



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

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

January 29, 2019

Dear Superintendent DeMaria:

Thank you for your participation in the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) assessment peer review process under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which governed State assessments through the 2016-2017 school year. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which governs State assessments beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, maintains the essential requirements from NCLB that each State annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards with a few additional requirements. I appreciate the efforts of the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) to prepare for the peer review, which occurred in March 2018.

State assessment systems provide essential information that States, districts, principals and teachers can use to identify the academic needs of students, target resources and supports toward students who need them most, evaluate school and program effectiveness and close achievement gaps among students. A high-quality assessment system also provides useful information to parents about their children's advancement against and achievement of grade-level standards. The Department's peer review of State assessment systems is designed to provide feedback to States to support the development and administration of high-quality assessments.

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

- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts for grades 3-8 (Ohio's State Tests (OST)). **Substantially meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- General assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts for high school (OST ELA I & II, OST Integrated Math I & II; OST Algebra, OST Geometry). **Substantially meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- General assessments in science for grades 5 and 8 (OST Science 5/8). **Substantially meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

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

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

- General assessments in science for high school (OST Biology). **Substantially meet the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**
- Alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) for grades 3-8 and high school in mathematics and reading/language arts; and grades 5, 8 and high school in science (Ohio Alternate Assessment for Students with Cognitive Disabilities (Ohio AASCD)). **Partially meets the requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the NCLB and ESSA.**

The components that **substantially meet requirements** meet 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 Department acknowledges that the Ohio AASCD mathematics and R/LA assessments are under significant redevelopment at this time, and will be submitted for a complete peer review in 2020.

Please note that the assessment requirements for ESEA, as amended by the NCLB, were in effect through the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The ODE peer review was conducted under the requirements of this statute. Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the assessment requirements of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, will apply to State assessments. Given that this review began under the requirements of the ESEA as amended by the NCLB, it is important to indicate that, while several of the State's assessments meet some of the peer review guidance criteria under the NCLB, the State is still responsible to ensure that these assessments also comply with the requirements of the ESSA. Department staff carefully reviewed ODE evidence and peer review recommendations in light of the updated requirements for State assessments under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result of this additional review, I have determined that the ODE assessments need to meet one additional requirement related to alternate academic achievement standards. This requirement is listed under critical element 6.3, along with the other evidence needed from the March 2018 peer review.

The specific list of items required for ODE to submit is enclosed with this letter. Because ODE has not met the all of the requirements for the condition on ODE's Title I, Part A fiscal year 2018 grant award regarding assessment peer review, the condition will remain in place until all of the evidence requested in this letter has been resubmitted and peer reviewed. If the outcome of the re-review by peers indicates full approval, then the condition should be removed. If adequate progress is not made, the Department may take additional action. ODE must submit a plan and timeline within 30 days outlining when it will submit all required additional documentation for peer review. 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.

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/

Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education

Enclosures

cc: Lisa Chandler, Assessment Director; Center for Performance and Impact

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

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
2.1 – Test Design and Development	<p>For the Ohio’s State Tests (OST) reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in grades 3-8 and high school and the OST grades 5/8 science and high school biology assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the test design and test development process aligns the assessments to the depth and breadth of the State’s academic content standards, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Processes to ensure that each assessment reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (e.g., that the cognitive demand specified in the test blueprints align with the cognitive demand found in the content standards).
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy	<p>For the Ohio Alternate Assessment for Students with Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD) in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of policies and procedures to protect the integrity and confidentiality of test materials, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results.
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content	<p>For the OST reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in grades 3-8 and high school and the OST grades 5/8 science and high school biology assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, specifically documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of cognitive complexity (evidence requested in critical element 2.1 may be used to support this critical element as well). <p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the assessments show adequate alignment to the State’s academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the internal structure for each assessment is aligned to the test specifications for the assessment (e.g., a dimensionality analysis which supports the sub-domains of the test and the underlying construct).
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	<p>For the OST reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in grades 3-8 and high school and the OST grades 5/8 science and high school Biology assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the tests are related as expected with other variables (e.g., evidence of relationships among test scores across OST subject areas). <p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts, mathematics and science</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the tests are related as expected with other variables. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence showing predictive relationships between the tests and other variables not limited to cognitive assessments (e.g., student behavioral outcome measures, teacher evaluations of student ability, etc.); OR ○ Evidence of validity based on relationships among test scores across subject areas within the Ohio alternate assessments.
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State monitors, maintains, and improves the quality of the assessments (e.g., documentation of regular internal and external technical review of components of the State’s assessment system, such as State Board of Education minutes, minutes from technical advisory committee (TAC) meetings, and documentation of roles and responsibilities of TAC members).
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that information regarding these assessments is available to parents in languages other than English. • Evidence that all parents are advised of the possible consequences of participation in the Ohio AASCD.
5.2 – Procedures for Including ELs	<p>For the entire Ohio assessment system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to parents in accessible formats (for parents whose language is not English), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s). ○ Selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners.

Critical Element	Additional Evidence Needed
5.3 - Accommodations	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that accommodations are available for English learners with significant cognitive disabilities.
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	<p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the alternate academic achievement standards ensure that a student who meets these standards is on track to pursue post-secondary education or employment. <p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts and mathematics, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State’s alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade level academic content standards, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A description of the process used to develop the alternate academic achievement standards that shows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The State’s grade-level academic content standards or grade-level 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 ▪ 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	<p>For the OST reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in grades 3-8 and high school and the OST grades 5/8 science and high school Biology assessments and the Ohio AASCD assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the reports were available evidence that individual student reports are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to the extent practicable, provided in an accessible format in a language that parents can understand. <p>For the Ohio AASCD in reading/language arts, mathematics and science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of itemized score analyses (e.g., educator reports, interpretative guides) in reporting to stakeholders.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Peer Review of State Assessment Systems

March 2018 State Assessment Peer Review Notes (with 2016 Resubmission)



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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Contents

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS.....	3
1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students	3
1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards	4
1.3 – Required Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)	5
1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments (reviewed by Department staff only)	6
1.5 – Participation Data (reviewed by Department staff only)	7
SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS.....	7
2.1 – Test Design and Development.....	8
2.2 – Item Development.....	10
2.3 – Test Administration	12
2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration (reviewed by Department staff only)	14
2.5 – Test Security.....	15
2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy.....	17
SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY	18
3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content.....	19
3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes.....	22
3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure.....	24
3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables	26
SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER.....	28
4.1 – Reliability.....	28
4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility.....	29
4.3 – Full Performance Continuum	31
4.4 – Scoring.....	32
4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms.....	33
4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment	34
4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance.....	35
SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS.....	36
5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities	37
5.2 – Procedures for including ELs	39
5.3 – Accommodations.....	41
5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations	43
SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING	44
6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards.....	45
6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting	46
6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards	47
6.4 – Reporting.....	49

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

SECTION 1: STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">1.1 – State Adoption of Academic Content Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic content standards for all students in reading/language arts, mathematics and science and applies its academic content standards to all public elementary and secondary schools and students in the State.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p><u>Ohio Revised Code 3301.079(A)(1):</u></p> <p>Overview of Standards Revision</p> <p>Feb-2017-MEETING-Minutes-Final.pdf.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 37-40 <p>ELA-Learning-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference for all students (p. 5) <p>MATH-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p. 3 <p>ScienceStandards.pdf.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to science standards (p. 3) • Biology (pp. 288-296) 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio Revised Code requires State Board of Education to adopt academic content standards.</p> <p>The evidence provided by Ohio is the February 2017 Ohio State Board’s adoption of the content standards.</p>
<p>Section 1.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">1.2 – Coherent and Rigorous Academic Content Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and science specify what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school to succeed in college and the workforce; contain content that is coherent (e.g., within and across grades) and rigorous; encourage the teaching of advanced skills; and were developed with broad stakeholder involvement.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Overview of Standards Revision and State Board Adoption</p> <p>Feb-2017-MEETING-Minutes-Final.pdf.pdf</p> <p>ELA-Learning-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>MATH-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>ScienceStandards.pdf.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology (pp. 288-296) 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>For ELA and math, Ohio provided evidence of stakeholder involvement of the college and career ready standards. Started with public review in 2016, the Ohio State Board of Education approved improvements to these standards in February 2017 following a year-long review process.</p> <p>Ohio teachers helped make the intent of specific standards more clear. At times, teachers recommended changing the grade level when students will learn certain skills or information.</p> <p>Ohio provided evidence that Biology standards were adopted June 2011 and are in process of revision during 2017 school year. Current standards are linked to course syllabus.</p> <p>The peer reviewers determined that Ohio provided sufficient evidence to address this Critical Element.</p>
<p>Section 1.2 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.3 – Required Assessments</p> <p>The State’s assessment system includes annual general and alternate assessments (based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate academic achievement standards-AAAS) in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3-8 and at least once in high school (grades 10-12); • Science at least once in each of three grade spans (3-5, 6-9 and 10-12). 	<p>Reviewed by ED Staff (2016)</p>	<p>Reviewed by ED Staff (2016)</p>
<p>Section 1.3 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.4 – Policies for Including All Students in Assessments</p> <p>The State requires the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students in its assessment system and clearly and consistently communicates this requirement to districts and schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For students with disabilities(SWD), policies state that all students with disabilities in the State, including students with disabilities publicly placed in private schools as a means of providing special education and related services, must be included in the assessment system; • For English learners (EL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies state that all English learners must be included in the assessment system, unless the State exempts a student who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months from one administration of its reading/ language arts assessment; ○ If the State administers native language assessments, the State requires English learners to be assessed in reading/language arts in English if they have been enrolled in U.S. schools for three or more consecutive years, except if a district determines, on a case-by-case basis, that native language assessments would yield more accurate and reliable information, the district may assess a student with native language assessments for a period not to exceed two additional consecutive years. 	<p>Reviewed by ED Staff (2016)</p>	<p>Reviewed by ED Staff (2016)</p>
<p>Section 1.4 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">1.5 – Participation Data</p> <p>The State’s participation data show that all students, disaggregated by student group and assessment type, are included in the State’s assessment system. In addition, if the State administers end-of-course assessments for high school students, the State has procedures in place for ensuring that each student is tested and counted in the calculation of participation rates on each required assessment and provides the corresponding data.</p>	<p>Reviewed by ED Staff (2016)</p>	<p>Reviewed by ED Staff (2016)</p>
<p>Section 1.5 Summary Statement-REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.1 – Test Design and Development</p> <p>The State’s test design and test development process is well-suited for the content, is technically sound, aligns the assessments to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement(s) of the purposes of the assessments and the intended interpretations and uses of results; • Test blueprints that describe the structure of each assessment in sufficient detail to support the development of assessments that are technically sound, measure the full range of the State’s grade-level academic content standards, and support the intended interpretations and uses of the results; • Processes to ensure that each assessment is tailored to the knowledge and skills included in the State’s academic content standards, reflects appropriate inclusion of challenging content, and requires complex demonstrations or applications of knowledge and skills (i.e., higher-order thinking skills); • If the State administers computer-adaptive assessments, the item pool and item selection procedures adequately support the test design. 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio Revised Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3301.0712 College and Work Ready Assessment System <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3301-13-01 Defining Terms and Establishing Statewide Assessments • 3301-13-02 Administering Required State Assessments at the Designated Grades • 3301-12-02 Achievement test aligned to standards <p>FINAL 9-29-17 Rules Book Ohio.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposes of test use (pp. 27 and 32) <p>English language arts, mathematics, biology Test Blueprints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Resources <p>Overview of Standards Revision and State Board Adoption</p> <p>Alignment_Study_Report_withAppendicies.pdf</p> <p>ELA-Learning-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>MATH-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>OST grade 5 & 8 Science</p> <p>ScienceStandards.pdf.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology (pp. 288-296) <p>Assessment Committees Ohio Department of Education.mht</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Purposes for test use are stated.</p> <p>Demographic make-up of review panel members of study commissioned by Ohio could have been more detailed to verify inclusion of content experts for SWD and EL.</p> <p>Ohio provided evidence that only partially meets this element because the findings of the alignment study needs to be addressed; particularly the inclusion in the test blueprints of the depth of knowledge (DoK) ranges.</p> <p>OST grades 5 & 8 Science</p> <p>Alignment study commissioned by Ohio used reviewers to validate intent of item writers regarding content and complexity (DoK). Committee appeared to be representative.</p> <p>Validity Evidence 6 (p. 20) reports some point overages in Grade 5 and Biology. Although this may not be considered a major issue, users have the right to expect tests to be built within blueprint specifications.</p> <p>Ohio has guidelines for cognitive complexity (CD) (p. 22, p. 71) for form development, but not specified in test blueprints. (This is cited in the report as a weakness in content validity.) Lack of specificity impacts test construction and composition.</p> <p>Peer reviewers did not see documentation of steps to address any of the weaknesses identified in the</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		alignment study commissioned by Ohio.
<p>From 2016 Ohio Science Tests For the OST tests, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of adequate alignment between the State’s science grades 5-8 assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content and cognitive complexity. 		
<p>Section 2.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For OST grades 5 & 8 Science (2018), provide evidence of steps to address weaknesses related to content validity as cited in the provided alignment study. For OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS), provide a plan for including DOK in blueprint. 		
Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.2 – Item Development</p> <p>The State uses reasonable and technically sound procedures to develop and select items to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards in terms of content and cognitive process, including higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Item-Development-Sequence.pdf.pdf</p> <p>Assessment Committees Ohio Department of Education.mht</p> <p>English language arts, mathematics, biology Test Blueprints</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item Development Process and Test Construction, (pp. 91-96) <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of test specifications (p. 3) • Item development and review (pp. 6-9) • Descriptions of procedures used to author test items (pp. 8-9). 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio provided evidence that the item development process is reasonable. Items are developed to assess student achievement based on the State’s academic content standards. There are many review steps in place during item/task development.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>In 2013, Ohio transitioned from portfolio to an assessment aligned to the Ohio Learning Standards Extended (OLS-E). Page 3 provides a link to the OLS-E for a detailed description. Peer reviewers did not find copy of blueprints in materials submitted for review.</p> <p>The Technical Report provided describes training and review process for item development. The document references special education and content experts involved in the process, but evidence of the actual training was not provided. Examples of evidence of training item would be to include a slide deck of the training, a training agenda or materials related to the learning characteristics of examinees, or the process to be used for development of content-based items to accommodate learner characteristics.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the peer reviewers opined that Ohio provided sufficient evidence to address this Critical Element.</p>
<p>From 2016 Ohio AASCD</p> <p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA, mathematics, and science, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of test item development processes, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ test item specifications; ○ descriptions of procedures used to author test items; and 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		○ documentation on how test item writers and reviewers are trained.
Section 2.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.3 – Test Administration</p> <p>The State implements policies and procedures for standardized test administration, specifically the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has established and communicates to educators clear, thorough and consistent standardized procedures for the administration of its assessments, including administration with accommodations; • Has established procedures to ensure that all individuals responsible for administering the State’s general and alternate assessments receive training on the State’s established procedures for the administration of its assessments; • If the State administers technology-based assessments, the State has defined technology and other related requirements, included technology-based test administration in its standardized procedures for test administration, and established contingency plans to address possible technology challenges during test administration. 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Directions for Administration Manual Ohio_TA_Certification_Companion_2015-2016.pdf Spr16_OH_DTC_Checklist.pdf Spring 2017 Test Administrator Checklist</p> <p>FINAL 9-29-17 Rules Book Ohio.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (pp. 17-40) <p>K-8 District Test Coordinator Bulletin Ohio Department of Education.mht</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-8 • 9-12 <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <p>OH_State_Test_Times.pdf Ohio_Special_Testing_Cases_Guidance.pdf 2016-17_Ohio_Online_Pre-ID_Layout-Posted.pdf OH_TIDE_UserGuide.pdf Ohio TIDE Tasks Summary for Test Coordinators.pdf Online_TIDE_User_Management_Guidance.pdf OH_TIDE_UserGuide.pdf 2016_TIDE_Tutorial_Part1.htm TIDE Tutorial: An Overview TIDE Tutorial: Uploading Pre-ID Files TIDE Tutorial: Uploading Student Setting Files TIDE Tutorial: Adding and Editing Student Records</p> <p>Online Reporting System (ORS) User Guide ORS Tutorial: An Overview ORS Tutorial: Downloading Data</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided by Ohio in the form of administration manuals, checklists, bulletins, user guides, etc., provide sufficient support for the critical element.</p> <p>Test administration and coordination manuals provided as evidence by Ohio outline consistent standardized procedures for the administration of assessments, including administration with accommodations.</p> <p>The peer reviewers determined that Ohio provided sufficient evidence to address this Critical Element.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	ORS Tutorial: Score Reports ORS Tutorial: Test Participation Reports Online System Requirements	
Section 2.3 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY	Evidence —REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY(Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence — REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY
<p align="center">2.4 – Monitoring Test Administration</p> <p>The State adequately monitors the administration of its State assessments to ensure that standardized test administration procedures are implemented with fidelity across districts and schools.</p>	<p>Reviewed by ED Staff (2016)</p>	<p>Reviewed by ED Staff (2016)</p>
<p>Section 2.4 Summary Statement—REVIEWED BY DEPARTMENT STAFF ONLY</p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Peer Review Notes from 2016 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">2.5 – Test Security</p> <p>The State has implemented and documented an appropriate set of policies and procedures to prevent test irregularities and ensure the integrity of test results through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention of any assessment irregularities, including maintaining the security of test materials, proper test preparation guidelines and administration procedures, incident-reporting procedures, consequences for confirmed violations of test security, and requirements for annual training at the district and school levels for all individuals involved in test administration; Detection of test irregularities; Remediation following any test security incidents involving any of the State’s assessments; Investigation of alleged or factual test irregularities. 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio Revised Code</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3319.151 Assisting student in cheating on assessments 3319.99 Penalty 3319.321 Confidentiality <p>Ohio Administrative Code</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3301-13-05 Establishing security and security investigation provisions for assessments (F) Annual training at district and school levels 3301-13-05 (J) <p>FINAL 9-29-17 Rules Book Ohio.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (pp. 71-87) <p>OST_Spring2017_Test_Administration_Manual.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (pp. 9-13) <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (pp. 114-116) 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio Revised Codes, Ohio Administrative Code, Rules Book, Administration Manual, and Technical Report provide sufficient support for the critical element.</p> <p>For example, Ohio has addressed the most important test security issues in Ohio state law, ED policy in their administration and coordination manuals. Ohio provided evidence regarding test security provisions, maintaining test security, reporting incidents, investigation, and penalties.</p> <p>The peer reviewers determined that Ohio provided sufficient evidence to address this Critical Element.</p>
<p>Section 2.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>2.6 – Systems for Protecting Data Integrity and Privacy</p> <p>The State has policies and procedures in place to protect the integrity and confidentiality of its test materials, test-related data, and personally identifiable information, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To protect the integrity of its test materials and related data in test development, administration, and storage and use of results; • To secure student-level assessment data and protect student privacy and confidentiality, including guidelines for districts and schools; • To protect personally identifiable information about any individual student in reporting, including defining the minimum number of students necessary to allow reporting of scores for all students and student groups. 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Spring2017_Test_Administration_Manual.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 9-13 <p>OhioStateTests_Spring16_DFAM.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 8-13 <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 18, 114-116 <p>Data_Priv_Rpt.pdf.asp</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum number of students is 10. <p>OH_TA_User_Guide_2015-2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 42-47 <p>Ohio Revised Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3319.151 Assisting student in cheating on assessments • 3319.99 Penalty • 3319.321 Confidentiality <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3301-13-05 Establishing security and security investigation provisions for assessments <p>FINAL 9-29-17 Rules Book Ohio.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test Security Provisions (pp. 71-87) <p>SSID-User-Manual.pdf.pdf</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>Evidence to support that Ohio implemented security and protection of test materials protocols during development was limited.</p> <p>The type of evidence Ohio could have provided would have been documentation of contractor’s secure system for handling test materials (typically specified in the contract) and evidence of secure mailing and/or receipt of secure online access to materials by contractor and ODE staff. Also, Ohio could have provided documentation such as signed assurances of review committee members stating that they would not disclose information (e.g., Content and Fairness Committee).</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	Report Card Resources Ohio Department of Education.mht AASCD (3-8, HS) AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 6-9 	
From 2016 Ohio AASCD For the Ohio AASCD, ODE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of procedures to secure and protect test materials during the test development process. 		
Section 2.6 Summary Statement		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For AASCD (3-8, HS), provide evidence to support security and protection of test materials during item development. 		

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL QUALITY – VALIDITY

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.1 – Overall Validity, including Validity Based on Content</p> <p>The State has documented adequate overall validity evidence for its assessments, and the State’s validity evidence includes evidence that the State’s assessments measure the knowledge and skills specified in the State’s academic content standards, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of adequate alignment between the State’s assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity; • If the State administers alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, the assessments show adequate linkage to the State’s academic content standards in terms of content match (i.e., no unrelated content) and the breadth of content and cognitive complexity determined in test design to be appropriate for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test development process, standard setting, structural soundness (pp. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9-10) • Test Integrity Forensics (pp. 18-21) <p>Alignment_Study_Report_withAppendicies.pdf</p> <p>Overview of Standards Revision and State Board Adoption</p> <p>ELA-Learning-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>MATH-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>ScienceStandards.pdf.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology pp. 288-296 <p>Ohio Revised Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3301.079 Academic standards - model curriculum • 3301.0711: Administration and grading of assessments • 3301.712: College and work ready assessment system <p>OST_Standard_Setting_Technical_Report_ELA_Math (002).pdf</p> <p>OST grade 5 & 8 Science</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>For OST assessments, the Ohio external alignment study notes those the test items that do not meet the blueprint ranges. Ohio’s response to the findings should include corrective actions, but peer reviewers did not find appropriate evidence regarding corrective actions.</p> <p>Each test item on the OST test forms is classified by the test development process for cognitive complexity. However, the OST test blueprints do not have any rules or ranges for levels of cognitive complexity on the test forms. The process for test form development does however have general guidelines for DOK composition in mathematics and CD in science. Generally, those guidelines are for 20% DOK 1, 60% DOK 2, and 20% DOK 3 and 4 for ELA and mathematics. For science, the guidelines are 30-40% for CD 1, 50-60% for CD 2, and 10-20% for CD 3 and 4. If DOK/CD is important to test construction and test composition it should be specified in the test blueprints. This omission is a weakness in the content validity of these tests.</p> <p>OST grade 5 & 8 Science</p> <p>The technical report stated concern that guidance was provided on cognitive complexity, but since it was part of the blueprint, it was difficult to meet ranges in test forms. The Report (Alignment_Study_Report_withAppendicies.pdf) indicates that this was a weakness in the content validity of these tests.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<p>Spring-2015-OCBA-Standard-Setting_09022015_combined.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ohio’s Learning Standards and Extensions (pp. 2-3) • Review of alignment of items (pp. 7-8) 	<p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>Ohio did not submit evidence that there was a plan that followed through with corrective action the recommendations of the alignment study, or plans to commission a new study.</p>
<p>From 2016: For the OST tests, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of adequate alignment between the State’s science (grades 5-8) assessments and the academic content standards the assessments are designed to measure in terms of content (i.e., knowledge and process), the full range of the State’s academic content standards, balance of content, and cognitive complexity. <p>For the Ohio AASCD, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of alignment, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Report of results of an independent alignment study that is technically sound (i.e., method and process, appropriate units of analysis, clear criteria) and documents adequate alignment, specifically that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each assessment is aligned to its test blueprint, and each blueprint is aligned to the full range of State’s academic content standards; or ▪ Each assessment is aligned to the full range of the State’s academic content standards, and the procedures the State follows to ensure such alignment during test development. <p>Evidence that the State addressed any gaps or weaknesses identified in the alignment studies submitted.</p>		
<p>Section 3.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS), provide a plan to address content validity (cognitive complexity) in blueprints and the test development process. • For the Ohio AASCD (3-8, HS), provide an alignment study that is technically sound (i.e., method and process, appropriate units of analysis, clear criteria) and documents adequate alignment. • For the Ohio AASCD (3-8, HS), provide a plan and timeline for aligning AASCD to Ohio’s Learning Standards-Extended.
Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.2 – Validity Based on Cognitive Processes</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that its assessments tap the intended cognitive processes appropriate for each grade level as represented in the State’s academic content standards.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <p>OST_Standard_Setting_Technical_Report_ELA_Math (002).pdf</p> <p>OST Science grades 3 and 5</p> <p>Spring-2015-OCBA-Standard-Setting_09022015_combined.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio provided projected performance data, but not actual data, as evidence of appropriate cognitive processes for each of the tested grade levels.</p> <p>OST Science grades 3 and 5</p> <p>Ohio provided projected performance data, but not actual data, as evidence of appropriate cognitive processes for each of the tested grade levels.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>Ohio did not provide evidence to document findings of Content and Fairness Review Committee relative to a cognitive process review.</p> <p>Peer reviewers recommend that since the Ohio revised extended standards are currently out for review, it will be important to build a cognitive process analysis into any future planned alignment study, once the extended standards are approved and aligned to the current assessment and to new items under development.</p>
<p>From 2016 review:</p> <p>For the OST and the Ohio AASCD (all subjects), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the assessments are eliciting the intended cognitive processes as listed in the State standards. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 3.2 Summary Statement		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS), provide actual student performance data for evidence of appropriate cognitive processes for each of the tested grade levels. • For OST Science grades 3 and 5, provide actual student performance data for evidence of appropriate cognitive processes for each of the tested grade levels. • For AASCD (3-8, HS), provide evidence that the assessments are eliciting the intended cognitive processes as listed in the State standards. 		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>3.3 – Validity Based on Internal Structure</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the scoring and reporting structures of its assessments are consistent with the sub-domain structures of the State’s academic content standards on which the intended interpretations and uses of results are based.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>ELA-Learning-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>MATH-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>Item-Development-Sequence.pdf.pdf</p> <p>English language arts, mathematics, biology Test Blueprints</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of Internal Structure (pp. 11-16) • Summary of Validity of Test Score Interpretations (pp. 21-22) • Reliability for Subscales (pp. 44-45) • Validity of OST Test Score Interpretation (pp. 1-2) • Subscale Inter-correlations (pp. 46-49) <p>OST_Standard_Setting_Technical_Report_ELA_Math (002).pdf</p> <p>Spring-2015-OCBA-Standard-Setting_09022015_combined.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio provided evidence for internal structure that includes second-order Structural model for OST assessments and subscale inter-correlations.</p> <p>The K-12 grade-specific standards define end-of-year expectations and a cumulative progression designed to enable students to meet college and career readiness expectations no later than the end of high school. The CCR and the high school (grades 9-12) standards work in tandem to define the college and career readiness line -- the former providing broad standards, the latter providing additional specificity.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>According to the evidence provided, students are not required to take every task in the assessment and can start the test at the point that is most appropriate for the student. The task at which the student exits the assessment is not predetermined.</p> <p>For the AASCD, ODE must provide more details about the internal structure of the assessment.</p>
<p>From 2016 review: For the Ohio AASCD (all subjects), ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the internal structure for each assessment is aligned to the test specifications for the assessment (e.g., a dimensionality analysis which supports the sub-domains of the test and the underlying construct). 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 3.3 Summary Statement		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the AASCD (3-8, HS), provide more details about the internal structure of the assessment (an analysis that supports the sub-domains of the test and the underlying construct). 		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">3.4 – Validity Based on Relationships with Other Variables</p> <p>The State has documented adequate validity evidence that the State’s assessment scores are related as expected with other variables.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of Internal Structure (pp. 11-16) Subscale Intercorrelations (pp. 46-49) <p>OST_Standard_Setting_Technical_Report_ELA_Math (002).pdf</p> <p>Spring-2015-OCBA-Standard-Setting_09022015_combined.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biology <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio provided evidence for the assessments’ internal structures that include second-order Structural model for OST assessments and subscale inter-correlations. However, the subscale inter-correlations were not calculated across the available content areas. For example, ELA, math, science, and social studies could have been put into the same correlation matrix for several grades (grades 5 and 8).</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>The AASCD Technical Report provided by Ohio does not specifically address validity based on relationships among test scores across subject areas.</p> <p>As per evidence submitted by Ohio, and even though students can take different sets of items, the tests are calibrated so each student gets a scale score for each content area. Additional validity evidence documentation supporting how AASCD are related to other variables was needed. For example, correlation coefficients could be obtained between ELA, math, science, and social studies. Typically, ELA correlates higher with social studies than math. Also, math tends to correlate higher with science than with ELA.</p>
<p>From 2016 review: For OST tests, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence showing predictive relationships between the tests and other variables not limited to cognitive assessments (e.g., student behavioral outcome 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	measures, teacher evaluations of student ability, etc.); OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of validity based on relationships among test scores across subject areas within the Ohio general assessments. For the Ohio AASCD, ODE must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence showing predictive relationships between the tests and other variables not limited to cognitive assessments (e.g., student behavioral outcome measures, teacher evaluations of student ability, etc.); OR • Evidence of validity based on relationships among test scores across subject areas within the Ohio alternate assessments. 	
Section 3.4 Summary Statement		
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS), the state has not provided evidence (for 2018) showing predictive relationships between the tests and other variables or evidence of validity based on relationships among test scores across subject areas to support the critical element. • For AASCD (3-8, HS), the state has not provided additional evidence (for 2018) showing predictive relationships between the tests and other variables or evidence of validity based on relationships among test scores across subject areas to support 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

SECTION 4: TECHNICAL QUALITY - OTHER

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.1 – Reliability</p> <p>The State has documented adequate reliability evidence for its assessments for the following measures of reliability for the State’s student population overall and each student group and, if the State’s assessments are implemented in multiple States, for the assessment overall and each student group, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test reliability of the State’s assessments estimated for its student population; • Overall and conditional standard error of measurement of the State’s assessments; • Consistency and accuracy of estimates in categorical classification decisions for the cut scores and achievement levels based on the assessment results; • For computer-adaptive tests, evidence that the assessments produce test forms with adequately precise estimates of a student’s achievement. 	<p align="center">OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Consistency (pp. 65-66) • Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 66-72) • Student Classification Consistency (pp. 73-75) • Reliability of Subgroups in the Population (p. 76-82) • Reliability for Subscales (pp. 82-84) 	<p align="center">OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 4.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.2 – Fairness and Accessibility</p> <p>The State has taken reasonable and appropriate steps to ensure that its assessments are accessible to all students and fair across student groups in the design, development and analysis of its assessments.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p><u>Ohio Administrative Code:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>3301-13-07</u>: Establishes the provisions and decision procedures for the fairness sensitivity review committee <p>Appendix-F-Fairness-Guidelines-with-number.pdf.pdf</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background of Ohio Computer Based Assessments (p. 22) • Item Development Process (pp. 92-93) • Item Review (pp. 94-96) • Field Testing (pp. 96-97) • DIF Analysis (pp. 98-100) • Eligibility (p. 105) • Administration Procedures (pp. 105-107) • Accommodations (pp. 107-114) • Validity of OST Test Score Interpretations (pp. 1-5) <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test Development (pp. 2-6) • Item Development (pp. 6-9) • Differential Item Functioning Summary (p. 46-49) 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>The AASCD Technical Report includes item review and fairness review information as well as DIF analyses for male and female students, African American students and white students, and Hispanic and white students.</p> <p>It appears that only a handful of items were categorized as C (significant DIF) for DIF.</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p>
<p>From 2016 review: For the Ohio AASCD, ODE must provide: Evidence of procedures followed when differential item functioning analysis (DIF) identify items with large potential bias.</p> <p>Consistent with the note on page 1, the evidence requested by the peer reviewers does not necessarily reflect the final set of additional evidence, if any, that a State may need to submit to demonstrate that its assessment system meets all of the critical elements for the assessment peer review. As a result, a State should refer to the letter to the State, including the list of additional evidence needed, if any, from the Department.</p>		

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 4.2 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.

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>4.3 – Full Performance Continuum</p> <p>The State has ensured that each assessment provides an adequately precise estimate of student performance across the full performance continuum, including for high- and low-achieving students.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 66-72) • Reliability of Subgroups in the Population (p. 76-82) • Reliability for Subscales (pp. 82-84) <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginal Reliability and Marginal Standard Error of Measurement (pp. 36-37) • Conditional Standard Errors of Measurement (pp. 38-44) • Scale Score Distributions (pp. 29-30, 63-134) 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p>
<p>From 2016 review: For the Ohio AASCD, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the R/LA high school test yields valid and reliable scores across the entire performance range. 		
<p>Section 4.3 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.4 – Scoring</p> <p>The State has established and documented standardized scoring procedures and protocols for its assessments that are designed to produce reliable results, facilitate valid score interpretations, and report assessment results in terms of the State’s academic achievement standards.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability (pp. 65-91) • Reporting and Interpreting OST Scores (pp. 117-128) • Performance Standards (pp. 128-139) • Scaling and Equating (pp. 140-145) • Constructed-response Scoring (pp. 146-147) • Hand Scoring (pp. 148-153) • Machine-Scored constructed-Response Item Development Tools (p. 93) • Interpretation of Scores (p. 126-128) • Item Response Theory Procedures (pp. 62-64) • OST Reporting Scale (Scale Scores) (pp. 143-144) • Reliability for Subscales (pp. 82-84) • Subscale Intercorrelations (pp. 85-90) • Machine Scoring (p. 93) • Quality Assurance in Document Processing (pp. 159-161) • Quality Assurance in Data Preparation (p. 161) • Quality Assurance in Scoring and Reporting (pp. 162-171) 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 4.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.5 – Multiple Assessment Forms</p> <p>If the State administers multiple forms within a content area and grade level, within or across school years, the State ensures that all forms adequately represent the State’s academic content standards and yield consistent score interpretations such that the forms are comparable within and across school years.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reporting and Interpreting OST Scores (pp. 117-128) • Performance Standards (pp. 128-139) • Scaling and Equating (pp. 140-145) • Constructed-response Scoring (pp. 146-147) • Hand Scoring (pp. 148-153) • Test Design “fixed form assessments” (p. 23) 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p>
<p>Section 4.5 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.6 – Multiple Versions of an Assessment</p> <p>If the State administers assessments in multiple versions within a content area, grade level, or school year, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Followed a design and development process to support comparable interpretations of results for students tested across the versions of the assessments; • Documented adequate evidence of comparability of the meaning and interpretations of the assessment results. 	<p align="center">OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability (pp. 65-91) • Field Testing (pp. 96-97) • Reporting and Interpreting OST Scores (pp. 117-128) • Performance Standards (pp. 128-139) • Scaling and Equating (pp. 140-145) • Constructed-response Scoring (pp. 146-147) • Hand Scoring (pp. 148-153) 	<p align="center">OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p> <p>However, peer reviewers recommended that Ohio include in their Technical Report information on performance differences (if any) between paper and pencil and online versions of the assessment and the percent of students taking the paper version should be provided.</p>
<p>Section 4.6 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X No additional evidence is required</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">4.7 – Technical Analysis and Ongoing Maintenance</p> <p>The State has a system for monitoring and maintaining, and improving as needed, the quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria for the analyses of all of the assessments in its assessment system (i.e., general assessments and alternate assessments).</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Data is used to monitor the</u> quality of its assessment system, including clear and technically sound criteria <p>Evidence in support of the requirement for a system of maintaining and improving the quality of the assessment system – attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAC agenda June 2016 • TAC agenda 1-19-2017 • TAC Report 1-21-2017 (p. 3) • TAC Report June 9 and 10, 2017 <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>The TAC agendas and minutes, as well as the Annual Technical Report, confirmed that Ohio is monitoring, maintaining, and improving the general assessments.</p> <p>Ohio submitted minutes from the 1/21/17 TAC meeting as evidence of external monitoring of the assessment system. Peer reviewers recommended that Ohio implement the TAC recommendations regarding use of forensic data.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>The TAC document provided by Ohio did not contain references to the AASCD assessment.</p>
<p>From 2016 review:</p> <p>For the OST general science tests and the Ohio AASCD, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of Ohio’s tests, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation of regular internal and external technical review of components of the State’s assessment system, such as State Board of Education minutes, minutes from technical advisory committee (TAC) meetings, and documentation of roles and responsibilities of TAC members. 		
<p>Section 4.7 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For AASCD (3-8, HS), provide evidence for monitoring, maintaining, and improving the quality of the assessment (for example, TAC documents). 		

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

SECTION 5: INCLUSION OF ALL STUDENTS

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.1 – Procedures for Including Students with Disabilities</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all public elementary and secondary school students with disabilities in the State’s assessment system, including, at a minimum, guidance for individual educational plan (IEP) Teams to inform decisions about student assessments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards; • States that decisions about how to assess students with disabilities must be made by a student’s IEP Team based on each student’s individual needs; • Provides guidelines for determining whether to assess a student on the general assessment without accommodation(s), the general assessment with accommodation(s), or an alternate assessment; • Provides information on accessibility tools and features available to students in general and assessment accommodations available for students with disabilities; • Provides guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities; • Includes instructions that students eligible to be assessed based on alternate academic 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3.1, Student Population (p. 29) • Section 7.3, Accommodations (pp. 107-114) <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p> <p>FINAL 9-29-17 Rules Book Ohio.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 53-57 <p>Student-participation.pdf.pdf</p> <p>OHAccessManual_FULLL.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 3-4 <p>2014-Ohio-Operating-Standards-for-the-Education-of-Children-with-Disabilities.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 117-125 <p>Summary-of-Changes-2014-Ohio-Operating-Standards-for-the-Education-of-Children-with-Disabilities-Issued-2014-8-25.pdf.pdf</p> <p>A Guide to Parent Rights in Special Education Ohio Department of Education.mht</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p> <p>Accessibility Manual is a comprehensive manual designed to provide guidance to Ohio test administrators and IEP Teams. Guidance for including SWD, ELs, 504, and underserved states Ohio applies industry standard universal design and provides a broad range of accessibility features, designated supports, and accommodations.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>Ohio did not provide documentation supporting that parent reports are available in languages other than English, such as statements/procedures in test administration manuals, TCMs, parent notifications, etc.</p> <p>Ohio did not provide evidence that parents participating in a student’s individualized educational plan (IEP) are provided clear explanations of the differences between assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards and assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, including any effects of State and local policies on a student’s education resulting from taking an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards, or if students should be assessed using Ohio’s general assessments or alternate assessments, with or without accommodations.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>achievement standards may be from any of the disability categories listed in the IDEA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that parents of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are informed that their student’s achievement will be based on alternate academic achievement standards and of any possible consequences of taking the alternate assessments resulting from district or State policy (e.g., ineligibility for a regular high school diploma if the student does not demonstrate proficiency in the content area on the State’s general assessments); The State has procedures in place to ensure that its implementation of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities promotes student access to the general curriculum. 	<p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>3301-13-03</u> -Establishing provisions for the participation of students with disabilities in required assessments administered at the designated grades <p>AASCD – while the test is not in a translated format, it is orally translated when needed</p>	
<p>From 2016 review: For the Ohio AASCD, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that information regarding the test is available to parents in languages other than English. 		
<p>Section 5.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For AASCD (3-8, HS) and OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS), provide evidence that information regarding the test is available to parents in English and in languages other than English, and that parents are informed of the consequences of their students participating in the alternate assessment. 		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>5.2 – Procedures for including ELs</p> <p>The State has in place procedures to ensure the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s assessment system and clearly communicates this information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, including, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for determining whether an English learner should be assessed with accommodation(s); • Information on accessibility tools and features available to all students and assessment accommodations available for English learners; • Guidance regarding selection of appropriate accommodations for English learners. 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Population (p. 29) • Accommodations (pp. 107-114) <p>Ohio English Language Proficiency Assessment (OELPA) Ohio Department of Education.mht</p> <p>GuidelinesfortheIdentificationofEnglish LearnersV2.pdf.pdf</p> <p>OELPA2016AccessibilityManual.pdf.pdf</p> <p><u>FINAL 9-29-17 Rules Book Ohio.pdf</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pp. 44-52 <p><u>OELPA Trainings and Resources (not available)</u></p> <p><u>Translated Family Reports for OELPA Results</u></p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Note, OELPA is not a state assessment that is being Peer Reviewed.</p> <p>Ohio did not provide documentation that parent reports are available in languages other than English, such as statements/procedures in test administration manuals, TCMs, parent notifications, etc.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>Ohio did not provide documentation that there are procedures in place ensuring the inclusion of all English learners in public elementary and secondary schools in the State’s general assessment system, and that these clearly transmit the appropriate information to districts, schools, teachers, and parents, and that such procedures and information are available in languages other than English. Examples of such documentation are: statements in test documents stating which procedures exist for determining if an EL should be assessed using the general assessments, with or without accommodations, or the alternate assessment; as evidenced by administration manuals, TCMs, parent notifications, etc.</p>
<p>From 2016 review: For the Ohio AASCD, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that information regarding the test is available to parents in languages other than English. 		
<p>Section 5.2 Summary Statement</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For AASCD (3-8, HS) and OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS) provide evidence that assessment information regarding both the general and alternate assessments (see NOTES above) are available to parents and other educational stakeholders in languages other than English. 		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">5.3 – Accommodations</p> <p>The State makes available appropriate accommodations and ensures that its assessments are accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Specifically, the State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for students with disabilities(SWD) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and students covered by Section 504; Ensures that appropriate accommodations are available for English learners (EL); Has determined that the accommodations it provides (i) are appropriate and effective for meeting the individual student’s need(s) to participate in the assessments, (ii) do not alter the construct being assessed, and (iii) allow meaningful interpretations of results and comparison of scores for students who need and receive accommodations and students who do not need and do not receive accommodations; Has a process to individually review and allow exceptional requests for a small number of students who require accommodations beyond those routinely allowed. 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio Administrative Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3301-13-03 -Establishing provisions for the participation of students with disabilities in required assessments administered at the designated grades <p>SP18-AASCD-DFAM.pdf</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accommodations (pp. 107-114) <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>OHAccessManual_FULLL.pdf</p> <p>OELPA2016AccessibilityManual.pdf.pdf</p> <p>FINAL 9-29-17 Rules Book Ohio.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliability for Subgroups (pp. 41-44) Accommodations (p. 39) Students with Disabilities (p. 53) Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD) (pp. 54-57) Students Identified as English Learners (pp. 44-46) Ohio English Language Proficiency Assessment (pp. 47-52) 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Accommodations other than read aloud ELA and some math accommodation are typical of industry standard and have been generally considered to meet this critical element. However, Ohio is encouraged to review data on number and performance of students using human readers or computer speech. Other studies include expert review of construct alignment to the standards.</p> <p>Ohio should consider creating an assessment accommodations correlation between EL’s English Language Proficiency levels and the appropriate accommodations available, according to each EL’s English language proficiency, and possibly considering other factors, such as socioeconomic level and if the student has had interrupted educational experiences.</p> <p>The OELPA Accessibility Manual does not apply to OST ELA/math (3-8 and HS) and Biology (HS).</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>At a minimum, the peer reviewers recommended that section 2.7, <i>Considerations for English Learner Accommodations of the Ohio Access Manual</i>, be referenced in the AASCD Administration Manual, page 51.</p>
<p>From 2016 review: For the Ohio AASCD, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of procedures that describe appropriate accommodations for EL students participating in the test. 		

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

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
Section 5.3 Summary Statement		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <p>For the OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that Ohio makes available appropriate accommodations that ensure that its general assessments are accessible to students with disability and to EL, and that, in the case of EL, those appropriate accommodations are aligned to the student’s English language proficiency. <p>For the AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that Ohio makes available appropriate accommodations for students that ensures that its alternate assessment is accessible to students with disabilities and to EL, and that, in the case of students with disabilities, those appropriate accommodations comply with IDEA and Section 504. 		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">5.4 – Monitoring Test Administration for Special Populations</p> <p>The State monitors test administration in its districts and schools to ensure that appropriate assessments, with or without appropriate accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive accommodations that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with the State’s policies for accommodations; • Appropriate for addressing a student’s disability or language needs for each assessment administered; • Consistent with accommodations provided to the students during instruction and/or practice; • Consistent with the assessment accommodations identified by a student’s IEP Team or 504 team for students with disabilities, or another process for an English learner; • Administered with fidelity to test administration procedures. 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS), OST Science (5-8), and AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Population (p. 29) • Accommodations (pp. 107-114) <p>FINAL 9-29-17 Rules Book Ohio.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision Flow Chart EL Accommodations (p. 117) • Ohio AASCD Decision making Flow Chart (p. 57) <p>OHAccessManual_FULLL.pdf</p> <p>OELPA2016AccessibilityManual.pdf.pdf</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS), OST Science (5-8), and AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>ODE provided guidance in multiple documents on accommodations; however, Ohio did not provide evidence that there are monitoring procedures in place to ensure that those accommodations are provided during test administration.</p> <p>Therefore, Ohio did not provide evidence supporting this critical element. Ohio must provide evidence of monitoring test administrations to ensure that ELs and students with special needs receive appropriate accommodations. Such monitoring verifies the following: that documentation is consistent with state policies; that the accommodations are appropriate to each student’s disability or language need; that the same accommodations are provided in instruction; evidence that the accommodations are congruent with the student’s IEP or 504 plan or a similar process for an EL student, and evidence that the accommodations are administered according to test administration procedures.</p> <p>Such evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following: state plans for site visits to monitor districts and schools to affirm the appropriate delivery of accommodations; example of protocols used for state onsite visits; documentation of findings and recommendations for corrective action; desk audits of IEPs, ELs, and 504 plans compared to actual administration; a description and plan for use of data to ensure implementation of the plans above.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>From 2016 review: For the OST and Ohio AASCD, Ohio must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of State monitoring of test administrations for special populations in districts and schools. • Evidence that appropriate assessments, with or without accommodations, are selected for students with disabilities under IDEA, students covered by Section 504, and English learners so that they are appropriately included in assessments and receive appropriate accommodations. 		
<p>Section 5.4 Summary Statement</p> <p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS), OST Science (5-8), and AASCD (3-8, HS) for 2018 submission, provide documentation that Ohio monitors test assessment administrations for special populations in districts and schools. This should include 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 these students actually receive the most appropriate accommodations, and are included in those assessments. 		

SECTION 6: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND REPORTING

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p>6.1 – State Adoption of Academic Achievement Standards for All Students</p> <p>The State formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State formally adopted academic achievement standards in the required tested grades and, at its option, also alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; • The State applies its grade-level academic achievement standards to all public elementary and secondary school students enrolled in the grade to which they apply, with the exception of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities to whom alternate academic achievement standards may apply; • The State’s academic achievement standards and, as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards, include: (a) At least three levels of achievement, with two for high achievement and a third of lower achievement; (b) descriptions of the competencies associated with each achievement level; and (c) achievement scores that differentiate among the achievement levels. 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Overview of Standards Revision and State Board Adoption</p> <p>Feb-2017-MEETING-Minutes-Final.pdf.pdf</p> <p>ELA-Learning-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>MATH-Standards-2017.pdf.pdf</p> <p>ScienceStandards.pdf.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology pp. 288-296 <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3.1, Student Population (p. 29) • Section 7.3, Accommodations (pp. 107-114) • Performance Standards (pp. 128-139) • Scaling and Equating (pp. 140-145) <p>OST_Standard_Setting_Technical_Report_ELA_Math (002).pdf</p> <p>Spring-2015-OCBA-Standard-Setting_09022015_combined.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>The evidence provided by Ohio describes the revision process of the academic standards, but it does not address actual adoption of academic achievement standards.</p> <p>State Board Meeting minutes February 2017 reflect that Board did approve academic <u>content</u> standards but there is no reference to achievement standards.</p> <p>The evidence cited does not affirm that Academic Achievement Standards were formally adopted by the OST assessments. Ohio provided a reference to Ohio Revised Code 3301.0710(A)(2) which cites five achievement levels for the OGT. However, this citation do not constitute evidence of Ohio’s formal adoption or approval of academic achievement levels or descriptors.</p>
<p>Section 6.1 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS), provide evidence that the state has formally adopted challenging academic achievement standards in reading/language arts, mathematics and in science for all students. 	

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.2 – Achievement Standards-Setting</p> <p>The State used a technically sound method and process that involved panelists with appropriate experience and expertise for setting its academic achievement standards and alternate academic achievement standards to ensure they are valid and reliable.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>OST_Standard_Setting_Technical_Report_ELA_Math (002).pdf</p> <p>Spring-2015-OCBA-Standard-Setting_09022015_combined.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biology 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p> <p>Peer review panel recommended that future standard setting panels in Ohio include expertise in instruction and assessment of ELs and SWD.</p>
Section 6.2 Summary Statement		
X No additional evidence is required		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.3 – Challenging and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards</p> <p>The State’s academic achievement standards are challenging and aligned with the State’s academic content standards such that a high school student who scores at the proficient or above level has mastered what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate from high school in order to succeed in college and the workforce.</p> <p>If the State has defined alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards, show linkage to different content across grades, and reflect professional judgment of the highest achievement standards possible for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Alignment Study Report with Appendices.pdf</p> <p>OST_Standard_Setting_Technical_Report_ELA_Math (002).pdf</p> <p>Spring-2015-OCBA-Standard-Setting_09022015_combined.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrates sufficient support for the critical element.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>Ohio needs to define academic achievement standards for each separate grade level. Currently, grade level bands do not meet the requirement to link the achievement levels to the state grade level academic standards.</p>
<p>From 2016 review:</p> <p>For the Ohio AASCD in R/LA and mathematics, ODE must provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that State’s alternate academic achievement standards are linked to the State’s grade level academic content standards, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A description of the process used to develop the alternate academic achievement standards that shows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The State’s grade-level academic content standards or grade-level 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 ○ A description of steps taken to vertically articulate the alternate academic achievement standards (including cut scores and performance level descriptors) across each grade. 		
<p>Section 6.3 Summary Statement</p>		

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For AASCD (3-8, HS), the state must link alternate academic achievement standards to the State’s grade-level academic content standards or extended academic content standards. 		

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

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p align="center">6.4 – Reporting</p> <p>The State reports its assessment results, and the reporting facilitates timely, appropriate, credible, and defensible interpretations and uses of results for students tested by parents, educators, State officials, policymakers and other stakeholders, and the public, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State reports to the public its assessment results on student achievement at each proficiency level and the percentage of students not tested for all students and each student group after each test administration; • The State reports assessment results, including itemized score analyses, to districts and schools so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret the results and address the specific academic needs of students, and the State also provides interpretive guides to support appropriate uses of the assessment results; • The State provides for the production and delivery of individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports after each administration of its assessments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide valid and reliable information regarding a student’s achievement; ○ Report the student’s achievement in terms of the State’s grade-level academic achievement standards (including performance-level descriptors); ○ Provide information to help parents, teachers, and principals interpret the test results and address the specific academic needs of students; ○ Are available in alternate formats (e.g., Braille or large print) upon request and, to 	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>Ohio School Report Card Data</p> <p>Report Card Resources Ohio Department of Education.mht</p> <p>OST_Annual_Technical_Report_Spring2016.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability pp. 65-91 • Reporting and Interpreting OST Scores pp. 117-128 • Performance Standards pp, 128-139 • Scaling and Equating pp. 140-145 • Constructed-response Scoring pp. 146-147 • Hand Scoring pp. 148-153 <p>OH_ORIS_UserGuide_2015-2016.pdf</p> <p>FINAL 9-29-17 Rules Book Ohio.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Versions pp. 34-35 <p>Spring 2016 Family Reports Interpretive Guide</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>OhioAASCD-Sp2015-Family-Report-Interpretive-Guide1.pdf</p> <p>Translated Family Reports for OELPA Results Ohio Department of Education.mht</p> <p>AASCD FAQs</p> <p>AASCD_TechnicalReport_2017.pdf</p>	<p>OST ELA, Math (3-8, HS), and Biology (HS)</p> <p>The peer review panel did not find evidence regarding the provision of individual student reports in alternate formats or alternate communications that ensured that all parents (including parents of EL) have access to their child’s academic performance.</p> <p>Ohio may consider publishing procedures for parents to use in seeking appropriate support for accessing reports of testing results in accessible formats, and making these publications available in languages other than English.</p> <p>AASCD (3-8, HS)</p> <p>Peer reviewers indicated that educator score reports were not found in the evidence that Ohio provided.</p>

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

STATE ASSESSMENT PEER REVIEW NOTES FOR OHIO Resubmission

Critical Element	Evidence (Record document and page # for future reference)	Comments/Notes/Questions/Suggestions Regarding State Documentation or Evidence
<p style="text-align: center;">the extent practicable, in a native language that parents can understand;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State follows a process and timeline for delivering individual student reports to parents, teachers, and principals as soon as practicable after each test administration. 		
<p>From 2016 review: For the OST science tests and Ohio AASCD tests, 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the alternate assessments, evidence of itemized score analyses in reporting to stakeholders. 		
<p>Section 6.4 Summary Statement</p>		
<p>X The following additional evidence is needed/provide brief rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For AASCD (3-8, HS), provide evidence for the availability of educator score reports and instructions on how to interpret them either in print and online, published in English and in other languages that parents of EL can understand. • For all tests in this review, evidence is needed for provision of individual student reports in alternate formats or alternate communication that ensures that all parents have access to their child’s academic performance, including parents of English learners. 		

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