



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Honorable Paolo DeMaria
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Ohio Department of Education
25 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215

January 13, 2017

Dear Superintendent DeMaria:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). We appreciate the efforts required to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in August 2016. As you know, 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.

On October 6, 2016, the Department sent a letter to chief State school officers outlining the outcomes for States related to the assessment peer review. I am writing to provide you feedback on your State's recent submission of evidence. External peer reviewers and Department staff evaluated the Ohio Department of Education's (ODE) submission and found, based on the evidence received, that the components of your assessment system met some, but not all of the statutory and regulatory requirements of section 1111(b)(1) and (3) of the ESEA. Based on the recommendations from this peer review and our own analysis of the State's submission, I have determined the following:

- Reading/language arts (R/LA) and mathematics AA-AAAS in grades 3-8 and high school (Ohio AASCD-R/LA and mathematics). **Partially meets requirements.**
- Science general assessments in grades 5 and 8 (OST). **Substantially meets requirements.**
- Science AA-AAAS in grades 5, 8 and 10 (Ohio AASCD-Science). **Partially meets requirements.**

The component that **substantially meets requirements** meets most of the requirements of the statute and regulations but some additional information is required. The Department expects that ODE should be able to provide this additional information within one 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.

The components that **partially meet requirements** do not meet a number of the requirements of the statute and regulations and ODE will need to provide substantial additional information to demonstrate it meets the requirements. The Department expects that ODE may not be able to submit all of the required information within one year.

The specific list of items required for ODE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because some of the State's components have partially met the requirements, the Department is placing a condition on the State's Title I grant award related to those components of the assessment system. To satisfy this condition, ODE must submit satisfactory evidence to address the items identified in the enclosed list. ODE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. The Department will also host regular (e.g., quarterly) progress calls with the State to discuss the State's progress on its timeline. If, following the peer review of the additional evidence, adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. Additionally, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) will monitor progress on matters pertaining to requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) related to the participation of students with disabilities in Title I assessments. Insufficient progress to address such matters may lead OSERS to place a condition on ODE's IDEA Part B grant award.

The Department notes that ODE submitted a waiver request for assessing speaking and listening that was approved on August 15, 2016, for the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 school years.

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

Thank you for your ongoing commitment to improving educational outcomes for all students. I look forward to our continued partnership as we move ahead with this critical work. I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. If you have any questions, please contact Mario Nunez of my staff at: OSS.Ohio@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Ann Whalen
Senior Advisor to the Secretary
Delegated the Duties of Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: James Wright, Director, Office of Curriculum and Assessment

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the Ohio Science Tests (OST), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See request for evidence of alignment in element 3.1 below.
2.2 – Item Development	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of test item development processes, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test item specifications; ○ Descriptions of procedures used to author test items; and ○ Documentation on how test item writers and reviewers are trained.
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures to secure and protect test materials during the test development process.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the OST tests, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. <p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of alignment, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report of results of an independent alignment study that is technically sound (i.e., method and process, appropriate units of analysis, clear criteria) and documents adequate alignment, specifically that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each assessment is aligned to its test blueprint, and each blueprint is aligned to the full range of State’s academic content standards; or ▪ Each assessment is aligned to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and the procedures the State follows to ensure such alignment during test development. ○ Evidence that the State has addressed any gaps or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies submitted.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the OST and the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the assessments are eliciting the intended cognitive processes as listed in the State standards.
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the internal structure for each assessment is aligned to the test specifications for the assessment (e.g., a dimensionality analysis, which supports the subdomains of the test and the underlying construct).
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For OST tests, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence showing predictive relationships between the tests and other variables not limited to cognitive assessments (e.g., student behavioral outcome measures, teacher evaluations of student ability, etc.); OR • Evidence of validity based on relationships among test scores across subject

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>areas within the Ohio general assessments.</p> <p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence showing predictive relationships between the tests and other variables not limited to cognitive assessments (e.g., student behavioral outcome measures, teacher evaluations of student ability, etc.); OR • Evidence of validity based on relationships among test scores across subject areas within the Ohio alternate assessments.
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures followed when differential item functioning analysis (DIF) identify items with large potential bias.
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the R/LA high school test yields valid and reliable scores across the entire performance range for each starting point on the test.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the OST general science tests and the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of Ohio’s tests, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation of regular internal and external technical review of components of the State’s assessment system, such as State Board of Education minutes, minutes from technical advisory committee (TAC) meetings, and documentation of roles and responsibilities of TAC members.
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that information regarding the test is available in parents in languages other than English.
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See evidence requested in element 5.1 above.
5.3 – Accommodations	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures that describe appropriate accommodations for EL students participating in the test.
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	<p>For the OST and Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, Ohio must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of State monitoring of test administrations for special populations in districts and schools. • Evidence that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive appropriate accommodations.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA and mathematics, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State’s alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade level academic content standards, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A description of the process used to develop the alternate academic achievement standards that shows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The State’s grade-level academic content standards or grade-level

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
	<p>extended academic content standards were used as a main reference in writing performance level descriptors for the alternate academic achievement standards; OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The process of setting cut scores used, as a main reference, performance level descriptors linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards ; OR ▪ The AA-AAAS cut scores were set and performance level descriptors written to link to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards; AND <p>○ A description of steps taken to vertically articulate the alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores and performance level descriptors) across each grade.</p>
6.4 – Reporting	<p>For the OST science tests and Ohio AASCD tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand or, if it is not practicable to provide written translations to a parent with limited English proficiency, be orally translated for such parent. • For the alternate assessments, evidence of itemized score analyses in reporting to stakeholders.

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

August 2016 State Assessment Peer Review Notes



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

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

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS ... 3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students 3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards 4
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only) 5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments(reviewed by Department staff only) 6
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only) 8

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS..... 9
2.1 – Test Design and Development 9
2.2 – Item Development 11
2.3 – Test Administration..... 12
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only) 17
2.5 – Test Security 19
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy 21

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY..... 23
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content..... 23
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes..... 25
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure..... 26
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables..... 28

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER 29
4.1 – Reliability..... 29
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility 31
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum 33
4.4 – Scoring..... 34
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms 36
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment 37
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance 38

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS 39
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities..... 39
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs..... 42
5.3 – Accommodations 44
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations 46

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING 49
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students 49
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting 51
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards 52
6.4 – Reporting 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 OHIO

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p><u>Ohio Revised Code 3301.079(A)(1)</u>: Requires State Board of Education to adopt academic content standards.</p> <p>State Board of Education June 2010 Minutes (pp. 4-8)</p>	<p>OST Evidence supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments The evidence submitted (including Ohio Revised Code 3301.079(A)(1) and State Board of Education June 2010 Minutes) does not explicitly support the adoption of <i>extended</i> standards in support of AASCD.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that the Ohio State Board adopted challenging (extended) academic content standards for AASCD 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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p><u>Ohio Science Learning Standards</u></p> <p>Stakeholder Input: Ohio Academic Content Standards Revisions in Science; working group agenda</p> <p>Science Standards Review Process: Outlines steps in Phase I of the revisions process (2009-2010) and the role of stakeholders (p. 3)</p>	<p>OST</p> <p>Evidence supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>Content standards documents demonstrate sufficient support of critical element.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>Ohio provided the following evidence to support their annual alternate assessments (AASCD) and Annual Science Assessments:</p> <p>AASCD: <u>AASCD Technical Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition to Ohio’s AASCD (p. 1). <p><u>Accommodations Manual</u> (p. 8-9) <u>Ohio’s Alternative Assessments Fact Sheet</u> <u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u> (p. 37, 99)</p> <p>Annual Science Assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 5 • Grade 8 • Physical Science (High School) <p><u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u> (pp. 14-15) <u>Ohio State Tests Fact Sheet/Schedule</u> <u>Testing Times for Ohio’s State Tests</u></p>	<p>Ohio Alternate Assessments (AASCD) are administered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELA - grade clusters 3-5, 6-8, and High School (OGT) • Math - grade clusters 3-5, 6-8 and High School (OGT) • Science - 5, 8 and OGT <p>Ohio also submitted evidence for their statewide annual Science Tests (OST; grades 5, 8 and the Physical Science assessment for High School).</p>
Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments 	<p>Ohio provided evidence that students with disabilities and English Learners (EL) must be included in their assessment system:</p> <p>Students with disabilities: <u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (pp. 37, 99) <u>Accommodations Manual</u> (pp. 4-9) <u>Participation Guidelines for Ohio’s Alternate Assessment</u> AASCD Technical Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2 Alternate Assessment Eligibility (pp. 1-2). <p>English learners (Note: Ohio exempts for one administration of their reading/language arts assessment ELs who have been in U.S. schools for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/language arts assessment) (*): <u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book:</u> (pp. 28, 99). <u>OELPA’s Accessibility Manual</u> (p. 1).</p> <p>(*) Ohio Administrative Code: <u>3301-13-11</u> establishes provisions for the exemption of first year EL and for the allowance of accommodations.</p>	<p>Ohio provided evidence that the AASCD (their statewide assessment for students with disabilities) includes all elementary and secondary students.</p> <p>Ohio provided evidence of exempting EL who have attended schools in the US for less than 12 months from one administration of the statewide reading/language arts 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 OHIO

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.		
Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
X No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>For Ohio Alternative Assessment (AASCD): Ohio provided evidence to support that their participation data show that students with disabilities are disaggregated by grade and student group, and included in Ohio’s assessment system.</p> <p>Ohio provided evidence that they have procedures for ensuring that students with disabilities are tested on their alternate assessment (AASCD), counted in the participation rates and provides the corresponding data: <u>AASCD Technical Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.3 Student Participation in spring 2015 (pp. 10-12). <p><u>Guidance on Student Participation in State Tests</u></p> <p>For Ohio Science Assessments (OST): Ohio provided evidence to support that their participation data show that all students taking the Ohio Science Tests (OST) are disaggregated by grade and student group, and are included in Ohio’s assessment system.</p> <p>Ohio provided evidence that they have procedures for ensuring that all students in the selected grades (5th grade, 8th grade) are tested on their Science assessments (OST), counted in the participation rates and provides the corresponding data: <u>Science and Social Studies Tests Participation 2015 Ohio School & District Test Results: Disaggregated test results by student group.</u> <u>Guidance on Student Participation in State Tests</u></p>	<p>Ohio provided evidence that AASCD assessment data is disaggregated by grade level and by student group.</p> <p>Ohio provided evidence that OST (5th grade, 8th grade) assessment data is disaggregated by grade level and by student group.</p> <p>Ohio also provided evidence that they have procedures in place to ensure that all students with disabilities taking the AASCD and all students taking the OST are tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates to provide the corresponding data.</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</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 OHIO

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>General assessments in science:</p> <p>Ohio Revised Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301.0712</u> College and Work Ready Assessment System <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301-13-01</u> Defining Terms and Establishing Statewide Assessments • <u>3301-13-02</u> Administering Required State Assessments at the Designated Grades <p><u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u> (pp. 94)</p> <p><u>Science Standards</u></p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1, Executive Summary (pp. 1) • Section 1.1, Evidence Based on Test Content (pp. 1-3) • Section 1.4, Summary of Validity of Test Score Interpretations (p. 8) • Section 2, Background of Ohio Statewide Assessments (p. 9) <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1, Evidence Based On Test Content, (pp. 1-3) • Section 4, Item Development and Test Construction (pp. 18-20) • Section 4.6, Test Construction (pp. 23-29) <p><u>Grade 5 Test Blueprint</u></p> <p><u>Grade 8 Test Blueprint</u></p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report, Attached</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1, Evidence Based On Test 	<p>OST</p> <p>No evidence submitted of alignment of grades 5 and 8 Science assessment blueprints to State content standards.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>Evidence submitted demonstrates sufficient support of critical 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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Content, (pp. 1-3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4, Item Development and Test Construction (pp. 18-20) • Section 4.6, Test Construction (pp. 23-29) <p>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (p. 41)</p> <p>AASCD Technical Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2. Test Development (pp. 2-6) • 3. Item Development (pp. 6-9) <p>English Language Arts Test Design Math Test Design Science Test Design</p>	
Section 2.1 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of alignment of grades 5 and 8 Science assessments to State 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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p><u>Grade 5 Test Blueprint</u> <u>Grade 8 Test Blueprint</u></p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1, Executive Summary (p.1) • Section 1.1 Evidence Based on Test Content on Pages 1 through 3, • Section 4.1, Item Development Process and Test Construction, (pp. 18-29) • Section 10, Table 10.1.1, Universal Tools and Designated Supports, (pp. 80-82) • Appendix D <u>Ohio’s Accessibility Manual</u> <p>Ohio Alternative Assessments Fact Sheet AASCD Technical Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2. Test Development (pp. 2-6). • 3. Item Development (pp. 6-9). <p>Appendix B: Alternate Assessment Task Development Flow Chart.</p>	<p>OST Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments Technical manual section on item development (pp. 6-9) does not include sufficient description of item development process.</p>
<p>Section 2.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X__ The following additional evidence is needed for the alternate assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional detail about personnel who developed items—how were they trained? What was their background? • Provide additional documentation of item development processes. Technical Report (pp. 6-9) and Task Development Flow Chart only outline the processes but do not provide sufficient detail. Additional detailed documentation should include: test item specifications, details of the “reasonable and technically sound” procedures used to author items, documentation on how item writers and reviewers were trained. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>Science Grades 5 and 8:</p> <p><u>Test Coordinator’s Manual</u></p> <p><u>Directions for Administration Manual</u></p> <p><u>2015-2016 Testing Times</u></p> <p><u>Guidance for Marking Scorable Documents</u></p> <p><u>TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators</u></p> <p><u>Special Testing Scenarios Guidance</u></p> <p><u>Ohio Pre-ID File Layout for Ohio’s State Tests, the Alternate Assessment and the OELPA</u></p> <p><u>Guidance Document for 2015-16 Ohio Pre-ID Files</u></p> <p><u>TIDE User Guide</u></p> <p><u>TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators</u></p> <p><u>Online User Management Guidance Document</u></p> <p><u>TIDE</u></p> <p><u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u></p> <p>Monthly Newsletter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>K-8</u> <p><u>ODE Webcasts and Presentations on State Tests: Information from ODE for administrators, teachers, students and families on state testing.</u></p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.1, Eligibility, (p. 30) • Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31) • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39) • Section 5.4, Test Security (pp. 39-41) 	<p>OST</p> <p>Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Directions for Administration and Test Coordinator’s Manual are dated for the Spring 2016 assessment administration. State communicated via email on 8/15/2016 that the 2014-15 documentation contained the same content.</p> <p>Alternate assessments Administration and Test Coordinator’s Manual are dated for the Spring 2016 assessment administration. State communicated via email on 8/15/2016 that the 2014-15 documentation contained the same content.</p> <p>The AASCD Training PowerPoint applies to the 2016 assessment administration. State communicated via email on 8/15/2016 that the 2014-15 version was substantively the same.</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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Science Grades 5 and 8: <u>Test Coordinator’s Manual</u> <u>Test Administration Certification Course</u> <u>Test Administrator Certification Companion</u> <u>Directions for Administration Manual</u> <u>Spring 2016 District Test Coordinator Checklist</u> <u>Fall 2015 District Test Coordinator Checklist</u> <u>Spring 2016 Test Administrator Checklist</u> <u>Fall 2015 Test Administrator Checklist</u> <u>2015-2016 Testing Times</u> <u>Guidance for Marking Scorable Documents</u> <u>Discrepancy Resolution Guidance</u> <u>Rescores and Verifications</u> <u>TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators</u> <u>Special Testing Scenarios Guidance</u> <u>Spring 2016 Sample Demographic Pages</u> <u>Ohio Pre-ID File Layout for Ohio’s State Tests, the Alternate Assessment and the OELPA</u> <u>Guidance Document for 2015-16 Ohio Pre-ID Files</u> <u>TIDE User Guide</u> <u>TIDE Administrator User Guide</u> <u>TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators</u> <u>TIDE Tutorial: An Overview</u> <u>TIDE Tutorial: Uploading Pre-ID Files</u> <u>TIDE Tutorial: Uploading Student Setting Files</u> <u>TIDE Tutorial: Adding and Editing Student Records</u> <u>Online User Management Guidance Document</u> <u>TIDE</u> <u>Online Reporting System (ORS) User Guide</u></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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>ORS Tutorial: An Overview</u> <u>ORS Tutorial: Downloading Data</u> <u>ORS Tutorial: Score Reports</u> <u>ORS Tutorial: Test Participation Reports</u> <u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u> Monthly Newsletter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>K-8</u> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.1, Eligibility (p. 30) • Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31) • Appendix C, <u>Test Administrator User Guide</u> (p. 50) <p><u>Guidance for State Infrastructure Trial Online System Requirements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Supporting Operating Systems for Student Testing</u> • <u>Supported Web Browsers for Online Systems</u> • <u>Requirements for Peripheral Equipment Technical Specifications Manual</u> <p><u>Secure Browser Installation Manual</u> <u>Long Term Support Plan</u> <u>Mac OS X 10.11 Note</u></p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.1, Eligibility (p. 30) • Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31) • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39) 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix C, <u>Test Administrator User Guide</u> (p. 50) • Section 10.1, Table 10.1.1, Universal Tools and Designated Supports (pp. 80-82) <p>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration Manual</p> <p>Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual</p> <p>Accommodations Manual (pp.11-24)</p> <p>AASCD Special Testing Scenarios Guidance Document</p> <p>Ohio Alternative Assessments Fact Sheet AASCD Technical Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4. Test Administration (page 9-12). <p>AASCD Additional Order and Pre-ID Windows Guidance Document</p> <p>Ohio Pre-ID File Layout for Ohio’s State Tests, the Alternate Assessment and the OELPA</p> <p>Guidance Document for 2015-16 Ohio Pre-ID Files</p> <p>AASCD Training PowerPoint</p> <p>TIDE User Guide</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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators</p> <p>Online User Management Guidance Document TIDE</p> <p>Online System Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting Operating Systems for Student Testing • Supported Web Browsers for Online Systems • Requirements for Peripheral Equipment <p>Online User Role Matrix</p> <p>Data Entry Interface FAQ</p> <p>Date Entry Interface user Guide</p> <p>TIDE FAQ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ohio’s State Test Rules Book • Monthly Newsletter • K-8 	
Section 2.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>For AASCD: Ohio provided evidence that they adequately monitors the administration AASCD to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools: <u>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration Manual</u> <u>Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual Accommodations Manual</u> (pp.11-24) <u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u> Monthly Newsletter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>K-8</u> <p>For OST: Ohio provided evidence to support that they adequately monitor the administration of its Science assessments (OST) to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools: <u>Test Coordinator’s Manual</u> <u>Directions for Administration Manual</u> <u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u> Monthly Newsletter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>K-8</u> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31) • Section 5.4, Test Security (pp. 39-41) • Section 5.5, Data Forensic Program (pp. 41-43) • Section 12.6.3, Test Scoring (pp. 11-114) • Please see the Alternate Index for the evidence for monitoring. 	<p>Evidence submitted meets critical 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 OHIO

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required.		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; • Detection of test irregularities; • Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>Ohio Revised Code</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3319.151</u> Assisting student in cheating on assessments • <u>3319.99</u> Penalty • <u>3319.321</u> Confidentiality <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301-13-05</u> Establishing security and security investigation provisions for assessments: • Annual training at district and school levels <u>3301-13-05</u> (J) <p><u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test Security Provisions page 76-80; • Guidelines and Procedures: Maintaining Test Security and Reporting Testing Incidents page 81-93 • Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities page 78 <p><u>Test Coordinator’s Manual</u> (pp. 9-11) <u>Directions for Administration Manual</u> (pp. 8-10)</p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 5.4, Test Security (pp. 39-41) ○ Section 5.5, Data Forensics Program (pp. 41-43) <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p>	<p>Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Directions for Administration and Test Coordinator’s Manual are dated for the Spring 2016 assessment administration. State communicated via email on 8/15/2016 that the 2014-15 documentation contained the same content.</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 OHIO

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"> ○ Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31) ○ Appendix C, <u>Test Administrator User Guide</u> (p. 50) <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 5.4, Test Security (p. 39) 	
Section 2.5 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p><u>Test Coordinator’s Manual</u> <u>Directions for Administration Manual</u></p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 4.1, Item Development Process (p. 18) ○ Section 5.4, Test Security (pp. 39-41) ○ Section 6.2, Reports Provided (p. 52) ○ Appendix C, <u>Test Administrator User Guide</u> (p. 50) <p>Ohio Revised Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3319.151</u> Assisting student in cheating on assessments • <u>3319.99</u> Penalty • <u>3319.321</u> Confidentiality <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301-13-05</u> Establishing security and security investigation provisions for assessments <p><u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test Security Provisions page 76-80 <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.4, Test Security (pp. 39-41) • Section 12.4, Quality Assurance in Data Preparation (pp. 104-105) • Appendix C, <u>Test Administrator User Guide</u> (p. 50) <p><u>Statewide Student Identifier System</u></p> <p><u>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration</u></p>	<p>OST Directions for Administration and Test Coordinator’s Manual are dated for the Spring 2016 assessment administration. State communicated via email on 8/15/2016 that the 2014-15 documentation contained the same content.</p> <p>State did not submit evidence of defined minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores, however reviewers found policy at http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/Report-Card-Resources/Gap-Closing-Measure/Understanding-AMOs.pdf.aspx</p> <p>Alternate assessments. Administration and Test Coordinator’s Manual are dated for the Spring 2016 assessment administration. State communicated via email on 8/15/2016 that the 2014-15 documentation contained the same content.</p> <p>No information about policies/procedures to protect the integrity of test materials during test development was provided.</p> <p>No information about procedures to protect PII/statistical disclosure limitation (e.g. defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores) was in the evidence cited. However reviewers found policy online at: http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/Report-Card-Resources/Gap-Closing-Measure/Understanding-AMOs.pdf.aspx</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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Manual (p. 14)</u></p> <p><u>Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual (pp. 5-6)</u></p> <p><u>AASCD Technical Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 4.3 Test Security (p. 9) <p>Ohio Revised Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3319.321</u> Confidentiality <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301-13-05</u> Establishing security and security investigation provisions for assessments <p><u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test Security Provisions page 76-80 <p><u>Statewide Student Identifier System</u></p>	
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the alternate assessments, provide relevant evidence of policies/procedures to protect test materials during test development. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <p>Ohio Revised Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301.079</u> Academic standards - model curriculum • <u>3301.0711</u>: Administration and grading of assessments • <u>3301.712(5)(a)</u>: College and work ready assessment system <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301-7-01</u>: Standards for the ethical use of tests • <u>3301-13-01</u>: Defining terms and establishing statewide assessments <p>Stakeholder Input: Ohio Academic Content Standards Revisions in Science; working group agenda</p> <p>Science Standards Review Process: Outlines steps in Phase I of the revisions process (2009-2010) and the role of stakeholders (p. 3)</p> <p><u>AASCD Technical Report</u></p> <p><u>English Language Arts Test Design Document</u></p> <p><u>Math Test Design Document</u></p> <p><u>Science Test Design Document</u></p>	<p>OST</p> <p>Reviewers were unable to find documentation of alignment studies demonstrating alignment between the grades 5 and 8 Science assessments and the Ohio Science content standards.</p> <p>Alternate Assessments</p> <p>Reviewers were unable to find documentation of alignment studies demonstrating alignment between the assessments and the Ohio extended content standards or the alternative academic achievement standards.</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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Ohio Revised Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301.0711 (C)(1)(a)(b) Administration and grading of assessments</u> <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301-13-01 (A)(2)(7) Defining terms and establishing statewide assessments</u> • <u>3301-13-03 Establishing provisions for the participation of students with disabilities in required assessments administered at the designated grades</u> • <u>3301-13-07 (C)(4) Establishing the provisions and decision procedures for the fairness sensitivity review committee</u> <p><u>AASCD Performance Level Descriptors</u></p>	
Section 3.1 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of alignment of grades 5 and 8 Science assessments to State content standards and academic achievement standards • Evidence of alignment of alternate assessments to extended content standards and alternate academic achievement 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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>NONE</p>	<p>OST</p> <p>No evidence provided in support of the critical element requirement to provide adequate validity evidence of cognitive processes either via student cognitive laboratory studies or through teacher-reported cognitive process studies.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>The State asserts that investigation of cognitive processes (e.g. conducting cognitive labs) is not appropriate or useful since they conducted a field test. However there are several examples of the utility of cognitive laboratory studies for this student population, including:</p> <p align="center"> http://www.cehd.umn.edu/nceo/OnlinePubs/Tech44/ http://sed.sagepub.com/content/47/2/108.short </p> <p>In addition, if the State thinks that teachers understand their students’ cognitive processes and are better able to articulate them as asserted in the submission, State should provide documentation of the analyses of this teacher-produced cognitive process review.</p>
<p>Section 3.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct and document adequate research on cognitive processes of assessed population for general science assessments. • Conduct and document adequate research on cognitive processes of assessed population for alternate assessments.. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1, Executive Summary (p. 1) • Section 1.3, Evidence of Internal Structure (pp. 5-8) • Section 1.4, Summary of Validity of Test Score Interpretations (p. 8) • Section 9.6, Reliability for Subscales on (pp. 77-78) • Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretation (pp. 79-80) • Section 10.4, Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 87-89) • Section 10.5, Subscale Intercorrelations (pp. 89-91) <p><u>Ohio Science Learning Standards</u> <u>Grade 5 Test Blueprint</u> <u>Grade 8 Test Blueprint</u> <u>Performance Level Descriptors-Grade 5 Science</u> <u>Performance Level Descriptors-Grade 8 Science</u> <u>Alternate assesments:</u> <u>English Language Arts Test Design</u> <u>Math Test Design</u> <u>Science Test Design</u></p> <p><u>AASCD Technical Report</u></p>	<p>OST Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments State asserts no subdomains on the assessments, but test blueprints identify multiple subdomains within each domain (ELA, Math, Science). The State did not provide any evidence exploring the structure and reportability of subscores.</p> <p>State’s notes supporting their evidence for this critical element discuss a set of principal components analyses supporting the unidimensionality of the assessments. However no detailed documentation of these analyses is provided, such as complete statistical output, and description of sample sizes (adjusted for assessment starting and ending points as discussed).</p>
<p>Section 3.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed for the alternate 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 OHIO

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">• Justification that the unidimensional model for each assessment is aligned to the State's academic content standards• More detailed documentation of dimensionality analyses		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.3, Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 5-8) • Section 7.2, Recommended Performance Standards (p. 56) • Section 8.4, Linking the OST to Other Scales for Performance Comparison (pp. 66-67) • Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80) <p>OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction, Paragraph 4, (pp. 3-4) • Benchmark Information (pp. 13-14) • Appendix F 	<p>OST</p> <p>The critical element asks for validity evidence based on relationship to “other variables.” State only provides relationships to other cognitive assessments.</p> <p>Also if students are taking the full set of general assessments, it should be possible to examine associations between scale scores across multiple assessments for this population as measures of convergent/divergent validity.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>The State notes that this student population cannot practicably be assessed by other “test instruments.” The critical element, however, asks for validity evidence based on relationship to “other variables.”</p> <p>Also if students are taking the full set of AASCD assessments, it should be possible to examine associations between scale scores across multiple assessments for this population as measures of convergent/divergent validity.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide validity evidence showing the predictive relationships between the general science assessments and other variables not limited to other cognitive assessments, e.g. student behavioral outcome measures, teacher evaluations of student ability, employment outcomes, etc. • Provide reports of convergent/divergent validity based on intercorrelations across the other general assessments (ELA, Math, Social Studies) • Provide validity evidence showing the predictive relationships between the alternate assessments and other variables not limited to other cognitive assessments, e.g. student behavioral outcome measures, teacher evaluations of student ability, employment outcomes, etc. • Provide reports of convergent/divergent validity based on intercorrelations across the 4 AASCD 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 OHIO

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 9.1, Estimating Reliability (p. 68) • Section 9.2 , Internal Consistency (p. 68) • Section 9.3, Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 68-71) • Section 9.4, Student Classification Consistency (pp. 72-76) • Section 9.5, Reliability of Subgroups in the Population (p. 77) • Section 9.6, Reliability for Subscales (pp. 77-78) <p>OST Annual Technical Report, Attached</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 9.3, Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 68-71) • Section 9.5, Reliability of Subgroups in the Population (p. 77) <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 9.4, Student Classification Consistency (pp. 72-76) <p><u>AASCD Technical Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.2 Test Reliability (p. 35) <p><u>AASCD Technical Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.2.2 Conditional Standard Errors of Measurement (pp. 37-42) • 10.2.1 Marginal Reliability and Marginal Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 35-37) 	<p>OST Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments Submitted evidence demonstrates sufficient support of critical 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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<u>AASCD Technical Report:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.3 Classification Accuracy (pp. 42-43) 	
Section 4.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in Chapter 2, Section 2 Background of Ohio Statewide Assessments (p. 9) • Section 4.1, Item Development Process (pp. 18-20) • Section 4.2, Item Review (pp. 20-22) • Section 4.3, Field Testing (pp. 22-23) • Section 5.1, Eligibility (p. 30) • Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31) • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39) • Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-82) • Appendix C, <u>Test Administrator User Guide</u> (p. 50) <p>• <u>3301-13-07 (C)(4)</u>: Establishes the provisions and decision procedures for the fairness sensitivity review committee</p> <p><u>ORC 3301.079 (I)(2)(a)</u>: Establishes guidelines for the review of standards to ensure appropriateness.</p> <p><u>Science Standards Review Committee</u></p> <p><u>Science Standards Review Committee Member Rubrics</u></p> <p><u>AASCD Technical Report:</u></p>	<p>OST</p> <p>Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>The technical report identifies several areas where items appear to exhibit C DIF at high rates (e.g. White/Hispanic ELA OGT). According to the report, these items were all retained for operational assessment after content review. No evidence of process/procedures (e.g. item modification, second round of fairness review, adjudication) for this second round of review is provided.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

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"> • 2. Test Development (pp. 2-6) • 3. Item Development (pp. 6-9) • 10.4 Differential Item Functioning Summary (p. 43-45) 	
Section 4.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u>X</u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of procedures followed to ensure fairness for items exhibiting C DIF on the alternate assessments. 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 9.3, Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 68-71) • Summary statistics (p. A-1) <p><u>AASCD Technical Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 10.2.2 Conditional Standard Errors of measurement (pp. 37-42) • Appendix B: Scale Score Distributions (p. 64) 	<p>OST</p> <p>Evidence submitted supports the critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments.</p> <p>Evidence submitted supports the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><u>X</u> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4, Subsection 4.1.1, Machine-Scored constructed-Response Item Development Tools (p. 19) • Section 6.3, Interpretation of Scores (p. 52-54) • Section 7 Performance Standards (pp. 55-61) • Section 8.1, Item Response Theory Procedures (pp. 62-64) • Section 8.2, OST Reporting Scale (Scale Scores) (pp. 64-65) • Section 9.6, Reliability for Subscales (pp. 77-78) • Section 10.5, Subscale Intercorrelations (pp. 89-91) • Section 11.1, Machine Scoring (p. 93) • Section 11.2, Hand-Scoring (pp. 93-97) • Section 12.3, Quality Assurance in Document Processing (pp. 103-104) • Section 12.4, Quality Assurance in Data Preparation (pp. 104-105) in Chapter 12 • Section 12.6, Quality Assurance in Scoring and Reporting (pp. 105-116) <p><u>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration Manual</u></p> <p><u>AASCD Training PowerPoint</u></p> <p><u>AASCD Technical Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 7.2.2.1 IRT Model (p. 21) 	<p>OST Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments Administration and Test Coordinator’s Manual are dated for the Spring 2016 assessment administration. State communicated via email on 8/15/2016 that the 2014-15 documentation contained the same content.</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 OHIO

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"> • Section 7.2.2.2 Item Parameter Estimation (p. 22) • Section 7.2.2.3 IRT Calibration (p. 22) 	
Section 4.4 Summary Statement		
__X_ No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>OST Not Applicable AASCD NOT APPLICABLE—only one operational form per administration</p>	<p>OST OST Annual Technical Report (p. 61) states only one operational form per grade per year. Also 2014-15 was first operational year of OST.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>NOT APPLICABLE—only one operational form per administration</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4.1, Item Development Process (pp. 18-20) • Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31) • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39) • Section 8.2, OST Reporting Scale/Scale Score (pp. 64-65) • Section 11 Constructed-Response Scoring (pp. 93-97) <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 8.3, Equating Paper and Online Test Scores (pp. 65-66) 	<p>OST</p> <p>Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments NOT APPLICABLE—only one operational version of the test.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>Evidence to support that Ohio has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments) is presented in:</p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report, Attached</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4.1, Item Development Process (pp. 18-20) • Section 4.3, Field Testing (pp. 22-23) • Section 8.1, Item Response Theory Procedures (pp. 62-64) • Section 12.2, Quality Assurance in Test Production(pp. 100-103) 	<p>OST</p> <p>Technical analyses appear sufficient and of adequate periodicity. However, no evidence provided in support of requirement for a system of maintaining and improving the quality of the assessment system (e.g. schedule of Technical Advisory Committee meetings, minutes from such meetings, schedule of assessment maintenance activities, plan for ongoing validity studies, etc.).</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>Same observation as for general science tests above.</p>
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of system of maintaining and improving the quality of the assessment system 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with 	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.1, Eligibility (p. 30) • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39) • Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80) • Appendix C, <u>Test Administrator User Guide</u> (p. 50) <p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (pp. 37-40)</p> <p><u>Ohio’s Accessibility Manual</u></p> <p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (p. 46)</p> <p><u>Operating Standards and Guidance</u></p> <p><u>Ohio Operating Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities</u></p> <p><u>Summary of Changes to the Ohio Operating Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities</u></p> <p><u>Parent’s Guide</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (p. 41) <u>Accommodations Manual</u> (pp. 3-9) Ohio Administrative Code: <u>3301-13-03</u> <u>3301-13-09</u> <u>Participation Guidelines for Ohio’s Alternate Assessment</u> • <u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (p. 38) 	<p>OST Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines flowchart was very clear and helpful.</p> <p>No evidence that the AASCD Family FAQ is offered in languages other than English to ensure parents are sufficiently informed in accordance with the critical element requirements.</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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>disabilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA; • Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); • The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 	<p><u>Accommodations Manual</u> (pp. 6-7, 13-18)</p> <p><u>Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines – used by an IEP team</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (p. 37) <u>Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines – used by an IEP team</u> • <u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (pp. 37, 41) <u>Accommodations Manual</u> (pp. 11-23) • <u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> page 46 <u>Accommodations Manual</u> (pp. 11-23) • <u>Operating Standards and Guidance Ohio Operating Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities Summary of Changes to the Ohio Operating Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities</u> • <u>AASCD Family FAQ Parent’s Guide</u> • <u>English Language Arts – Ohio Academic Content Standards –Extended Mathematics – Ohio Academic Content Standards – Extended</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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<u>Science – Ohio Academic Content Standards – Extended</u> <u>Social Studies - Ohio Academic Content Standards – Extended</u>	
Section 5.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that the AASCD Family FAQ is available in languages other than English 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p><u>Guidelines for the Identification and Assessment of Limited English Proficient Students</u></p> <p><u>OELPA Accessibility Manual</u></p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39) • Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations, (pp. 79-80) <p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines for Identifying, Assessing, Serving and Reporting English Language Learner (ELL) (pp. 27-34) • Decision Flow Chart for Selecting Additional ELL Accommodations (p. 35) <p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (pp. 28-35)</u></p> <p><u>OELPA Accessibility Manual (p.1)</u></p> <p><u>OELPA Trainings and Resources</u></p> <p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodations (pp.28-33) • Guidelines for Identifying, Assessing, Serving and Reporting English Language Learner (ELL) (pp. 32-34) • Decision Flow Chart for Selecting Additional ELL Accommodations (p. 35) <p><u>OELPA Accessibility Manual (pp. 7-8, Pages 15-17)</u></p> <p><u>Ohio's Accessibility Manual with Appendices (pp. 7-8, Pages 15-17)</u></p>	<p>OST</p> <p>Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>State did not provide evidence that all procedures for including EL students are available for all stakeholders in clear and understandable language (including a language other than English) as required in the critical 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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.2 Summary Statement		
<p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that procedures for including EL students (including those students requiring accommodations) are provided to all stakeholders in clear and understandable language (including languages other than English). 		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (pp. 29-41) <u>Ohio’s Accessibility Manual</u> Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>3301-13-03</u> Establishing provisions for the participation of students with disabilities in required assessments administered at the designated grades <u>3301-13-09</u> Provisions for an excuse from taking any assessment required for graduation of for an adult with disabilities, or for providing accommodations on any assessment required for graduation for an adult <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39) Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80) Appendix C, <u>Test Administrator User Guide</u> (p. 50) <p><u>OELPA Accessibility Manual</u></p> <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>3301-13-11</u> Establishing provisions for the exemption of first year limited English proficient students and for the allowance of accommodations for limited English proficient students <p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (pp. 38-40) <u>Ohio’s Accessibility Manual</u> Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>3301-13-03</u> <u>3301-13-09</u> <p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (pp.28-33) <u>Ohio’s Accessibility Manual with Appendices</u></p>	<p>OST</p> <p>Recommend that, as evidence of having “a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed,” the State should cite “The Accommodations Manual – Selection, Use and Evaluation of Accommodations that Support Instruction and Assessment of Children with Disabilities,” dated February 2011 (accessed from: http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Testing/Special-Testing-Accommodations/Accommodations-on-State-Assessments/Accommodations-Manual-February-2011.pdf.aspx)</p> <p>Alternate assessments Administration and Test Coordinator’s Manual are dated for the Spring 2016 assessment administration. State communicated via email on 8/15/2016 that the 2014-15 documentation contained the same content.</p> <p>The Spring 2016 AASCD Directions for Assessment Manual explicitly discusses the provision of accommodations for students with disabilities to make the AASCD assessments accessible. However, there is no documentation of analogous policies and procedures for EL students requiring alternative assessment. There is some discussion of this issue in the Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual (p.8) but it is difficult to determine from the evidence</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>(pp. 7-8, Pages 15-17)</p> <p><u>Ohio's State Tests Rules Book</u> (p. 38)</p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39). • Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80) • Appendix C, Test Administrator User Guide <p><u>Ohio's State Tests Rules Book</u> page 41</p> <p><u>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions for Administration Manual</u> (pp. 3, 44-49)</p> <p><u>Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator's Manual</u> (p. 8, Appendix C)</p>	<p>presented if the state is ensuring appropriate accommodations for EL students as per the critical element.</p>
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of policies and procedures ensuring appropriate accommodations for EL students requiring alternative 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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>Evidence to support that Ohio monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners:</p> <p>General Science Assessments: <u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision Flow chart for Selecting Additional ELL Accommodations (p. 35) <u>Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines – used by an IEP team</u> <p>Ohio English Language Proficiency Assessment (OELPA): <u>OELPA Test Coordinator’s Manual</u> <u>OELPA Test Administration Manual for Online Testers</u> <u>OELPA Accessibility Manual</u> <u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u> (pp.27-36) Monthly Newsletter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>K-8</u> • <u>9-12</u> <p>Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD): <u>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration Manual</u> <u>Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual</u></p>	<p>OST</p> <p>The State’s submission notes state: “Monitoring is conducted by districts with support through materials and guidance provided by the state and regional centers.” However, the critical element requires that the State “monitors test administration in its districts and schools” to ensure that special populations students “are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations.” However, no evidence was provided of State monitoring of district activity in this area (such state-level report aggregating LEA monitoring, evidence that the state is reviewing LEA monitoring activities and recommending corrective action, etc.).</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>The State’s submission notes state: “Monitoring is conducted by districts with support through materials and guidance provided by the state and regional centers.” However, the critical element requires that the State “monitors test administration in its districts and schools” to ensure that special populations students “are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations.” However, no evidence was provided of State monitoring of district activity in this area (such state-level report aggregating LEA monitoring, evidence that the state is reviewing LEA monitoring activities and recommending corrective action, etc.).</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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p><u>Ohio’s Accessibility Manual</u> <u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u> Monthly Newsletter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>K-8</u> • <u>9-12</u> <p>OST Annual Technical Report, Attached</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39) • Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80) • Appendix C, <u>Test Administrator User Guide</u> (p. 50) <p><u>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration Manual</u> <u>Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual</u> <u>Accommodations Manual</u> (pp. 25-26) <u>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</u> Monthly Newsletter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>K-8</u> • <u>9-12</u> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 5 Section 5.3 Accommodations on Page 31 through Page 39, • Chapter 10 Section 10.1 Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations on Page 79 through 80 and • Appendix C Test Administrator User Guide • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39). • Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80) • Appendix C, Test Administrator User 	

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p style="text-align: center;">Guide</p> <p><u>Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines – used by an IEP team</u></p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report, Attached</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39). • Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80) • Appendix C, Test Administrator User Guide <p>English Learners:</p> <p><u>OELPA Test Coordinator’s Manual</u></p> <p><u>OELPA Test Administration Manual for Online Testers</u></p> <p><u>OELPA Accessibility Manual</u></p> <p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book</u></p> <p>Monthly Newsletter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>K-8</u> • <u>9-12</u> <p><u>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book:</u></p> <p>Decision Flow chart for Selecting Additional ELL Accommodations (p. 35)</p>	
Section 5.4 Summary Statement		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of State monitoring test administration of the science assessments for special populations in districts and schools. • Provide evidence of State monitoring test administration of the alternate assessments for special populations in districts and 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.1, Eligibility (p. 30) • Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39) • Section 7, Subsection 7.1.1, Performance Level Descriptors (p. 56) • Section 7.2, Recommended Performance Standards (pp. 56-58) <p>OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact Data (pp. 14-15) <p>OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015, Performance Level Descriptors, Appendix D.</p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 8.2, OST Reporting Scale/Scale Scores (pp. 64-65) <p><u>AASCD Technical Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.1 Overview (pp. 12-13) • Section 6.2 Performance Standards (pp. 13-14) • 9.3 Percent of Students at Each Performance Level (pp. 32-34) <p>Ohio Revised Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301.079</u> Academic Standards-model curriculum <p>State Board of Education June 2010 Minutes (pp. 4-8).</p>	<p>OST Evidence submitted supports the critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments Evidence submitted supports the critical 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 OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<u>Ohio State Tests Rules Book</u> (pp. 37, 99) AASCD Standard Setting Report	
Section 6.1 Summary Statement		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of Standard Setting Approach (pp. 5-8) • Evaluation of the Standard Setting Workshop (p. 17) • Appendix H <p>OH AASCD standard setting report: <u>AASCD Performance Standards Matching the Judgmental Task with Standard Setting Panelist Expertise: the Item Descriptor Matching Method</u></p>	<p>OST</p> <p>Evidence submitted supports the critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>Evidence submitted supports the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 6.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction (p. 1) • Overview of Standard Setting Approach (pp. 5-8) • Standard Setting Materials and Procedures, Appendices D, F, G • In Evaluation of the Standard Setting Workshop (pp. 21-22), • Appendix H. <p><u>English Language Arts Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended</u></p> <p><u>Mathematics Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended</u></p> <p><u>Science Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended</u></p> <p><u>Social Studies Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended</u></p> <p><u>OH AASCD Performance Level Descriptors</u></p> <p><u>AASCD Technical Report (pp. 33-34)</u></p>	<p>OST Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p> <p>Alternate assessments Evidence submitted supports critical element.</p>
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<p><u>Ohio School Report Card Data</u></p> <p>OST Annual Technical Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.1, Appropriate Uses for Scores and Reports (p. 44-45) • Section 6.2, Reports Provided (pp. 45-52) • Section 6.3, Interpretation of Scores (pp. 52-54) <p><u>Ohio School Report Card Data</u></p> <p><u>Online Reporting System User Guide</u></p> <p><u>Spring 2016 Family Reports Interpretive Guide</u></p> <p><u>AASCD FAQs</u></p>	<p>OST</p> <p>State does not provide evidence individual student interpretative, descriptive, and diagnostic reports are provided in alternative formats and in a language that parents can understand.</p> <p>Alternate assessments</p> <p>State does not provide evidence of itemized score analyses to help stakeholders interpret results.</p> <p>State does not provide evidence that individual student interpretative, descriptive, and diagnostic reports are provided in alternative formats and in a language that parents can understand.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p> <p><u> X </u> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that individual student interpretative, descriptive, and diagnostic reports for the general science tests are provided in alternative formats and in a language that parents can understand. • Provide evidence of itemized score analyses in reporting to stakeholders for the alternate assessments. • Provide evidence that individual student interpretative, descriptive, and diagnostic reports for the alternate assessments are provided in alternative formats and in a language that parents can understand. 		

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