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

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.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Additional Evidence Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 – Test Design and Development | For the Ohio Science Tests (OST), ODE must provide:  
  - See request for evidence of alignment in element 3.1 below. |
| 2.2 – Item Development | For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
  - Evidence of test item development processes, specifically:
    - 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 | For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
  - Evidence of procedures to secure and protect test materials during the test development process. |
| 3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content | For the OST tests, ODE must provide:  
  - 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.  
  - Evidence of alignment, such as:  
    - 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:
      - 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 | For the OST and the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
  - Evidence that the assessments are eliciting the intended cognitive processes as listed in the State standards. |
| 3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure | For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
  - 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 | For OST tests, ODE must provide:  
  - 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... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Additional Evidence Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility | For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
• Evidence of procedures followed when differential item functioning analysis (DIF) identify items with large potential bias. |
| 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum | For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
• 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. |
| 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance | For the OST general science tests and the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
• 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. |
| 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities | For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
• Evidence that information regarding the test is available in parents in languages other than English. |
| 5.2 – Procedures for including ELs | For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
• See evidence requested in element 5.1 above. |
| 5.3 – Accommodations | For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:  
• Evidence of procedures that describe appropriate accommodations for EL students participating in the test. |
| 5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations | For the OST and Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, Ohio must provide:  
• 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 | For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA and mathematics, ODE must provide:  
• Evidence that State’s alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade level academic content standards, such as:  
  o A description of the process used to develop the alternate academic achievement standards that shows:  
    ▪ The State’s grade-level academic content standards or grade-level
### Critical Element | Additional Evidence Needed
---|---
extended academic content standards were used as a main reference in writing performance level descriptors for the alternate academic achievement standards; OR
- 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
  o A description of steps taken to vertically articulate the alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores and performance level descriptors) across each grade.

#### 6.4 – Reporting
For the OST science tests and Ohio AASCD tests in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:
- 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.
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.
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Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
### SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</td>
<td>Ohio Revised Code 3301.079(A)(1): Requires State Board of Education to adopt academic content standards. State Board of Education June 2010 Minutes (pp. 4-8)</td>
<td>OST Evidence supports critical element. 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 extended standards in support of AASCD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1.1 Summary Statement**

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

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

### Critical Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</td>
<td><strong>Ohio Science Learning Standards</strong>&lt;br&gt;Stakeholder Input: Ohio Academic Content Standards Revisions in Science; working group agenda&lt;br&gt;Science Standards Review Process: Outlines steps in Phase I of the revisions process (2009-2010) and the role of stakeholders (p. 3)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong>&lt;br&gt;Evidence supports critical element.&lt;br&gt;Alternate assessments&lt;br&gt;Content standards documents demonstrate sufficient support of critical element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1.2 Summary Statement**

_ X _ No additional evidence is required
## Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

### 1.3 – Required Assessments

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:

- 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).

Ohio provided the following evidence to support their annual alternate assessments (AASCD) and Annual Science Assessments:

**AASCD:**
- Accommodations Manual, (p. 8-9)
- Ohio’s Alternative Assessments Fact Sheet
- Ohio’s State Test Rules Book (p. 37, 99)

**Annual Science Assessments:**
- Grade 5
- Grade 8
- Physical Science (High School)

Ohio also submitted evidence for their statewide annual Science Tests (OST; grades 5, 8 and the Physical Science assessment for High School).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Alternate Assessments (AASCD) are administered as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ELA - grade clusters 3-5, 6-8, and High School (OGT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Math - grade clusters 3-5, 6-8 and High School (OGT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Science - 5, 8 and OGT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.
### Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments | Ohio provided evidence that the AASCD (their statewide assessment for students with disabilities) includes all elementary and secondary students.  
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. |
| 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.  
- 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):  
  - 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 |  
Ohio provided evidence that students with disabilities and English Learners (EL) must be included in their assessment system:  
**Students with disabilities:**  
Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (pp. 37, 99)  
Accommodations Manual (pp. 4-9)  
Participation Guidelines for Ohio’s Alternate Assessment  
AASCD Technical Report:  
- 1.2 Alternate Assessment Eligibility (pp. 1-2).  
**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) (*):  
Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book: (pp. 28, 99).  
OELPA’s Accessibility Manual (p. 1).  
(* Ohio Administrative Code: 3301-13-11 establishes provisions for the exemption of first year EL and for the allowance of accommodations. |
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
<th>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY**

X  No additional evidence is required.
## Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

### 1.5 – Participation Data

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.

### Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

**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.

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:

- AASCD Technical Report:
  - 4.3 Student Participation in spring 2015 (pp. 10-12).

**Guidance on Student Participation in State Tests**

**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.

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:

- Science and Social Studies Tests Participation 2015
- Ohio School & District Test Results: Disaggregated test results by student group.

**Guidance on Student Participation in State Tests**

### Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

Ohio provided evidence that AASCD assessment data is disaggregated by grade level and by student group.

Ohio provided evidence that OST (5th grade, 8th grade) assessment data is disaggregated by grade level and by student group.

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.

### Section 1.5 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

X No additional evidence is required
## SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 – Test Design and Development</td>
<td><strong>General assessments in science:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ohio Revised Code:&lt;br&gt;• 3301.0712 College and Work Ready Assessment System&lt;br&gt;Ohio Administrative Code:&lt;br&gt;• 3301-13-01 Defining Terms and Establishing Statewide Assessments&lt;br&gt;• 3301-13-02 Administering Required State Assessments at the Designated Grades&lt;br&gt;Ohio’s State Test Rules Book (pp. 94)&lt;br&gt;Science Standards&lt;br&gt;OST Annual Technical Report&lt;br&gt;• Section 1, Executive Summary (pp. 1)&lt;br&gt;• Section 1.1, Evidence Based on Test Content (pp. 1-3)&lt;br&gt;• Section 1.4, Summary of Validity of Test Score Interpretations (p. 8)&lt;br&gt;• Section 2, Background of Ohio Statewide Assessments (p. 9)&lt;br&gt;OST Annual Technical Report&lt;br&gt;• Section 1.1, Evidence Based on Test Content, (pp. 1-3)&lt;br&gt;• Section 4, Item Development and Test Construction (pp. 18-20)&lt;br&gt;• Section 4.6, Test Construction (pp. 23-29)&lt;br&gt;Grade 5 Test Blueprint&lt;br&gt;Grade 8 Test Blueprint&lt;br&gt;OST Annual Technical Report, <strong>Attached</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Section 1.1, Evidence Based On Test</td>
<td>OST&lt;br&gt;No evidence submitted of alignment of grades 5 and 8 Science assessment blueprints to State content standards.&lt;br&gt;Alternate assessments&lt;br&gt;Evidence submitted demonstrates sufficient support of critical element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Section 4, Item Development and Test Construction (pp. 18-20)  
- Section 4.6, Test Construction (pp. 23-29)  
Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (p. 41)  
AASCD Technical Report:  
  - 2. Test Development (pp. 2-6)  
  - 3. Item Development (pp. 6-9)  
English Language Arts Test Design  
Math Test Design  
Science Test Design | |

### Section 2.1 Summary Statement

__X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- 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.
## Critical Element

2.2 – Item Development

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 Test Blueprint</td>
<td>OST Evidence submitted supports critical element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 Test Blueprint</td>
<td>Alternate assessments Technical manual section on item development (pp. 6-9) does not include sufficient description of item development process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 1, Executive Summary (p.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 1.1 Evidence Based on Test Content on Pages 1 through 3,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 4.1, Item Development Process and Test Construction, (pp. 18-29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 10, Table 10.1.1, Universal Tools and Designated Supports,(pp. 80-82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appendix D Ohio’s Accessibility Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Alternative Assessments Fact Sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 1, Executive Summary (pp.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 1.1 Evidence Based on Test Content on Pages 1 through 3,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 4.1, Item Development Process and Test Construction, (pp. 18-29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 10, Table 10.1.1, Universal Tools and Designated Supports,(pp. 80-82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appendix D Ohio’s Accessibility Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Alternative Assessments Fact Sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCD Technical Report:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2. Test Development (pp. 2-6).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3. Item Development (pp. 6-9).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Alternate Assessment Task Development Flow Chart.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2.2 Summary Statement

X__ The following additional evidence is needed for the alternate assessments:

- 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.
### Critical Element: Test Administration

The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically:

- 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.

#### Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)

- **Science Grades 5 and 8:**
  - Test Coordinator’s Manual
  - Directions for Administration Manual 2015-2016 Testing Times
  - Guidance for Marking Scorable Documents
  - TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators
  - Special Testing Scenarios Guidance
  - Ohio Pre-ID File Layout for Ohio’s State Tests, the Alternate Assessment and the OELPA Guidance Document for 2015-16 Ohio Pre-ID Files
  - TIDE User Guide
  - TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators
  - Online User Management Guidance Document
  - TIDE Ohio’s State Test Rules Book
  - Monthly Newsletter
    - K-8
  - ODE Webcasts and Presentations on State Tests: Information from ODE for administrators, teachers, students and families on state testing.
  - OST Annual Technical Report
    - 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)

#### Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

- **OST**
  - Evidence submitted supports critical element.
  - 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.

- **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 version was substantively the same.

- The AASCD Training PowerPoint applies to the 2016 assessment administration. State communicated via email on 8/15/2016 that the 2014-15 documentation contained the same content.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Science Grades 5 and 8:**  
Test Coordinator’s Manual  
Test Administration Certification Course  
Test Administrator Certification Companion  
Directions for Administration Manual  
Spring 2016 District Test Coordinator Checklist  
Fall 2015 District Test Coordinator Checklist  
Spring 2016 Test Administrator Checklist  
Fall 2015 Test Administrator Checklist  
2015-2016 Testing Times  
Guidance for Marking Scorable Documents  
Discrepancy Resolution Guidance  
Rescores and Verifications  
TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators  
Special Testing Scenarios Guidance  
Spring 2016 Sample Demographic Pages  
Ohio Pre-ID File Layout for Ohio’s State Tests, the Alternate Assessment and the OELPA Guidance Document for 2015-16 Ohio Pre-ID Files  
TIDE User Guide  
TIDE Administrator User Guide  
TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators  
TIDE Tutorial: An Overview  
TIDE Tutorial: Uploading Pre-ID Files  
TIDE Tutorial: Uploading Student Setting Files  
TIDE Tutorial: Adding and Editing Student Records  
Online User Management Guidance Document  
TIDE  
Online Reporting System (ORS) User Guide |
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORS Tutorial: An Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS Tutorial: Downloading Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS Tutorial: Score Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORS Tutorial: Test Participation Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Newsletter</td>
<td>• K-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td>• Section 5.1, Eligibility (p. 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix C, Test Administrator User Guide (p. 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance for State Infrastructure Trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online System Requirements</td>
<td>• Supporting Operating Systems for Student Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported Web Browsers for Online Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Requirements for Peripheral Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Specifications Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Browser Installation Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Support Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac OS X 10.11 Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td>• Section 5.1, Eligibility (p. 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix C, Test Administrator User Guide (p. 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 10.1, Table 10.1.1, Universal Tools and Designated Supports (pp. 80-82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodations Manual (pp.11-24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AASCD Special Testing Scenarios Guidance Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AASCD Additional Order and Pre-ID Windows Guidance Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Pre-ID File Layout for Ohio’s State Tests, the Alternate Assessment and the OELPA Guidance Document for 2015-16 Ohio Pre-ID Files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AASCD Training PowerPoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIDE User Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

### Section 2.3 Summary Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIDE Tasks for Test Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online User Management Guidance Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online System Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting Operating Systems for Student Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported Web Browsers for Online Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Requirements for Peripheral Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online User Role Matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Entry Interface FAQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date Entry Interface user Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIDE FAQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monthly Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• K-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2.3 Summary Statement**

_X_ No additional evidence is required
### STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
<th>Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</td>
<td>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: Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration Manual Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual Accommodations Manual (pp.11-24) Ohio’s State Test Rules Book Monthly Newsletter • K-8</td>
<td>Evidence submitted meets critical element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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: Test Coordinator’s Manual Directions for Administration Manual Ohio’s State Test Rules Book Monthly Newsletter • K-8 OST Annual Technical Report • 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
### Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
### Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
(Record document and page # for future reference)

### Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY

#### Section 2.4 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.
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5 – Test Security</td>
<td>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:</td>
<td>Evidence submitted supports critical element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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;</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Detection of test irregularities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Revised Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3319.151 Assisting student in cheating on assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3319.99 Penalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3319.321 Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Administrative Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3301-13-05 Establishing security and security investigation provisions for assessments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual training at district and school levels 3301-13-05 (J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Test Security Provisions page 76-80;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guidelines and Procedures: Maintaining Test Security and Reporting Testing Incidents page 81-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities page 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Coordinator’s Manual (pp. 9-11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directions for Administration Manual (pp. 8-10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Section 5.4, Test Security (pp. 39-41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Section 5.5, Data Forensics Program (pp. 41-43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Section 5.2, Administration Procedures (pp. 30-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Appendix C, Test Administrator User Guide (p. 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Section 5.4, Test Security (p. 39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2.5 Summary Statement**

_X_ No additional evidence is required
### Critical Element
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy

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:

- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Coordinator’s Manual Directions for Administration Manual</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td>State did not submit evidence of defined minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores, however reviewers found policy at <a href="http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/Report-Card-Resources/Gap-Closing-Measure/Understanding-AMOs.pdf.aspx">http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/Report-Card-Resources/Gap-Closing-Measure/Understanding-AMOs.pdf.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Section 4.1, Item Development Process (p. 18)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Section 5.4, Test Security (pp. 39-41)</td>
<td>No information about policies/procedures to protect the integrity of test materials during test development was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Section 6.2, Reports Provided (p. 52)</td>
<td>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: <a href="http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/Report-Card-Resources/Gap-Closing-Measure/Understanding-AMOs.pdf.aspx">http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Data/Report-Card-Resources/Gap-Closing-Measure/Understanding-AMOs.pdf.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appendix C, Test Administrator User Guide (p. 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Revised Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3319.151 Assisting student in cheating on assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3319.99 Penalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3319.321 Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Administrative Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3301-13-05 Establishing security and security investigation provisions for assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Test Security Provisions page 76-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Section 5.4, Test Security (pp. 39-41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Section 12.4, Quality Assurance in Data Preparation (pp. 104-105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appendix C, Test Administrator User Guide (p. 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Student Identifier System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manual (p. 14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual (pp. 5-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AASCD Technical Report:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Section 4.3 Test Security (p. 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Revised Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 3319.321 Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Administrative Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 3301-13-05 Establishing security and security investigation provisions for assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Test Security Provisions page 76-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide Student Identifier System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2.6 Summary Statement**

_X__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</td>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td>OST 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Revised Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3301.079 Academic standards - model curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3301.0711: Administration and grading of assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3301.712(5)(a): College and work ready assessment system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Administrative Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3301-7-01: Standards for the ethical use of tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3301-13-01: Defining terms and establishing statewide assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder Input: Ohio Academic Content Standards Revisions in Science; working group agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science Standards Review Process: Outlines steps in Phase I of the revisions process (2009-2010) and the role of stakeholders (p. 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AASCD Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Language Arts Test Design Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math Test Design Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science Test Design Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Revised Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3301.0711 (C)(1)(a)(b) Administration and grading of assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Administrative Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3301-13-01 (A)(2)(7) Defining terms and establishing statewide assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3301-13-03 Establishing provisions for the participation of students with disabilities in required assessments administered at the designated grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3301-13-07 (C)(4) Establishing the provisions and decision procedures for the fairness sensitivity review committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCD Performance Level Descriptors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 3.1 Summary Statement

_\_X\_ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:

- 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.
### Critical Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NONE                                                      | OST

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.

Alternate assessments
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:

- [http://www.cehd.umn.edu/nceo/OnlinePubs/Tech44/](http://www.cehd.umn.edu/nceo/OnlinePubs/Tech44/)
- [http://sed.sagepub.com/content/47/2/108.short](http://sed.sagepub.com/content/47/2/108.short)

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.

### Section 3.2 Summary Statement

- X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - 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.
### Critical Element

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</td>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report&lt;br&gt;• Section 1, Executive Summary (p. 1)&lt;br&gt;• Section 1.3, Evidence of Internal Structure (pp. 5-8)&lt;br&gt;• Section 1.4, Summary of Validity of Test Score Interpretations (p. 8)&lt;br&gt;• Section 9.6, Reliability for Subscales on (pp. 77-78)&lt;br&gt;• Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretation (pp. 79-80)&lt;br&gt;• Section 10.4, Evidence Based on Internal Structure (pp. 87-89)&lt;br&gt;• Section 10.5, Subscale Intercorrelations (pp. 89-91)&lt;br&gt;Ohio Science Learning Standards&lt;br&gt;Grade 5 Test Blueprint&lt;br&gt;Grade 8 Test Blueprint&lt;br&gt;Performance Level Descriptors-Grade 5 Science&lt;br&gt;Performance Level Descriptors-Grade 8 Science&lt;br&gt;Alternate assessments:&lt;br&gt;English Language Arts Test Design&lt;br&gt;Math Test Design&lt;br&gt;Science Test Design&lt;br&gt;AASCD Technical Report</td>
<td>OST Evidence submitted supports critical element.&lt;br&gt;Alternate assessments&lt;br&gt;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.&lt;br&gt;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).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3.3 Summary Statement**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Justification that the unidimensional model for each assessment is aligned to the State’s academic content standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More detailed documentation of dimensionality analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Element</td>
<td>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</td>
<td>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables | OST Annual Technical Report  
- 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)  
OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015  
- Introduction, Paragraph 4, (pp. 3-4)  
- Benchmark Information (pp. 13-14)  
- Appendix F | OST  
The critical element asks for validity evidence based on relationship to “other variables.” State only provides relationships to other cognitive assessments.  
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.  
Alternate assessments  
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.”  
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. |

**Section 3.4 Summary Statement**

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

- 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.
## SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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:
- 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.

OST Annual Technical Report
- 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)

OST Annual Technical Report, Attached
- Section 9.3, Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 68-71)
- Section 9.5, Reliability of Subgroups in the Population (p. 77)

AASCD Technical Report:
- 10.2 Test Reliability (p. 35)

AASCD Technical Report:
- 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)

Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.
## Critical Element | Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference) | Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
--- | --- | ---
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility | OST Annual Technical Report  
- 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, Test Administrator User Guide (p. 50)  
- 3301-13-07 (C)(4): Establishes the provisions and decision procedures for the fairness sensitivity review committee  
- ORC 3301.079 (I)(2)(a): Establishes guidelines for the review of standards to ensure appropriateness.  
- Science Standards Review Committee  
- Science Standards Review Committee Member Rubrics  
- AASCD Technical Report: | OST  
Evidence submitted supports critical element.  
Alternate assessments  
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. |
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.3 – Full Performance Continuum | OST Annual Technical Report  
- Section 9.3, Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 68-71)  
- Summary statistics (p. A-1)  
AASCD Technical Report:  
- Section 10.2.2 Conditional Standard Errors of measurement (pp. 37-42)  
- Appendix B: Scale Score Distributions (p. 64) | OST  
Evidence submitted supports the critical element.  
Alternate assessments.  
Evidence submitted supports the critical element. |

### Section 4.3 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 4, Subsection 4.1.1, Machine-Scored constructed-Response Item Development Tools (p. 19)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 6.3, Interpretation of Scores (p. 52-54)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 7 Performance Standards (pp. 55-61)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 8.1, Item Response Theory Procedures (pp. 62-64)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 8.2, OST Reporting Scale (Scale Scores) (pp. 64-65)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 9.6, Reliability for Subscales (pp. 77-78)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 10.5, Subscale Intercorrelations (pp. 89-91)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 11.1, Machine Scoring (p. 93)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 11.2, Hand-Scoring (pp. 93-97)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 12.3, Quality Assurance in Document Processing (pp. 103-104)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 12.4, Quality Assurance in Data Preparation (pp. 104-105) in Chapter 12</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 12.6, Quality Assurance in Scoring and Reporting (pp. 105-116)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration Manual</strong></td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AASCD Training PowerPoint</strong></td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AASCD Technical Report:</strong></td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 7.2.2.1 IRT Model (p. 21)</td>
<td><strong>OST</strong> Evidence submitted supports critical element. <strong>Alternate assessments</strong> 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 7.2.2.2 Item Parameter Estimation (p. 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 7.2.2.3 IRT Calibration (p. 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4.4 Summary Statement**

* _X_ No additional evidence is required
## State Assessment Peer Review Notes for Ohio

### Critical Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</td>
<td>OST&lt;br&gt;Not Applicable&lt;br&gt;AASCD&lt;br&gt;NOT APPLICABLE—only one operational form per administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>OST&lt;br&gt;OST Annual Technical Report (p. 61) states only one operational form per grade per year. Also 2014-15 was first operational year of OST. Alternate assessments&lt;br&gt;NOT APPLICABLE—only one operational form per administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 4.5 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment | **OST Annual Technical Report**  
- 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)  
**OST Annual Technical Report**  
- Section 8.3, Equating Paper and Online Test Scores (pp. 65-66) | **OST**  
Evidence submitted supports critical element.  
Alternate assessments  
NOT APPLICABLE—only one operational version of the test. |

**Section 4.6 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.
## 4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance

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).

### Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)

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:

**OST Annual Technical Report, Attached**
- 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)

### Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

OST
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.).

Alternate assessments
Same observation as for general science tests above.

### Section 4.7 Summary Statement

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - 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.
### SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities | OST Annual Technical Report  
• 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. Test Administrator User Guide (p. 50)  
Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (pp. 37-40)  
Ohio’s Accessibility Manual  
Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (p. 46)  
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  
Parent’s Guide  
• Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (p. 41)  
Accommodations Manual (pp. 3-9)  
Ohio Administrative Code:  
3301-13-03  
3301-13-09  
Participation Guidelines for Ohio’s Alternate Assessment  
• Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (p. 38) | OST  
Evidence submitted supports critical element.  
Alternate assessments  
Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment  
Participation Guidelines flowchart was very clear and helpful.  
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. |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disabilities;</td>
<td>Accommodations Manual, (pp. 6-7, 13-18) Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines – used by an IEP team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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);</td>
<td>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (p. 37) Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines – used by an IEP team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (pp. 37, 41) Accommodations Manual, (pp. 11-23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book page 46 Accommodations Manual, (pp. 11-23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AASCD Family FAQ Parent’s Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Language Arts – Ohio Academic Content Standards – Extended Mathematics – Ohio Academic Content Standards – Extended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science – Ohio Academic Content Standards – Extended Social Studies - Ohio Academic Content Standards – Extended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 5.1 Summary Statement**

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

- Provide evidence that the AASCD Family FAQ is available in languages other than English
### Critical Element

5.2 – Procedures for including ELs

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:

- 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.

#### Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)

- Guidelines for the Identification and Assessment of Limited English Proficient Students
  - OELPA Accessibility Manual
  - OST Annual Technical Report
    - Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39)
    - Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations, (pp. 79-80)
  - Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book
    - Guidelines for Identifying, Assessing, Serving and Reporting English Language Learner (ELL) (pp. 27-34)
    - Decision Flow Chart for Selecting Additional ELL Accommodations (p. 35)
  - OELPA Trainings and Resources
    - Guidelines for Identifying, Assessing, Serving and Reporting English Language Learner (ELL) (pp. 32-34)
    - Decision Flow Chart for Selecting Additional ELL Accommodations (p. 35)
  - OELPA Accessibility Manual (pp. 7-8, Pages 15-17)
  - Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (pp. 28-35)
    - 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)
  - OELPA Accessibility Manual (pp. 7-8, Pages 15-17)

#### Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

OST

Evidence submitted supports critical element.

Alternate assessments

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.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>X</em> The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Critical Element

### 5.3 – Accommodations

The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:

- 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.

### Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)

- **Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book** (pp. 29-41)
- **Ohio’s Accessibility Manual**
- **Ohio Administrative Code**:
  - 3301-13-03 Establishing provisions for the participation of students with disabilities in required assessments administered at the designated grades
  - 3301-13-09 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

### Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

OST Annual Technical Report
- 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. 50)

OELPA Accessibility Manual

Ohio Administrative Code:
- 3301-13-11 Establishing provisions for the exemption of first year limited English proficient students and for the allowance of accommodations for limited English proficient students

Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (pp. 38-40)

Ohio’s Accessibility Manual

Ohio Administrative Code:
- 3301-13-03
- 3301-13-09

Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (pp. 28-33)

Ohio’s Accessibility Manual with Appendices

OST


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.

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.
### Section 5.3 Summary Statement

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

- 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.
## Critical Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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**: | OST
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.). |

### General Science Assessments:
Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book:
- Decision Flow chart for Selecting Additional ELL Accommodations (p. 35)
- Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines – used by an IEP team

### Ohio English Language Proficiency Assessment (OELPA):
**OELPA Test Coordinator’s Manual**
**OELPA Test Administration Manual for Online Testers**
**OELPA Accessibility Manual**
Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book (pp.27-36)
Monthly Newsletter
- K-8
- 9-12

### Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD):
**Spring 2016 AASCD Directions**
**Administration Manual**
**Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio’s Accessibility Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• K-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report, <strong>Attached</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix C, Test Administrator User Guide (p. 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2016 AASCD Directions Administration Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2016 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodations Manual, (pp. 25-26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio’s State Test Rules Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• K-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OST Annual Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chapter 5 Section 5.3 Accommodations on Page 31 through Page 39,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chapter 10 Section 10.1 Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations on Page 79 through 80 and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix C Test Administrator User Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix C, Test Administrator User</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Critical Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guide&lt;br&gt;Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines – used by an IEP team&lt;br&gt;OST Annual Technical Report, Attached&lt;br&gt;• Section 5.3, Accommodations (pp. 31-39).&lt;br&gt;• Section 10.1, Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 79-80)&lt;br&gt;• Appendix C, Test Administrator User Guide&lt;br&gt;<strong>English Learners:</strong>&lt;br&gt;OELPA Test Coordinator’s Manual&lt;br&gt;OELPA Test Administration Manual for Online Testers&lt;br&gt;OELPA Accessibility Manual&lt;br&gt;Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book&lt;br&gt;Monthly Newsletter&lt;br&gt;• K-8&lt;br&gt;• 9-12&lt;br&gt;Ohio’s State Tests Rules Book:&lt;br&gt;Decision Flow chart for Selecting Additional ELL Accommodations (p. 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 5.4 Summary Statement

_\text{X}__ The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:<br>- Provide evidence of State monitoring test administration of the science assessments for special populations in districts and schools.<br>- Provide evidence of State monitoring test administration of the alternate assessments for special populations in districts and schools.
### STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students | OST Annual Technical Report  
- 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)  
OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015  
- Impact Data (pp. 14-15)  
OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015, Performance Level Descriptors, Appendix D.  
OST Annual Technical Report  
- Section 8.2, OST Reporting Scale/Scale Scores (pp. 64-65)  
AASCD Technical Report:  
- 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)  
Ohio Revised Code:  
- 3301.079 Academic Standards-model curriculum  
State Board of Education June 2010 Minutes (pp. 4-8). | OST  
Evidence submitted supports the critical element.  
Alternate assessments  
Evidence submitted supports the critical element. |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting | OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015  
- Overview of Standard Setting Approach (pp. 5-8)  
- Evaluation of the Standard Setting Workshop (p. 17)  
- Appendix H  
OH AASCD standard setting report:  
AASCD Performance Standards  
Matching the Judgmental Task with Standard Setting Panelist Expertise: the Item Descriptor Matching Method | OST  
Evidence submitted supports the critical element.  
Alternate assessments  
Evidence submitted supports the critical element. |

**Section 6.2 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.
## Critical Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OST Standard Setting Report Spring 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduction (p. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overview of Standard Setting Approach (pp. 5-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standard Setting Materials and Procedures, Appendices D, F, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In Evaluation of the Standard Setting Workshop (pp. 21-22),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appendix H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Language Arts Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Studies Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OH AASCD Performance Level Descriptors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AASCD Technical Report (pp. 33-34)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted supports critical element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence submitted supports critical element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>X</em> No additional evidence is required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.4 – Reporting</strong>&lt;br&gt;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:&lt;br&gt;• 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;&lt;br&gt;• 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;&lt;br&gt;• The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that:&lt;br&gt;  o Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement;&lt;br&gt;  o Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors);&lt;br&gt;  o Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students;&lt;br&gt;  o Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to Ohio School Report Card Data&lt;br&gt;OST Annual Technical Report&lt;br&gt;  • Section 6.1, Appropriate Uses for Scores and Reports (p. 44-45)&lt;br&gt;  • Section 6.2, Reports Provided (pp. 45-52)&lt;br&gt;  • Section 6.3, Interpretation of Scores (pp. 52-54)&lt;br&gt;Ohio School Report Card Data&lt;br&gt;Online Reporting System User Guide&lt;br&gt;Spring 2016 Family Reports Interpretive Guide&lt;br&gt;AASCD FAQs</td>
<td>OST&lt;brState does not provide evidence individual student interpretative, descriptive, and diagnostic reports are provided in alternative formats and in a language that parents can understand.&lt;brAlternate assessments&lt;brState does not provide evidence of itemized score analyses to help stakeholders interpret results.&lt;brState 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Element</th>
<th>Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)</th>
<th>Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 6.4 Summary Statement**

- The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:
  - 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.