to monitor that students are included in assessments and receive accommodations (both for the</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school and NCSC/MSAA) that are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<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 (both for the AzMERIT grades 3-8 and high school and MSAA) that are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; and • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 		

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 RESUBMISSION

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
-------------------------	---	---

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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>AZ 1280: Arizona State Board Minutes 8.24.15; p. 4 (Item 4C.)</p>	<p>MSAA AZ 1280, Page 4. Arizona State Board of Education’s formally adopted of the NCSC performance cut scores.</p> <p>Arizona Department of Education Assessment Section personnel presented information about the NCSC standard setting to the Arizona State Board of Education on August 15, 2015. The Board considered the information presented and formally, unanimously approved the proposed performance level cut scores.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review:</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		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.
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
<u>X</u> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
-------------------------	---	---

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards 	<p>AZ 1274: Nov 2015 Examiner Newsletter; p. 2 (Spring 2015 - Online and Paper Reports)</p> <p>AZ 1274: Nov 2015 Examiner Newsletter; p. 2 (Fall 2015 – Important Dates)</p> <p>AZ 2004: May 2016 Examiner Newsletter; p. 2 (Future AzMERIT Administrations - Summer 2016 EOC)</p> <p>AZ 2005: November 2016 Examiner Newsletter; p. 1 (Fall 2016 AzMERIT EOC – Important Dates)</p> <p>AZ 2006: February 2017 Examiner Newsletter; p. 3 (Spring 2017 – Important AzMERIT Tasks)</p> <p>AZ 1274: Nov 2015 Examiner Newsletter; p. 7 (NCSC 2015 Reports)</p> <p>AZ 2007: August 2016 Examiner Newsletter p. 5 (MSAA – Scoring for Spring 2016)</p> <p>AZ 2033: AzMERIT Spanish ISR; pp. 1-2 (Spanish Version of Student Reports)</p>	<p>The AZ MERIT reporting schedule has vastly improved from 2015 to 2017 and the reports are now getting disseminated in a timely way.</p> <p>Spring 2015 AzMERIT Reports have been available through AIR’s Online Reporting System (ORS) since October 6. Paper AzMERIT Family Reports were delivered to districts/charters on October 20. (p. 2). (evidence of a process and timeline)</p> <p>AZ 1274: Page 2 shows a chart that includes testing window dates and reporting dates.</p> <p>Fall 2016: AzMERIT EOC Test Administration turnaround times—impressive for the online results (around two weeks).</p> <p>AZ2033: Pages 1-2. ISR individual report is available to parents in Spanish for the AzMerit.</p> <p>It is suggested that a matrix showing the combined timelines for all tests including testing windows, reporting dates to each group (parents) by test may be developed. It could also be used as a baseline for evaluating the system for the delivery of student reports.</p> <p>Commendation to the State for providing timely, relevant, and useful information via its Examiner Newsletters. This regular</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 RESUBMISSION

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>(including performance-level descriptors);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand; ● The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 	<p>NCSC 2015 Reports District and School reports are available Nov 2015.</p>	<p>communication device represents an exemplary approach for communication with the people administering the assessments.</p> <p>MSAA/NCSC The NCSC/MSAA window for availability for reports seems short (a month at the beginning of school) for accessing.</p>
<p>Additional Evidence Requested, stemming from 2016 Peer Review: 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.</p>		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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