



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

December 2, 2021

The Honorable Kathy Hoffman
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Superintendent Hoffman:

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). I appreciate the efforts of the Arizona State Department of Education (ADE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2021.

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. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and the Department's analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following regarding the submitted assessments:

- Reading/ language arts (R/LA) and mathematics nationally recognized tests used as a locally selected high school assessment (SAT): **Substantially meets the requirements of the ESEA.**

Substantially meets requirements means that these assessments meet most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The specific list of items required for ADE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Within 30 days of receipt of this letter, ADE must provide to the Department a plan and timeline by which it will submit the additional documentation. If adequate progress is not made in providing this information, the Department may take additional action. Also, Because the SAT substantially meets requirements, and consistent with the information provided to States on May 17, 2017 (available here:

<https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa/locallyselected72117.pdf>), ADE may permit LEAs to administer the SAT in place of the high school statewide assessment beginning in the 2021-2022 school year.

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.

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.

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 my staff at: OESE.Assessment@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Ian Rosenblum
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Programs
Delegated the Authority to Perform the
Functions and Duties of the Assistant Secretary

Enclosures

cc: Audra Ahumada, Deputy Associate Superintendent

Critical Elements Where Additional Evidence is Needed for the SAT for Use as a Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Assessment in Arizona

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments	<p>For the Arizona assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of State policies that all English learners (ELs) must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/language arts assessment during the student’s first year of school in the United States.
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the test design aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics academic content standards, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence that demonstrates the assessments adequately sample the State’s R/LA and mathematics content standards. ○ For R/LA, a plan and timeline to fully align the assessment with all of the State’s R/LA standards or provide a rationale as to why certain R/LA standards are excluded from the assessment. ○ For mathematics, a plan and timeline to address the alignment gaps identified in the independent alignment evaluation.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that The State’s academic assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For R/LA, a plan and timeline to fully align the assessment with all of the State’s R/LA standards or provide a rationale as to why certain R/LA standards are excluded from the assessment. ○ For mathematics, a plan and timeline to address the alignment gaps identified in the independent alignment evaluation. ○ Evidence submitted for critical element 2.1 above will also support this critical element.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of the 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.
4.1 – Reliability	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability evidence for the Arizona student population overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards (for students in LEAs that utilize the locally selected option).

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., braille, large print): <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.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence that a system for monitoring, maintaining, and improving, as needed, the quality of its assessment system was in place for the planned SAT in Arizona, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system. • Evidence that information about the technical quality for the assessment is made public, including on the State’s website.
5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures for determining whether an EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s). ○ Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. ○ Evidence that all supports and EL accommodations available for ELs on the regular high school assessment are also available on the SAT for ELs in districts that elect to administer the SAT in lieu of the regular high school assessment.
5.3 – Accommodations	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the allowed SAT accommodations (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. • Evidence that children with disabilities and English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment-specifically that all supports and accommodations for students with disabilities and ELs that were available on the regular high school assessment are also available for students with disabilities and ELs in districts that elect to administer the SAT (evidence that supports a related request in critical element 5.2 will also support this request).

Critical Element	Evidence Needed
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that academic achievement standards include descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of how the State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce (e.g., evidence to support the validity of the achievement level descriptors).
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that reports are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian. Evidence that reports are, upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent.
7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that that the SAT is aligned with the challenging State academic standards and addresses the depth and breadth of those standards. Evidence requested for critical elements 2.1, 3.1 and 6.3 will also support this critical element.
7.2 – State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the State has procedures in place so that before a district requests approval to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment. Of how parents and, as appropriate, students, may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request.
7.3 – Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments	<p>For the SAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence the locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coverage of academic content. Difficulty of the assessment. Overall quality of the assessment.

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

January-March 2021 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS4

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 4

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards 5

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments..... 6

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments .. 8

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments..... 10

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS11

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development 11

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development 13

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration..... 14

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration 16

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security..... 17

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy .. 19

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY.....20

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content20

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes 22

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 23

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables..... 24

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER25

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability 25

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 27

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 28

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring..... 29

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms..... 30

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment..... 31

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 32

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS33

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities 33

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments..... 36

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations 37

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

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

..... 39

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING41

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 41
Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting 43
Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 44
Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting 46

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS ..49

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 49
Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments 51
Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments 53

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element 1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public schools and public school students in the State.</p>	<p>AZ 1201 Arizona Revised Statute 15-701.docx Page 1: Section A Part 1</p> <p>AZ 1202 Arizona Revised Statute 15-701.01.docx</p> <p>AZ 6002 ARIZONA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Regular Board Meeting 12192016</p> <p>AZ 6007 AZ SBE 12192016 Summary of Board Actions</p> <p>AZ 6003 Arizona’s English Language Arts Standards 11_12th grade</p> <p>AZ 6004 Arizona’s Mathematics Standards Alg 1</p> <p>AZ 6005 Arizona’s Mathematics Standards Alg 2</p> <p>AZ 6006 Arizona’s Mathematics Standards Geometry</p> <p>AZ 6009 Math Introduction Final Updated 05202018</p>	<p>The State Board of Education adopted the revised ELA and Mathematics Standards for implementation in the 2018-2019 school year at the Regular Board Meeting, December 19, 2016. (AZ 6002)</p>
<p>Section 1.1 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

Critical Element 1.2 – Challenging Academic Content Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u> The State’s challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards.</p>	<p>AZ 6008 ELA Introduction 2016 Final Page 2: Purpose of the Standards</p> <p>AZ 6009 Math Introduction Final Updated 05202018 Page 1: What the Math Standards Are</p> <p>AZ 6030 BAFO CB Initial Response Menu of Assessments.pdf</p>	<p>While AZ did not submit direct evidence on how the academic content standards are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards, the peers reviewed the alignment studies and agreed that Arizona based its academic standards on the Common Core which is aligned to the SAT.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

Critical Element 1.3 – Required Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments aligned with <u>grade-level academic achievement standards</u> or alternate academic achievement standards in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 9-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). <p>AND</p> <p>The State’s <u>academic content assessments</u> must be the same assessments administered to all students</p>	<p>AZ 6010 Assessment Overview 2020 and Beyond Final</p> <p>AZ 6011 SBE 5 Year Assessment Plan; slides 7, 9, 10, and 11</p>	<p>The State provided sufficient evidence that it administers all assessments that are required under the ESEA statute and regulations.</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

<p>in the tested grades, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. • A State may permit an LEA to administer a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of the State high school assessment if certain conditions are met. • A State that administers an end-of-course high school mathematics assessment may exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade and allow the student to take the State end-of-course mathematics test instead. • The Department may have approved the State, under the Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority, to permit students in some LEAs to participate in a demonstration assessment system in lieu of participating in the State assessment. 		
Section 1.3 Summary Statement		
x No additional evidence is required or		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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, policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including those children 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 ELs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment. ○ If a State has developed native language assessments for ELs in R/LA, ELs must be assessed in R/LA 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 	<p>AZ 1209 AZ AG Response to ADE’s Request for Opinion_09162013.pdf AZ 1210 AZ R7-2-401 G(5).docx AZ 1211 AZ R7-2-402 C(9).docx AZ 6012 2020 2021 MOA Technical Assistance_1; Technical Assistance for the Field, Section 2: #6-11</p>	<p>The State’s evidence indicates that all students must participate in assessments; and that includes all children with disabilities. There is not, however, evidence which explicitly demonstrates state policies or procedures that ensure all English learners (ELs) participate in State assessments.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

<p>language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the State uses the flexibility for Native American language schools and programs: (1) the State provides the content assessment in the Native American language to all students in the school or program; (2) the State submits such content assessment for peer review as part of its State assessment system; and (3) the State continues to provide ELP assessments and services for ELs as required by law. The State must assess in English the students' achievement in R/LA in high school. 		
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> x </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies state that all ELs must be included in all aspects of the content assessment system, unless the State has chosen the statutory option for recently arrived ELs under which such ELs are exempt from one administration of its reading/ language arts 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

Critical Element 1.5 – Meaningful Consultation in the Development of Challenging State Standards and Assessments

(Note: this is a new requirement under ESSA, so it does not apply to standards and assessments adopted prior to the passage of ESSA (December 2015)).

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State has developed or amended challenging academic standards and assessments, the State has conducted meaningful and timely consultation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State leaders, including the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education). • Local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas). • Representatives of Indian tribes located in the State. • Teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents. 	<p>AZ 6001 SBE Presentation Final Version; slides 3; 10-14; 18-19; 21-25; 29-36; and 40-47 AZ 6059 STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Meeting Minutes Standards 2016; see highlighted sections AZ 5001 ELA Working Group Master List for Assessment 040920 AZ 5002 Schools on Reservation Land AZ 5003 AZ Schools on Tribal Land Map AZ 6013 AZ Tribal Consultation Summary ELA and Mathematics</p>	<p>The State’s evidence demonstrates that it conducted meaningful and timely consultation with required stakeholder groups in the development of its academic content standards.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 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

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element 2.1 – Test Design and Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to <u>the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards</u> for the grade that is being assessed 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 depth and breadth of <u>the State’s grade-level academic content standards</u> and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results. • Processes to ensure that each academic assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in <u>the State’s academic content standards</u>, 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>Evidence Document (State submitted evidence): ADE Alignment Study – included in ADE submission. This document is provided as evidence that the SAT is aligned to the knowledge and skill included in Arizona’s academic content standards.</p> <p>AZ6030 BAFO CB Initial Response Menu of Assessments.pdf. Pages 23-24</p> <p>AZ 6057 Webb Alignment Study_WCEPS_AZ SAT</p> <p>#2.1.a: SAT® Suite Technical Manual (October 2017) For a statement of the purpose of the assessment and the intended interpretations and uses of the results, refer to pages 1 – 20 which provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results.</p> <p>#2.1.b: Test Specifications for the Redesigned SAT (2015) This document is submitted as evidence of College Board’s test blueprints describing the structure of each assessments. The document provides details regarding how the test is constructed and includes test blueprints, evidentiary foundation, and examples of text complexity and sample questions.</p> <p>#2.1.c SAT User Group Geometry Review Discussion of math, specifically geometry, alignment took place at a meeting of state partners and College Board. The analysis resulting from this discussion is included to show the ongoing work to ensure the SAT is</p>	<p>AZ6030, pgs. 23-24. HumRRO indicates appropriate alignment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In an independent study (conducted by HumRRO), comparisons of SAT items and item stimuli to the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) High Quality Assessment Criteria found alignment to these criteria in SAT Reading, Writing, and Math Tests (Nemeth, Michaels, Wiley, & Chen, 2017). Items were judged as being generally rigorous. • All of the Arizona Reading and Language anchor standards are addressed at least in part on the SAT. • Twenty of the 22 domains covered by the Arizona standards for high school mathematics in number and quantity, algebra, functions, modeling, geometry, and statistics and probability are included in the SAT. <p>Exhibit AZ 6057, dated 11/25/2020, is an alignment study of the Arizona Academic Content Standards for English Language Arts Grades 11-12, Algebra I, and Geometry with two forms of the SAT by WCEPS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 3 of the document indicates that the Arizona English Language Arts standards were considered “acceptably aligned” with the SAT. • However, the study indicated that, for Algebra I and Geometry, “. . . both test forms analyzed would need major adjustments to meet typically accepted alignment criteria. . .” <p>Per the alignment study, it would likely require the addition of an augmented section to the SAT math test in order to meet typically accepted alignment criteria.</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

<p>and intended uses and interpretations of results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the State administers a computer-adaptive assessment, it makes proficiency determinations with respect to the grade in which the student is enrolled and uses that determination for all reporting. • If the State administers a content assessment that includes portfolios, such assessment may be partially administered through a portfolio but may not be <i>entirely</i> administered through a portfolio. 	<p>well aligned with state standards and classroom expectations.</p> <p>#2.1.d SAT Assessment Reporting Question Analysis screenshot referenced in the notes section. Score reporting resources allow teachers and students to see the content and state specific standards alignment of each item as part of the reporting process</p> <p>2.1.e National Curriculum Survey Report College Board periodically conducts national curriculum surveys of middle school, high school, and postsecondary educators across the United States to collect data on (1) the skills and knowledge necessary for readiness for and success in entry-level, credit bearing courses in institutions of higher education and (2) the teaching emphasis placed on these skills and knowledge in middle school and high school classrooms. College Board uses the results of these curriculum surveys as evidence for (or against) the content validity of the SAT® college admission test and its associated assessments. The survey results help inform College Board regarding whether the skills and knowledge represented on the SAT are considered essential for student readiness for and success in common entry-level, credit-bearing postsecondary courses. In addition, the survey data help the College Board, educators, policy makers, and other stakeholders evaluate the extent to which middle school and high school students are being taught what postsecondary institutions expect them to know and be able to do in order to be ready for and successful in common entry level, credit-bearing courses.</p>	
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

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

- A plan and timeline on how AZ chosen math assessment will align with the State's math 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

Critical Element 2.2 – Item Development

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills. 	<p># 2.1.a: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017) This document provides details on College Board item development processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pages 28 - 34 describe the processes used to ensure the fairness of the assessment. Pages 27 - 52 provide a detailed description of test development procedures. Pages 108 - 114 describe the evidentiary foundation for the decisions made about the content included. Pages 120 - 133 describe the College Board pilot study of the predictive validity of the SAT. Pages 133 - 135 describe how the SAT assesses student readiness for college. <p>Documents 2.2a – 2.2.e represent the instructions provided to College Board item writers and reviewers.</p> <p>#2.2.a SAT Suite Writing and Language TD Reviewer Guide (CONFIDENTIAL) #2.2.b SAT Suite Reading TD Reviewer Guide (CONFIDENTIAL) #2.2.c SAT Suite Test Development Guide for the Reading Test (CONFIDENTIAL) #2.2.d SAT Suite Test Development Guide for the Writing and Language Test (CONFIDENTIAL) #2.2.e SAT Suite Math TD Reviewer Guide (CONFIDENTIAL)</p> <p>AZ6030 BAFO CB Initial Response Menu of Assessments.pdf. Pages 20.</p>	<p>AZ 6030, Pg. 20. “The preliminary findings from this cognitive lab provide evidence that lends support to the claim that the SAT items assess higher-order thinking skills.”</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rational</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 2.3 – Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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 general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, teachers of ELs, specialized instructional support personnel, and other appropriate staff receive necessary training to administer assessments and know how to administer assessments, including, as necessary, alternate assessments, and know how to make use of appropriate accommodations during assessments for all students with disabilities; • 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 6056 Menu of Assessments September 2020; slide 7.</p> <p>Arizona Department of Education (ADE) will follow the standardized test administration procedures set forth by the College Board for the administration of the SAT.</p> <p>#2.3.a. SAT School Day Coordinator Manual 2020-21 This is the most current version of the coordinator manual which provides detailed procedures to follow before, during, and after the SAT School Day administration. We encourage the peers to review the full document, however, below we have pinpointed certain sections that address areas that were called out in the USED guidance document: Page 3 describes the roles and responsibilities of testing staff. Pages 4-8 describe the test materials and forms that will be used to prepare for the test administration. Pages 10 – 12 include a checklist of tasks that need to be performed before, during and after test day along with a guide for where to find additional information within the testing manual. Pages 24 – 32 provide guidance on how to conduct accommodated testing. Pages 56 – 57 includes a sample Testing Staff Agreement form that each educator responsible for materials and/or room proctor must sign. This allows College Board and state SAT users to have an auditable record that training was completed, and processes followed. Page 58 provides a sample Nonstandard administration report to document which students have completed testing with accommodations.</p>	<p>While the College Board provides test administration instructions, etc. Arizona could have submitted evidence of training sessions or information provided to district testing coordinators, test administrators, etc. The State could also provide evidence of how it ensured that all necessary personnel received the required training.</p> <p>A.R.S. 15-741.02 Menu of Assessment Policy Although AZ stated it will follow the standardized test administration procedures, it did not provide any evidence to address test administration in the AZ documents.</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

	<p>Pages 43, and 66-79 provide guidance on how to fill out an irregularity report that administrators will use to document disruptions that occur during standardized testing.</p> <p>#2.3.b SAT School Day Standard Testing Manual 2020-21 This manual provides detailed procedures to follow before, during, and after the SAT School Day administration. Includes standard test-day script.</p> <p>#2.3.c SAT School Day Accommodated Testing Manual 2020-21 This manual provides detailed procedures to follow before, during, and after the SAT School Day administration. Includes accommodated test-day scripts.</p> <p>#2.3.d SAT School Day What to Expect and Prepare For Provides detailed information on what to expect and how to prepare for SAT School Day.</p> <p>#2.3.e SAT School Day Starter Kit This kit, organized by audience, points the reader to the implementation and communication resources College Board has designed to support preparations for the administration date.</p> <p>#2.3.f SAT School Day Checklist A resource for counselors to help them plan a successful SAT School Day implementation. This is a supplement to be used with the SAT School Day Coordinator Manual.</p> <p>#2.3.g ADE SAT School Day Implementation Webinar This is the training deck that was used to provide in person training to ADE test administrators. This webinar</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

	<p>contains screenshots of College Board’s Online Test Day Training Module (see slides 38-42). The Online Test Day Training Module presents the same information that is provided in the SAT School Day Coordinator Manual (Evidence #2.3.a), and includes an assessment to assess the user’s knowledge of SAT SD Implementation Processes. Upon request, College Board can provide the peers with login credentials to access the training module.</p>	
<p>Section 2.3 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 the State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration for the SAT. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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. Monitoring of test administration should be demonstrated for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>	<p>AZ 4015 2019 Assessment Observation Schedule AZ 4019 2019 Assessment Observation Procedures AZ 4024 AzMERIT 2019 Observation Notification Letter AZ 4025 AzMERIT 2019 Observation Protocol AZ 4026 2019 Assessment Advanced Information Survey AZ 4030 ADE Assessment Observation Summary 2019_All Tests AZ 6014 Feedback Response Letter AzMERIT Cartwright Heatherbrae AZ 6015 Feedback Response Letter MSAA ACCEL Tempe</p>	<p>The State’s evidence demonstrates that it adequately monitors the administration of its assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools. The State demonstrated the monitoring of test administration for all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS.</p>
<p>Section 2.4 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

Critical Element 2.5 – Test Security

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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 (both during test development and at time of test administration), 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. • Application of test security procedures to all assessments in the State system: the general academic assessments and the AA-AAAS. 	<p>AZ 6016 2020 DTC Test Security Agreement</p> <p>AZ 6017 AZ R7-2-310(B)(1-12); (C)(1-9); D</p> <p>AZ 6018 State Test Security Policy and Procedure 061715; Section B5</p> <p>Prevention of Assessment Irregularities Refer to the manuals and training decks submitted for C.E.2.3. These manuals provide standardized processes and recommended procedures to prevent irregularities.</p> <p>#2.3.a. SAT School Day Coordinator Manual 2020-21 #2.3.b SAT School Day Standard Testing Manual 2020-21 #2.3.c SAT School Day Accommodated Testing Manual 2020-21 #2.3g ADE SAT School Day Implementation Webinar</p> <p>Detection of test irregularities #2.1.a: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017) Pages 66 - 68 describe the College Board's statistical analysis, which is conducted as a component of the company's test security procedures.</p> <p>#2.3.a SAT School Day Coordinator Manual 2020-21 Pages 43, and 66-79 provide guidance on how to fill out an irregularity report that administrators will use to document disruptions that occur during standardized testing.</p> <p>Remediation</p>	<p>Arizona’s schools administering the SAT for federal accountability purposes follow the College Board test security procedures.</p> <p>AZ 6016, 6017, & 6018 outline Arizona’s processes for dealing with test security.</p> <p>An updated version of the security agreement should be provided when the SAT is available for selection.</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

	<p>Refer to ADE’s submission for information regarding remediation.</p> <p>Investigation #2.5.a: Why and How ETS Questions Scores (College Board Programs) (2016) This document describes the ways that ETS, our testing subcontractor, investigates cases that may affect the validity of test scores.</p> <p>#2.5.b: Investigation and Remediation of SAT Irregularities (2018) This document provides a high-level overview of the procedures the College Board undertakes to investigate irregularities and remediate any recurring issues.</p>	
<p>Section 2.5 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 the State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures prior to SAT implementation. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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-related data in test administration, scoring, 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 6019 2019 02 04 Student Data Collection and Protection Sheet v2</p> <p>AZ 6020 ADE Data Governance PII</p> <p>AZ 6012 2020 2021 MOA Technical Assistance_1; Technical Assistance for Assessment Providers, Section 1: #3</p> <p># 2.1.a: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017) Pages 58 - 59 describe the procedures the College Board has designed to maintain test security.</p> <p>#2.3.a SAT School Day Coordinator Manual 2020-21) This manual provides guidance for test coordinators who are responsible for overseeing the administration on how to maintain test security: Page 14 describes how to securely store test materials. Pages 20-23 describe how test coordinators should maintain security before and during testing. Pages 33-34 describe how test coordinators can prepare students for testing. Pages 42- 43 describes how to maintain school security during testing. Pages 43-44 describes how to report test administration irregularities and the test proctor role in maintaining security in the testing room. Pages 53-54 describes how to handle testing materials after testing is complete. Pages 66-79 include a sample irregularities report that supervisors use to begin investigation of test administration issues.</p>	<p>The evidence provided by the ADE did not address the protection of personally identifiable information that could be gleaned from testing data cells in reports that could allow someone to identify individual students in those cells if the ‘n’ is too small.</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

	<p>#2.3.b SAT School Day Standard Testing Manual 2020-21 Pages 3-4, 9-15, and 41-49 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p>#2.3.c SAT School Day Accommodated Testing Manual 2020-21 Pages 2-9, 15-16, 22-26, 29-32, and 107- 117 provide instruction on standardized testing procedures devised to maintain security during nonstandard test administration. Information in this section includes how to maintain security in the testing room and report administration irregularities.</p> <p>#2.6.a: SAT School Day Student Guide (2020-21) This brochure provides to students information about how the College Board secures their data and personally identifiable information. Pages 8-10, and 51-56 describe the College Board privacy policy as it relates to students. This section also provides information regarding instances where scores may be canceled due to testing irregularities or misconduct, and how students may securely send their scores to colleges and university systems.</p> <p>#2.6.b: Description of Test Management and Reporting System (2017) This document provides an overview of the security of the College Board online test management and reporting system.</p> <p>#2.6.c: Description of Confidential College Board Information Security Policy (2017) The College Board has created a high-level policy document that describes the processes in place to protect</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

	<p>the integrity and confidentiality of student level data. The policy is confidential, so this summary provides high level information regarding what the policy contains.</p> <p>#2.6.d College Board Privacy Statement (2020) This policy is currently accessible at https://about.collegeboard.org/privacy-center/privacystatement. The document, as it appeared on this site on November 12 2020, is submitted as evidence. It describes the College Board Data Privacy policy and privacy statements.</p> <p>#2.6.e. College Board Guidelines for the Release of Data (July 2018) This white paper describes the guidelines for the release of data obtained from test results to third party research institutions.</p> <p>#2.6.f: ETS Legal Privacy and Security Notice (2020) ETS manages the online test rostering system for the SAT. This document provides ETS' legal privacy and security notice.</p>	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<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 that the State has 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. <p>NOTE FROM DEPARTMENT STAFF TO ADE: Department staff agree that ADE did not provide this information in the peer review submission. Staff note, however, that ADE did provide this information when amending its ESEA Consolidated State Plan (see page 10 on https://oesed.gov/files/2020/04/Arizona-Final-Consolidated-State-Plan-PDF.pdf), which has been approved by the Department.</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element 3.1 – Overall Validity, Including Validity Based on Content

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. The State’s validity evidence includes evidence that:</p> <p><u>The State’s academic assessments</u> 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), balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • Documentation that the assessments address the depth and breadth of the content standards; • If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards and administers alternate assessments aligned with those standards, the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content 	<p>AZ 6057 WebbAlign_WCEPS_AZ SAT Alignment Report 11252020</p> <p>#2.1.a: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 1 - 20 provide an overview of the assessment, including a description its purpose, test format and content, scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results. • Pages 107 - 139 examine the validity of the SAT and includes information on the evidentiary foundations behind the test content, concordance between the current and previous version of the S.A, and the relationship between SAT scores and first-year grade point average, as well as the relationship between SAT scores and college and career readiness benchmarks. <p>#2.1.a Part 2: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tables A-3.1 - A-3.15 in Appendix, 3 (pages 11-35) provide test content specifications and content domains and descriptions. • Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides additional detail regarding how statistical indices were computed. • Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. • Appendix 7 (pages 321 - 396) displays the results of analyses performed to evaluate the validity of the SAT. 	<p>AZ6030, pgs. 23-24. HumRRO indicates appropriate alignment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In an independent study (conducted by HumRRO), comparisons of SAT items and item stimuli to the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) High Quality Assessment Criteria found alignment to these criteria in SAT Reading, Writing, and Math Tests (Nemeth, Michaels, Wiley, & Chen, 2017). Items were judged as being generally rigorous. • All of the Arizona Reading and Language anchor standards are addressed at least in part on the SAT. • Twenty of the 22 domains covered by the Arizona standards for high school mathematics in number and quantity, algebra, functions, modeling, geometry, and statistics and probability are included in the SAT. <p>Exhibit AZ 6057, dated 11/25/2020, is an alignment study of the Arizona Academic Content Standards for English Language Arts Grades 11-12, Algebra I, and Geometry with two forms of the SAT by WCEPS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 3 of the document indicates that the Arizona English Language Arts standards were considered “acceptably aligned” with the SAT. • However, the study indicated that, for Algebra I and Geometry, “. . . both test forms analyzed would need major adjustments to meet typically accepted alignment criteria. . .”

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

and cognitive complexity determine in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.		Per the alignment study, it would likely require the addition of an augmented section to the SAT math test in order to meet typically accepted alignment criteria.
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A plan from Arizona about how its chosen math assessment will align with the State's math 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

Critical Element 3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap: <u>the intended cognitive processes</u> appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>#3.2.a CONFIDENTIAL 2019 SAT Cognitive Lab Preliminary Report</p> <p>AZ 6030 BAFO CB Initial Response Menu of Assessments.pdf</p>	<p>Evidence 3.2a is the SAT Cognitive Lab preliminary report dated December 2019. However, a final report was to be available in 2020 but that report has not been submitted as evidence of the content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p> <p>AZ6030, Pg. 20. “The preliminary findings from this cognitive lab provide evidence that lends support to the claim that the SAT items assess higher-order thinking skills.”</p>
<p>Section 3.2 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

Critical Element 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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 <u>academic content standards</u>.</p>	<p>AZ 6058 3.3.b Delaware parent report</p> <p>#2.1.a SAT Suite Technical Manual Appendixes (October) Page 73 has a table with the section score characteristics Pages 139-141 (table A-6.9.1 through A-6.9.3) has the raw score correlations for Reading, Writing & Language, and Math on three operational forms of the SAT Pages 158-160 (table A-6.12.1 through A-6.12.3) has the scaled score correlations for Reading, Writing & Language, and Math on three operational forms of the SAT</p> <p>#3.3.a Student Score Report This document shows how the section scores are reported to students & families in the most generic paper report from College Board. It describes the performance related to the SAT benchmarks; states provide supplemental reports for their own performance levels</p> <p>#3.3.b Delaware parent report Since Arizona has not administered the SAT for accountability purpose yet, this report is provided as an example of how one state provides the intended interpretations in the context of their state content standards and performance descriptors. ADE may opt to provide similar reports to parents in 2021.</p> <p>#3.3.c skills insight sat suite Provided as evidence of how College Board presents the student’s performance in each test section in the context of academic skills. Educators have a map of these skills to specific state standards available to them, dynamically, through online score reporting tools.</p>	<p>AZ 6058. Delaware parent report is submitted to demonstrate how it “may opt to provide similar reports to parents in 2021.” However, this does not include evidence about the validity of the subscores.</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

	<p>#3.3.d: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017) This document describes the methodology and scale development process for the SAT Suite of Assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 8 - 11 provide a description of the scores derived from the SAT and an overview of how the scores were developed. • Pages 16 - 24 describe how the scaling study was designed. • Pages 25 - 40 describe the characteristics of SAT scaling. • Pages 66 - 74 describe the characteristics of SAT subscore scaling. 	
<p>Section 3.3 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 that 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. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 3.4 – Validity Based on Relations to Other Variables

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.	#3.4.a: Validity of the SAT for Predicting First-Year Grades and Retention to the Second Year (May 2019)	<p>Since AZ has not previously administered the SAT for accountability purposes, the College Board provided evidence of its validity for predicating first-year grades and retention to the second year.</p> <p>AZ will need to provide evidence for this critical element.</p>
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
<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 the State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY – OTHER

Critical Element 4.1 – Reliability

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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 consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards. If the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, measures of reliability for the assessment overall and each student group consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards, 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, including any domain or component sub-tests, as applicable; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores, achievement levels or proficiency levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>. 	<p>ADE did not complete accountability testing in the 2019-2020 school year, and so College Board did not have the data to complete test administration and subgroup reliability reports that we usually create for our state clients. As reference, College Board submits the Test administration and subgroup reliability reports that we previously created for Delaware Department of Education and Michigan Department of Education. We request that the Peers look at these reports as samples of reports that we can create for ADE in the future, upon request by the state education agency.</p> <p>#4.1.a DE 2018 SAT SWD TA Report This document has analysis for students that used testing accommodations during the 2018 SAT administration. Upon request, we can create a similar report for ADE.</p> <p>#4.1.b MI 2016 Subgroup Reliability This document contains reliability data for students with disabilities, English learners, and students who received accommodations. Upon request, we can create a similar report for ADE.</p>	<p>No state specific evidence.</p> <p>Since AZ has not administered the SAT for accountability purposes, it provided College Board reports produced from other states as evidence for this element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<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 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 consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing 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

Critical Element 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><i>For all State academic assessments,</i> assessments should be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) (see definition¹).</p> <p>For academic content assessments, the State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in their design, development and analysis.</p>	<p>See evidence submitted for C.E. 2.2 which describe College Board item development processes.</p> <p>#4.2.a SAT Suite Universal Design Principles Universal Design Principles This document details how the SAT Suite of Assessments is developed according to the following five principles of universal design defined by Thompson, Johnstone, and Thurlow (2002)</p> <p>#4.2.b Assessment Design and Development Fairness Framework The guidelines in this framework establish the rationale and criteria by which the fairness of SAT Suite test materials is evaluated.</p> <p>#2.1.e National Curriculum Survey Report College Board periodically conducts national curriculum surveys of middle school, high school, and postsecondary educators across the United States to collect data on (1) the skills and knowledge necessary for readiness for and success in entry-level, credit bearing courses in institutions of higher education and (2) the teaching emphasis placed on these skills and knowledge in middle school and high school classrooms. College Board uses the results of these curriculum surveys as evidence for (or against) the content validity of the SAT® college admission test and its associated assessments. The survey results help inform College Board regarding whether the skills and knowledge represented on the SAT are considered essential for</p>	<p>AZ deferred to the College Board for its processes to address this critical element.</p>

¹ see page 28 of “*A State’s Guide to the U.S. Department of Education’s Assessment Peer Review Process*”, September 24, 2018 available at: www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html

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

	<p>student readiness for and success in common entry-level, credit-bearing postsecondary courses. In addition, the survey data help the College Board, educators, policy makers, and other stakeholders evaluate the extent to which middle school and high school students are being taught what postsecondary institutions expect them to know and be able to do in order to be ready for and successful in common entrylevel, credit-bearing courses.</p>	
<p>Section 4.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>X</u> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum for academic assessments, including performance for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>#2.1.a SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 75 - 106 describe various psychometric analyses to study how the SAT assesses student performance across the full performance continuum. <p>#2.1.a Part 2: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. <p>#4.3.a: SAT Effectiveness at Representing Test Taker Achievement across the Performance Spectrum (2017)</p> <p>This document provides data regarding the SAT's effectiveness at representing test taker achievement.</p>	<p>No additional evidence is required.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 4.4 – Scoring

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <u>academic achievement standards</u>.</p>	<p># 2.1.a: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 2 - 4 describe the scores derived from the assessment and the intended use of results. • Page 48 - 49 describes the inter-rater reliability statistics related to the essay portion of the assessment. • Pages 60 - 74 describe the scoring procedures for the SAT, a description of how results are reported, and the item analysis that is performed on the operational items, including Differential Item Functioning (DIF) and Key Validation. The required qualifications for human scorers are also included in this section. • Pages 75 - 106 describe scaling procedures, equating, analysis of normative information to support appropriate interpretations of the common score scales, reliability analysis and additional psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. • Pages 133 - 135 describe the processes that were used to develop and validate the SAT benchmarks for college and career readiness. <p>#2.1.a. Part 2: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017) • Appendix 5 (pages 37 - 65) provides the essay scoring rubric and data to support the item analysis findings summarized in the technical manual.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 6 (pages 66 - 320) provides data to support the psychometric analysis performed by the College Board. <p>#3.3.d: Scaling for the SAT Suite of Assessments (2017)</p> <p>This document describes the methodology and scale development process for the SAT Suite of Assessments.</p>	<p>AZ deferred to the College Board for its scoring procedures to address this critical element.</p> <p>AZ academic achievement standards were not addressed.</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

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages 8 - 11 provide a description of the scores derived from the SAT and an overview of how the scores were developed. • Pages 16 - 24 describe how the scaling study was designed. • Pages 25 - 40 describe the characteristics of SAT scaling. • Pages 66 - 74 describe the characteristics of SAT subscore scaling. <p>#4.4.a: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Michigan (April 2017) College Board creates this type of report for all of its state clients. This report summarizes the performance of 11th grade students who took the SAT school day administration, Refer to pages 9 – 11 for a description of test analysis processes. While we did not create a similar report for ADE based on their SY19-20 test administration due to COVID restrictions, we will create a similar report for ADE for future administrations.</p>	
<p>Section 4.4 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 the State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable and meaningful results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s <u>academic achievement standards</u>. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers multiple forms of academic assessments 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>#2.1.a: SAT Suite of Assessments Technical Manual (October 2017) Pages 39 - 49 describe how the test is constructed to ensure multiple forms of the assessment are comparable Pages 82 - 90 describe equating procedures and results for the SAT.</p> <p>#2. 1.a Part 2: SAT® Suite of Assessments Technical Manual Appendixes (October 2017) Appendix 6; Tables A-6.3.2 through A-6.3.5 (pages 72 - 78) show data and sample sets related to the equating procedures described in pages 82 - 90 of evidence 2.1.a.</p> <p>#4.4.a: SAT Suite of Assessments Administration Report- Michigan (April 2017) Page 2 provides an executive summary which describes the number of forms used in the April 2017 administration of SAT SD in Michigan. While we did not create a similar report for ADE based on their SY19-20 test administration due to COVID restrictions, we will create a similar report for ADE for future administrations.</p>	<p>No state specific evidence.</p> <p>AZ deferred to the College Board to address this critical element regarding multiple forms. SAT Technical Manual from October 2017 and a Michigan report dated April 2017 were provided as evidence.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> X <input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>If the State administers any of its assessments in multiple versions within a subject area (e.g., online versus paper-based delivery; <u>or a native language version of the academic content assessment</u>), 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>The SAT has been administered in Arizona as a paper-based assessment.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a system for monitoring, 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), and Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State’s website. 	<p>#2.1.e National Curriculum Survey Report College Board periodically conducts national curriculum surveys of middle school, high school, and postsecondary educators across the United States to collect data on (1) the skills and knowledge necessary for readiness for and success in entry-level, credit bearing courses in institutions of higher education and (2) the teaching emphasis placed on these skills and knowledge in middle school and high school classrooms. College Board uses the results of these curriculum surveys as evidence for (or against) the content validity of the SAT® college admission test and its associated assessments. The survey results help inform College Board regarding whether the skills and knowledge represented on the SAT are considered essential for student readiness for and success in common entry-level, credit-bearing postsecondary courses. In addition, the survey data help the College Board, educators, policy makers, and other stakeholders evaluate the extent to which middle school and high school students are being taught what postsecondary institutions expect them to know and be able to do in order to be ready for and successful in common entrylevel, credit-bearing courses.</p> <p>As described in the adjacent note, College Board provides annual test administration supplements to its state partners that are used to compare annual results, and conduct debrief sessions and planning meetings for the following administration. We provide the below reports and meeting notes as samples of the kinds of reports and meetings we plan to conduct with ADE to analyze assessment results and conduct ongoing maintenance.</p>	<p><u>ADE Response:</u> “ADE will work with College Board through annual debrief meetings using the established process to discuss how to maintain and improve the quality of the assessment. ADE will be administering the SAT as part of the Menu of Assessments as an option in lieu of the High School Statewide Assessment beginning in spring 2022, therefore, we will not have met to discuss improvement or quality until after spring of 2022.”</p> <p>AZ deferred to the College Board to provide its processes for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the assessment with debriefing notes from a meeting with other states. However, there is no process provided by AZ to demonstrate an existing system into which the SAT will be included to maintain technical quality.</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

	#4.7.a Connecticut 2018 TA Report #4.7.b Delaware 2018 SAT Total Group TA Report #4.7.c CSDE Debrief Meeting Notes 051818 SAT	
Section 4.7 Summary Statement		
<input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence of 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.• Evidence of adequate technical quality is made public, including on the State's website.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<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. Decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team under IDEA, the placement team under Section 504, or the individual or team designated by a district to make that decision under Title II of the ADA, as applicable, based on each student’s individual abilities and needs.</p> <p>If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(1)(E) and (b)(2)(D), respectively, the State must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guidelines for determining whether to assess a student with an AA-AAAS, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior; • Provide information for IEP Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that: 	<p>AZ 1210 AZ R7-2-402 G(5) AZ 1211 AZ R7-2-402 C(9) AZ 6012 2020 2021 MOA Technical Assistance_1; Technical Assistance for the Field AZ 6021 Alternate Assessment Eligibility Rev Sept 2020 AZ 6022 MSAA Participation Guidance_Rev 080316 AZ Final</p> <p>#2.3.c SAT School Day Accommodated Testing Manual 2020-21 This manual provides detailed procedures to follow before, during, and after the SAT School Day administration.</p> <p>#2.3.g SAT School Day Spring 2021 Implementation Training This is the training deck that was used to provide in person training to ADE test administrators. Pages 27-33 provide information on SAT accommodation processes.</p>	<p>AZ 1210 and AZ 1211 are the State’s education code regulating the inclusion of students with IEPs or in a “private facility” in the statewide assessment system.</p> <p>AZ 6021 and AZ 6022 describe the criteria that must be met for students with disabilities to be considered eligible for an Alternate Assessment. AZ 6022 includes detailed guidance for IEP teams on making this determination.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides a clear explanation of the differences between assessments aligned with grade-level academic achievement standards and those aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student's education resulting from taking an AA-AAAS, such as how participation in such assessments may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma; • Ensure that parents of students assessed with an AA-AAAS are informed that their child's achievement will be measured based on alternate academic achievement standards; • Not preclude a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who takes an AA-AAAS from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma; and • Promote, consistent with requirements under the IDEA, the involvement and progress of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the general education curriculum that is based on the State's academic 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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>for the grade in which the student is enrolled; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop, disseminate information on, and promote the use of appropriate accommodations to ensure that a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities who does not take an AA-AAAS participates in academic instruction and assessments for the grade in which the student is enrolled. • The State has in place and monitors implementation of guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, if applicable. Such guidelines must be developed in accordance with 34 CFR § 200.6(d).² 		
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

² See the full regulation at 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (online at https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=07e168e9e7a6c5931b4549cc15547ee9&mc=true&node=se34.1.200_16&rgn=div8)

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 5.2 – Procedures for Including English Learners in Academic Content Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments 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 EL should be assessed with a linguistic accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for ELs; • Assistance regarding selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, including to the extent practicable, assessments in the language most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students’ mastery of skills in academic content areas until the students have achieved English language proficiency. 	<p>AZ 6012 2020 2021 MOA Technical Assistance_1; Technical Assistance for the Field</p> <p>AZ 6023 Menu Guidance. July 2019</p> <p>#2.3.c SAT School Day Accommodated Testing Manual 2020-21 This manual provides detailed procedures to follow before, during, and after the SAT School Day administration. Policy from the College Board state user accommodated manual is provided to show College Board policy and procedures are consistent with requirements. This manual, or a state specific one with similar content, is sent to every testing site, weeks before testing, so staff can be trained. Page 4 includes an important note about additional time support for EL students and the supports listed for planning purposes Page 6-7 covers the process to “ensure you have plans in place for testing students with accommodations and EL supports” and the procedure to register them in the system for reporting to the state</p> <p>#2.3.g SAT School Day Spring 2021 Implementation Training This presentation from a required training, publication in the state’s assessment newsletter, and inclusion on the states Web site is typical of SAT state users’ communication process. Pages 28-29 cover the new processes for accommodation eligibility and selection</p>	<p>There seems to be no state specific evidence directly related to procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content assessments.</p> <p>State needs to provide evidence of procedures for determining student eligibility for accommodations and information on selection of appropriate accommodations for ELs.</p> <p>AZ 6023 Menu Guidance July 2019.pdf, “Arizona’s Menu of Assessments: Considerations for Accessibility,” does state “Prior to the day of a test, Test Administrators must know what accommodations each student will be using and how to administer them properly.” However, this does not address the procedures for the selection process in determining whether accommodations will be required.</p> <p>There are only 3 accommodations that are allowed for English Learners: Simplified Directions, Translate Directions, and Translation Dictionary. The use of these accommodations is determined by the test administrator.</p> <p>Accessibility Tools and Features, known in Arizona schools as “Universal Test Administration Conditions” are available</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Pages 30-31 cover the procedures for EL participation with supports</p> <p>#5.2.a: College Board-Approved Word-to-Word Glossaries for the SAT® Suite of Assessments This document lists the word-to-word glossaries that the College Board has approved for use with the SAT by EL students. The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</p> <p>#5.2.b: College Board translated instructions for the SAT (2020) College Board provides translated test instructions to English language learners in 13 languages (Albanian, Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, French, Gujarati, Haitian Creole, Hindi, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Urdu, and Vietnamese). The state education agency decides which students can use these language supports. These supports do not require an accommodations request and provide college reportable scores to students.</p>	<p>to all students, including English Learners as needed. Exhibit 6023, pp. 12-14, addresses them.</p> <p>Assistance regarding the selection of appropriate linguistic accommodations for ELs, such as assessments in other languages were not addressed in the materials provided.</p> <p>Documentation of guidance is needed regarding the selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.</p>
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<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"> • Documentation of guidance regarding the selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners • Evidence the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all ELs in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s academic content 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

Critical Element 5.3 – Accommodations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and ELs, including ELs with disabilities. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that appropriate accommodations, such as, interoperability with, and ability to use, assistive technology, are available to measure the academic achievement of students with disabilities. • Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for ELs; • Has determined that the accommodations it provides (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; • Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. • Ensures that accommodations for all required assessments do not deny 	<p>AZ 6023 Menu Guidance July 2019; pages 3-6</p> <p>AZ 6030 BAFO CB Initial Response Menu of Assessments. pdf</p> <p>#2.3.a SAT-School Day Accommodated Testing Manual Policy from College Board state user accommodated testing manual is provided to show College Board policy and procedures are consistent with requirements. This manual, or a state specific one with similar content, is sent to every testing site, weeks before testing, so staff can be trained. Page 4 includes a table matching the accommodations with testing conditions so educators can make informed choices about the most appropriate choice for each student Pages 8-9 cover the special materials required for each accommodation so educators can make informed choices about the most appropriate choice for each student</p> <p>#2.3.g SAT School Day Spring 2021 Implementation Training This presentation from a required training, publication in the state’s assessment newsletter, and inclusion on the states Web site is typical of SAT state user’s communication process. Page 28 covers the processes necessary to select and register the most appropriate accommodations for each student; all students are provided the opportunity to participate and have a college reportable score under these policies</p>	<p>Based on the note provided by Arizona in the submission index: “ADE will be updating all State Testing Accessibility/Accommodation manuals to reflect the inclusion of our new statewide assessments and Menu option during the summer of 2021. Arizona will not have any state allowed accommodations and all accommodated tests will provide college reportable scores.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exhibit AZ 6023 addresses accommodations made available for all Arizona students, including those with Special Needs, English Learners, and English Learners with Special Needs. • The reviewers were not able to find references to accommodations such as interoperability with, and the ability to use, assistive technology in the exhibits that were provided. • The accommodations allowed for English Learners are limited, only 3 types. • The Arizona Department of Education has determined that the accommodations that are approved for use do not alter the construct being assessed. It is not clear whether the use of the approved accommodations is recorded in a way that would allow comparisons of scores for students using or not using accommodations. • The instructions in Exhibit AZ 6023 provides that if test administrators of Students with Special Needs or English Learners feel that they need to offer an accommodation that is not listed, that they should contact the ADE for guidance. <p>AZ 6030, Pg. 3. College Board stated “Students who test with accommodations or EL supports will receive college-reportable scores.”</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
students with disabilities or ELs the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in the assessment.		
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<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 that the State has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (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. • Evidence that children with disabilities and English learners are not denied the opportunity to participate in the assessment and any benefits from participation in 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

Critical Element 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for all students with disabilities and ELs 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 under IDEA, placement team convened under Section 504; or for students covered by Title II of the ADA, the individual or team designated by a district to make these decisions; or another process for an EL; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures; • Monitored for administrations of all required academic content assessments and AA-AAAS. 	<p>AZ 4015 2019 Assessment Observations Schedule</p> <p>AZ 4019 2019 Assessment Observation Procedures</p> <p>AZ 4021 2019 Follow-up and Targeted Observations</p> <p>AZ 4022 Arizona Department of Education 2018 Assessment Observation Letter to LEA</p> <p>AZ 4023 AzMERIT 2018 Observation Protocol Responses from ADE Staff</p> <p>AZ 4024 AZMERIT 2019 Observation Notification</p> <p>AZ 4025 AzMERIT 2019 Observation Protocol</p> <p>AZ 4026 2019 Assessment Advanced Information Survey</p> <p>AZ 4027 MSAA 2018 Observation Protocol Responses from ADE Staff</p> <p>AZ 4030 ADE Assessment Observation Summary 2019_All Tests</p> <p>AZ 6014 Feedback Response Letter AzMERIT Cartwright Heatherbrae</p> <p>AZ 6015 Feedback Response Letter MSAA ACCEL Tempe</p> <p>#2.3.g SAT School Day Spring 2021 Implementation Training Page 28 covers the processes necessary to register a student’s accommodations; all students are provided the</p>	<p>Note from the State: “ADE is submitting its current processes and procedures. The observation of the administration of the SAT will be added to ADE’s monitoring list for the 2021-2022 school year.”</p> <p>AZ submitted samples of its notification process, observation schedule, procedures, letters, protocols, observation summaries, and feedback response letters.</p> <p>The evidence provided documented that observations were scheduled, carried out, and results reported back to the LEAs. The observation protocol included the evaluation of use of accommodations.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>opportunity to participate and have a college reportable score under these policies. These records are reported along with each student’s testing record.</p> <p>#5.4.a 2017_18 SAT State Accountability Layout This file provides the layout of the final score reporting file for a state’s SAT administration. The SAT Data File Layout provides each element with values and comments; rows 22 & 50-53 allow states to easily monitor performance, access to accommodations, and participation.</p>	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [list additional evidence needed w/brief rationale] 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic content standards:</u></p> <p>The State formally adopted <u>challenging academic achievement standards</u> in reading/language arts, mathematics, and 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, alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its 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; <p>The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (1) at least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third for lower achievement; (2) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (3) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels.</p>	<p>AZ 6024 ACT SAT Concordance Cut Scores for AZ</p> <p>AZ 6025 SBE 06242019 ACT SAT Cut Score Approval</p> <p>AZ6012 Pursuant to ARS 15-741.02(E)(3)</p>	<p>Note from State in the submission index: “In 2018 ADE conducted a standard setting for the Menu of Assessments. ADE will be considering the possibility of resetting standards or a validation process after the 2021-2022 Administration of ACT as the Statewide High School Assessment and then will utilize the ACT and College Board Concordance Tables.”</p> <p>AZ6012. Pursuant to ARS 15-741.02(E)(3), in order to demonstrate scalability for state accountability programs, vendors shall provide cut scores that reflect four levels of performance. Cut scores will determine if a student is college and career ready as outlined in the academic standards adopted by the State Board of Education.</p> <p>AZ 6025 SBE 06242019. Recommendation and approval for the Board to approve the recommended Menu of Assessments Cut Scores for ACT and SAT. However, we were not provided information that described the levels of achievement, nor the competencies associated with them.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required or</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics for all students. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 6.2 – Achievement Standards Setting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards.</u> 	<p>AZ 6026 Arizona Standard Setting Technical Report ACT Menu 2019 Final</p> <p>AZ 6027 AZ Standard Setting Slides Final Summary v3</p> <p>AZ 6028 Evaluation Background Questionnaire v2</p> <p>AZ 6029 Standard Setting Agenda AZ 05242019</p> <p>AZ 6030 BAFO CR Initial Response to Menu of Assessments.pdf</p>	<p>AZ 6026, AZ 6027, AZ 6028, and AZ 6029 provide evidence of a standard setting for ACT. Pg. 3 stated, “The resulting cut scores can then be used in conjunction with the ACT-SAT concordance tables to find comparable cut scores on the SAT.”</p> <p>The State should provide evidence that cut scores established by a standard setting for the ACT, can simply be converted to the SAT scale and be comparable to cut scores established by a standard setting using the SAT itself.</p>
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
<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 from the State that cut scores established by a standard setting for the ACT, can simply be converted to the SAT scale and be comparable to cut scores established by a standard setting using the SAT itself. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p><u>For academic achievement standards:</u></p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards and with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards such that a student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards (1) are aligned with the State’s challenging academic content standards for the grade in which a student is enrolled; (2) promote access to the general curriculum consistent with the IDEA; (3) reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable for such students; (4) are designated in the IEP for each student for whom alternate academic achievement standards apply; and (5) are aligned to ensure that a student who meets the alternate academic achievement standards is on track to pursue</p>	<p>AZ 6030 BAFO CB Initial Response Menu of Assessments; Pages 19-31 of PDF</p> <p>States that chose to use the SAT as their high school assessment for Reading, Writing, and Mathematics standards have high school content standards that are explicitly aligned with college and career readiness. The standard setting process for each state varies, but the evidence of predictive validity between the SAT and post-secondary outcomes is critical to each process. The following documents can provide evidence of that validity and the points in the SAT scale that predict college and career readiness.</p> <p>Evidence Documents:</p> <p>6.3.a National sat validity study While the whole document is relevant, the abstract (page 4) and the conclusions (page 20) provide the bottom-line evidence for this element.</p> <p>6.3.b SAT score relationships with CTE program performance</p>	<p>AZ 6030 includes an independent evaluation by HumRRO that indicates that many states have decided that the alignment is good enough, even though some aspects of the standards are not assessed.</p> <p>“AZ 6026, Pg. 20. “The College Board’s national SAT validity study (Westrick, Marini, Young, Ng, Shmueli, & Shaw, 2019) provides evidence confirming the validity of the SAT as a predictor of college success. SAT level 3 (meet or exceed grade-level benchmarks) scores are strongly predictive of college and career readiness;...”</p> <p>AZ did not provide a reference to the State Board adoption of the academic achievement standards, but to the cut scores.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
postsecondary education or competitive integrated employment.		
Section 6.3 Summary Statement		
<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 how the academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element 6.4 – Reporting

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State reports its assessment results for all students assessed, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of those results by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public.</p> <p>The State reports to the public its assessment results on <u>student academic achievement for all students and each student group at each achievement level³</u></p> <p>For <u>academic content assessments</u>, 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 <u>specific academic needs of students</u>, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its academic content assessments that: 	<p>AZ 6012 2020 2021 MOA Technical Assistance_1; Technical Assistance for Assessment Providers #1 and 4</p> <p>AZ 6031 2017 MSAA Reporting Parent Letter Sample (English); last sentence page 1</p> <p>AZ 6032 ALERT MSAA Score Reports Available August 19 through September 13 2019</p> <p>AZ 6033 AzMERIT Updates and Menu of Assessments AZ 6034 SP19 AZ DTC Checklist; page 6</p> <p>AZ 6035 The Examiner May 2019; pages 2 and 3</p> <p>Individual score reports are delivered by College Board to every student tested within weeks of test administration.</p> <p>Evidence Documents: #6.4.a understanding sat scores #6.4.b understanding sat scores Spanish These documents describe the key elements of the online score reports. Students also have access to video tutorials and other help resources to be able to access and understand their results.</p> <p>#5.4.a 2017-18 SAT State Accountability Layout This file provides the layout of the final score reporting file for a state’s SAT administration. It is delivered in</p>	<p>AZ 6033 relates to timing of release of scores, but not for SAT.</p> <p>Note from Arizona: “The Arizona Department of Education will be utilizing the SAT reports via its reporting portal including district, school, and individual student reports, and guides for families.</p> <p>Results must be available to participating LEAs by May 25. ADE will only offer State Test Dates that will permit for results to be provided to LEAs by May 25.</p> <p>ADE will utilize its primary mode of communication with District Test Coordinators - The quarterly <i>Examiner Newsletter</i> and emails to communicate information regarding reports and resources for reporting. These communications will also direct schools to contact ADE if a parent requests an alternative format of student reports.” However, the state did not provide evidence of this.</p> <p>Information was not provided by ADE regarding how the SAT data file is uploaded to its student information system, and how those data files are distributed to school districts and high schools so that they can be used to inform their programs.</p> <p>In the exhibits provided, we were not able to locate information as to the availability of student reports in languages other than English, and whether this is something provided by the contractors or by the ADE itself.</p>

³ Although all students with disabilities must be included in a State’s assessment system, requirements for public reporting in ESEA section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) apply only to children with disabilities as defined in section 602(3) of the IDEA.

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a <u>student’s academic achievement</u>; ○ Report the <u>student’s academic achievement</u> in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards; ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific <u>academic needs of students</u>; ○ Are provided in an understandable and uniform format; ○ Are, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; ○ Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. ● 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>June or early July to all state SAT users with one row per student identified as eligible/required to participate in the SAT administration.</p> <p>The SAT Data File Layout tab provides each element with values and comments; student name, school, and other key information (i.e., SSID in row 22) is reported back to the state’s assessment team in the exact format it was provided to identify the student for testing. This is especially important for timely turn-around of this report for state purposes.</p> <p># 3.3.c skills insight sat suite</p> <p>Provided as evidence of how College Board presents the students’ performance in each test section in the context of academic skills. Every student gets this report as part of an individual score report. Educators have a map of these skills to specific state standards available to them, dynamically, through online score reporting tools.</p>	<p>It is also unclear as to whether there is State Board Policy requiring that districts provide oral translations and explanations in those cases where parents or guardians are limited-English proficient and possibly illiterate themselves.</p> <p>The exhibits provided by ADE did not address the requirement for providing services to a parent who is him/herself an individual with a disability and needs the presentation in a format accessible to him/her.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 6.4 Summary Statement		
<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 the reports from the SAT, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents and guardians can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent or guardian with limited English proficiency, are orally translated for such parent or guardian; • Upon request by a parent who is an individual with a disability as defined by the ADA, as amended, are provided in an alternative format accessible to that parent. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

SECTION 7: LOCALLY SELECTED NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS
 (if applicable; evidence for this section would be submitted in ADDITION to evidence for sections 1 through 6)

Critical Element 7.1 – State Procedures for the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment. The State has completed this review using its established technical criteria and has found the assessment meets its criteria prior to submitting for the Department’s assessment peer review.</p> <p>The State’s technical criteria include a determination that the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is aligned with the challenging State academic standards; and • Addresses the depth and breadth of those standards. <p>AND</p>	<p>AZ 6011 SBE 5 Year Assessment Plan; slides 7-10</p> <p>AZ 6012 2020 2021 MOA Technical Assistance_1</p> <p>AZ 6036 Arizona Revised Statute 15-741.02</p> <p>AZ 6037 State Board of Education MOA Policy 2020 2021</p> <p>AZ 6030 BAFO CB Initial Response Menu of Assessments.pdf</p>	<p>AZ 6011 documents a timeline of implementation and the options for LEAs.</p> <p>AZ 6036 documents how the State’s menu of assessments will be used, but it does not provide technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected assessment.</p> <p>AZ 6037 State Board of Education Policy about “menu of assessments” states that an LEA must administer selected assessment to every school within the LEA.</p> <p>AZ 6030 BAFO CB included an addendum, Attachment # 1, which was an “Independent Evaluation of SAT Technical Documentation,” including a review of alignment studies conducted by the College Board, HumRRO, and others. Note that this was a limited review of documentation only. Regarding its alignment with the Arizona State Academic Standards, among the results, they found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good alignment between both the SAT Reading Test and Writing & Language Test and the Arizona’s English-Language Arts Standards for 11th -12th grades. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Per the report, 20 of the 22 domains covered by the Arizona standards for high school mathematics in number and quantity, algebra, functions, modeling, geometry, and statistics and probability are included in the SAT. • Another exhibit, Document AZ 6057 (AZ 6057 WebbAlign_WCEPS_AZ SAT Alignment Report

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State has procedures in place to ensure that a district that chooses to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment administers the same assessment to all high school</p>		<p>11252020.pdf), dated 11/25/2020, is an alignment study of the Arizona Academic Content Standards for English Language Arts Grades 11-12, Algebra I, and Geometry with two forms of the SAT, by the Wisconsin Center for Educational Products and Services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 3 of the document indicates that the Arizona English Language Arts standards were considered “acceptably aligned” with the SAT. ○ However, the study indicated that, for Algebra I and Geometry, “. . . both test forms analyzed would need major adjustments to meet typically accepted alignment criteria. . .” <p>The HumRRO and the WCEPS studies show similar results for the alignment of the SAT Language Tests with Arizona Academic Standards for English-Language Arts for Grades 11 & 12. However, the two studies differ in their findings regarding the alignment with the SAT Mathematics test.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The ADE submission addressed the requirement that each school district in the State of Arizona choose to use only one nationally recognized high school academic assessment. ● A local education agency that adopts an achievement assessment pursuant to this section shall provide the necessary reasonable accommodations for a student who is an English language learner and the necessary accommodations and modifications for a student as required by the student's individualized education program team. <p>AZ did not provide evidence to support that established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment is available prior to the assessment.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>students in the district except for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who may be assessed with an AA-AAAS.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The technical criteria established by the State in reviewing a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment must ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations does not deny a student with a disability or an EL—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opportunity to participate in the assessment; and • Any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students without disabilities or students who are not ELs. 		
<p>Section 7.1 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 the State has established technical criteria to use in its review of any submission of a locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment • Evidence that the SAT is aligned with the challenging State academic standards and addresses the depth and breadth of those 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

Element 7.2 –State Monitoring of Districts Regarding the Use of Locally Selected, Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The State must have procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p>Before a district requests approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment; • Of how parents and, as appropriate, students may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request (includes students in public charter schools who would be included in such assessments); and • Of any effect of such request on the instructional program in the district. 	<p>AZ 6039 ACT parent letter GUHSD 1 (LEA)</p> <p>AZ 6040 ACT parent letter GUHSD 2 (LEA)</p> <p>AZ 6041 ACT parent letter GUHSD 3 (LEA)</p> <p>AZ 6042 AmphiTesting Calendar 2020 2021 (LEA)</p> <p>AZ 6043 Amphitheater Parent Letter (LEA) AZ 6044 Amphitheater webpage Testing Calendar (LEA)</p> <p>AZ 6045 June 26 20 2021 Menu of Assessments Notification Portal closes 07012020 (ADE)</p> <p>AZ 6046 May 7 2020 2021 Menu of Assessments Notification Portal to Open (ADE)</p> <p>AZ 6047 Menu of Assessments (LEA)</p> <p>AZ 6048 Menu of Assessments Board Item (LEA)</p> <p>AZ 6049 Menu of Assessments Letter (LEA)</p> <p>AZ 6050 Menu of Assessments Notification Form Fields (ADE)</p> <p>AZ 6051 Menu of Assessments Notification Portal for 2020 2021 (ADE)</p>	<p>Note from the State: “ADE will include additional fields in the 2021-2022 Menu of Assessment Notification Portal to include confirming communications with local community/parents and as appropriate students regarding the LEAs intent to participate in the Menu of Assessments.”</p> <p>The State has provided evidence that there are mechanisms in place to notify parents of the use of their “Menu of Assessments.” There was no evidence on how parents or students may provide input or of the district’s intent to request approval for use of a nationally recognized high school academic assessment.</p> <p>None of the sample letters were related to the SAT.</p> <p>AZ 6049 Menu of Assessments Letter (LEA) states in the first paragraph, “We are grateful to the Arizona State Legislature for the opportunity to eliminate seven testing days over the course of a child’s high school career and focus that time on learning in the classroom.” This statement is a justification of the third bullet in the critical element. No evidence was found in the other exhibits provided that addressed the first or second bullet related to this critical element.</p>
<p>Section 7.2 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>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has procedures in place so that before a district requests approval to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment, the district notifies all parents of high school students it serves— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That the district intends to request approval from the State to use a nationally recognized high school academic assessment in place of the statewide academic assessment ○ Of how parents and, as appropriate, students, may provide meaningful input regarding the district’s request

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

Element 7.3 –Comparability of the Locally Selected Nationally Recognized High School Academic Assessments with the State Assessments

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>The locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect to— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coverage of academic content; • The difficulty of the assessment; • The overall quality of the assessment; and • Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria; • Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level; • Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and • Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools. 	<p>AZ 6052 ACT SAT Concordance Cut Scores for AZ</p> <p>AZ 6053 ACT SAT Concordance Information</p> <p>AZ 6054 ACT SAT Concordance Tables</p> <p>AZ 6055 SBE 06242019 ACT SAT Cut Score Approval</p>	<p>Note from State in its academic index submission: “ADE will be conducting a standard setting for the new Statewide 11th Grade HS assessment (ACT) in summer of 2022. ADE will be utilizing the SAT and ACT Concordance tables until then.</p> <p>The State has not provided evidence of comparability. The concordance tables do not imply this. They use statistical procedures to align scores, but do not take content into consideration. All 4 of the exhibits presented by the ADE are regarding the “Concordance” between the SAT and the ACT. They don’t address the comparison between a local with state assessment.</p> <p>AZ did not provide evidence, that the SAT, when it is the locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment with respect to- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coverage of academic content; • The difficulty of the assessment; • The overall quality of the assessment; and • Any other aspects of the assessment that the State may establish in its technical criteria; • Produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR ARIZONA

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		statewide assessment at each academic achievement level; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and • Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools.
Section 7.3 Summary Statement		
<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> <p>Evidence the locally selected, nationally recognized high school (SAT) academic assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is equivalent to or more rigorous than the statewide assessment, with respect the Menu of Assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The coverage of academic content; ○ The difficulty of the assessment; ○ The overall quality of the assessment • Evidence that the assessment produces valid and reliable data on student academic achievement with respect to all high school students and each subgroup of high school students in the district that— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are comparable to student academic achievement data for all high school students and each subgroup of high school students produced by the statewide assessment at each academic achievement level; ○ Are expressed in terms consistent with the State’s academic achievement standards; and ○ Provide unbiased, rational, and consistent differentiation among schools within the State for the purpose of the State determined accountability system including calculating the Academic Achievement indicator and annually meaningfully differentiating between schools. 		

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