Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA)

2005-2006 Technical Manual

Prepared for the Maryland State Department of Education
by Pearson Educational Measurement
12.29.06

Table of Contents

Purpose

The purpose of this Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt MSA) 2005-2006 Technical Report is to provide objective information regarding technical aspects of the Alt-MSA. This volume is an update of previous Alt-MSA Technical Reports (i.e., 2003, 2004, 2005) and is designed as one source of information to Maryland K-12 educational stakeholders (including testing coordinators, educators, parents, and other interested citizens) about the development, implementation, scoring, and technical attributes of the portfolio-based Alt-MSA. Other sources of information regarding the Alt-MSA, provided in paper or online format, include the Alt-MSA Handbook, implementation material, and training materials.

The information provided here fulfills legal, professional and scientific guidelines (AERA, APA, NCME, 1999) for technical reports of large scale alternate educational assessments and is intended for use by qualified users within schools who use the Alt-MSA and interpret the results. Specifically, information was selected for inclusion in this report based on NCLB requirements and the following *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*:

- Standards 6.1 – 6.15 Supporting Documentation for Tests
- Standards 10.1—10.12 Testing Individuals with Disabilities
- Standards13.1—13.19 Educational Testing and Assessment

This technical report provides accurate, complete, current and clear documentation of the reliability, validity, scoring methods, and score results for the 2005-2006 Alt-MSA as is appropriate for use by qualified users and technical experts.

1.0 Historical Overview

1.1 Overview of the Alternate Assessment

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 2004, as well as The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), mandate that states provide an alternate assessment when implementing statewide accountability systems. An alternate assessment must be aligned to the State's content standards, must report student achievement according to established proficiency levels (known as Alternate Achievement Standards) with the same frequency and level of detail as the State's regular assessment, and must serve the same purpose as the assessment for which it is an alternate (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2003).

The Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA) is an assessment designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to participate in the regular Maryland School Assessment, even when accommodations are provided. The Alt-MSA is a way for all students with disabilities to take part in and benefit from a structured assessment system.

Background

From 1995-2003, students with disabilities who could not participate in the general education assessment participated in the Independence Mastery Assessment Program (IMAP). IMAP

- served as the alternate assessment for the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) and was intended as a program evaluation;
- assessed students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 11; and
- assessed program performance by assessing students in personal management, as well as community, recreation/leisure, career/vocational, and communication/ decision making/interpersonal skills.

New federal mandates in the revised Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as NCLB, prompted a revision of the general education assessment (MSPAP) as well as the IMAP by requiring that

- students receive an individual score in Reading and Mathematics and, by the 2007 – 2008 school year, Science; and
- students be assessed in grades 3-8 and a high school grade.

Mandates in the IDEA further specified that:

- Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) be generated for all students with disabilities;
- IEPs delineate the administration modifications required for a disabled student to participate in the general state or district-wide assessment program, or provide a rationale as to why the assessment is inappropriate and how the student will be assessed; and that
- students with disabilities have equal access to grade level academic content standards.

As a result of these new mandates both the general education assessment (MSPAP) and the IMAP were revised. The revised version of the MSPAP, the Maryland School Assessment (MSA), is administered to students in Grades 3-8 and 10 and tests students' attainment of grade-level objectives in Reading and Mathematics. Beginning in 2007, the MSA will also be administered in Science at grades 5 and 8.

The revised version of the IMAP, the Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA), is administered in grades 3–8 and 10 and assesses attainment of individually selected objectives in Reading and Mathematics aligned with grade-level content standards, using grade- and age-appropriate materials. Beginning in the 2007-2008 school year, the Alt-MSA will also assess attainment of objectives in Science at grades 5, 8, and 10.

Some milestones in the development of Maryland's alternate assessment program are outlined below.

Chronology of Alternate Assessment Development in Maryland

1994	IMAP domains and indicators were developed.
1994-1995	First administration of the IMAP.
1997	Amendments to the IDEA required all children be included in statewide testing and accountability systems.
2001-2002	IMAP modified to include Reading, Mathematics, and Writing.
Spring 2003	Design and development of the Alt-MSA.
Summer 2003	Standard setting for the Reading and Mathematics portions of the IMAP.
2003-2004	First administration of the Alt-MSA.
Summer 2004	Alt-MSA standards validation.
Fall 2005	Release of Alt-MSA Online, the online system that allows the Test Examiner Team (TET) to enter and store Mastery Objectives into an online database.

The Alt-MSA differs from the previously administered IMAP in several important ways, as shown in the table on the next page.

Comparing the Alt-MSA and the IMAP

	2004 to present Alt-MSA	IMAP 2002-2003 Accountability Assessment Items	IMAP 2002-2003 Non-Accountability Assessment Items
Purpose	Intended to assess student attainment of individually selected objectives in Mathematics and Reading aligned with grade-level content standards to support the requirements of NCLB.	Intended to assess student attainment of individually selected objectives in Mathematics and Reading at the student's instructional level to support the requirements of NCLB.	Assessed performance in writing, communication/ decision making/ interpersonal, personal management, community, recreation/leisure, career/vocational.
Grades Tested	3-8, and 10	3, 5, 8, 11	3, 5, 8, 11
Reporting	Student scores included in statewide results for Reading and Mathematics.	Student scores included in statewide results for Reading and Mathematics.	Scores not included in statewide accountability results.
Score Use	Accountability, inform instruction, program evaluation.	Accountability, inform instruction, program evaluation.	Inform instruction, program evaluation.
Assessment Specifications	• Assess Reading and Mathematics objectives based on Maryland content standards. • Test Examiner selects/writes 10 Reading and 10 Mathematics objectives aligned to the student's grade level. • Review of previous year's Alt-MSA results or conduct pre-assessment. • Authentic task/setting criteria (2004 and 2005 only) -two Mastery Objectives were required to be authentic and demonstrated in an authentic setting. • Detailed specifications for the design of assessment tasks (Mastery Objectives). • Assessment objectives customized to match the abilities of the student, by using appropriate prompts and supports to enable student participation. • Review of Mastery Objectives to verify adequacy and alignment.	• Assessed Reading and Mathematics objectives based on Maryland content standards. • Test Examiner identified Reading and Mathematics objectives based on student's instructional level. • For each objective, selected artifacts were collected at baseline, mid year, and end of year to demonstrate student growth. • Some assessment tasks developed locally according to MSDE guidelines and others designed by MSDE for administration statewide.	• Individualized writing and communication/ decision making/ interpersonal objectives were selected by Test Examiners. • Students participated in 2 grade-specific performance tasks that assessed personal management, community, recreation/leisure, and career/vocational.

	2004 to present Alt-MSA	IMAP 2002-2003 Accountability Assessment Items	IMAP 2002-2003 Non-Accountability Assessment Items
Scoring	• Dichotomous scoring of each task to determine mastery or non-mastery. • Calculation of mastery percentages in Reading and Mathematics that reflect the proportion of Mastery Objectives mastered. • Mastery percentage scores used to assign students to performance levels.	• A growth score was assigned based on student achievement and use of supports. • Students assigned to performance levels based on their demonstrated growth.	• Writing and communication/ decision making/ interpersonal were scored based on growth model. • Performance tasks score based on number of steps in each task the student performed.

Purpose of the Assessment

The Alt-MSA is designed to

- ensure that all students have an opportunity to access the instructional and informational benefits afforded by an assessment program;
- ensure that all students are included in the statewide accountability system;
- allow for all students to participate in a standards-based curriculum;
- provide a means for charting student performance from year to year relative to the state content standards;
- provide teacher/schools/districts with information to inform instruction and support program evaluation;
- support inferences regarding the extent to which a student has mastered a specific objective; and
- hold schools and districts accountable for improved instruction and student learning.

Participation in the Alt-MSA

Alternate assessments like the Alt-MSA are designed to measure the performance of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to participate in the general education assessment used by districts and states (even with accommodations) as determined by the individual student's IEP team. Participants in the Alt-MSA comprise approximately 1% of the total tested student population. It is mandatory that students with disabilities participate in either the MSA or Alt-MSA. Each student's IEP team decides which assessment is appropriate for an individual student.

Students with disabilities must participate in the MSA if they:

- participate in the grade-level general education curriculum with or without accommodations, supplemental aids and services, or assistive technologies, as determined by the IEP team; and

- are anticipated to meet the graduation requirements for a Maryland High School Diploma with or without accommodations, supplemental aids and services, or assistive technologies, as determined by the IEP team.

As noted previously, students with disabilities in grades 3–8 and 10 must participate in either MSA or Alt-MSA. The decision for which assessment is appropriate for an individual student is made by each student's IEP Team. A student with a significant cognitive disability will participate in Alt-MSA if he or she meets **all** of the following criteria:

a) The student is learning (at emerging, readiness, or functional literacy levels) extended Maryland reading and extended Maryland mathematics content standards objectives.

b) The student requires explicit and ongoing instruction in functional skills.

c) The student requires extensive and substantial modification (e.g., reduced complexity of objectives and learning materials, and more time to learn) of general education curriculum. The curriculum differs significantly from that of their non-disabled peers. They learn different objectives, may use different materials, and may participate in different learning activities.

d) The student requires intensive instruction and may require extensive supports, including physical prompts, to learn, apply, and transfer or generalize knowledge and skills to multiple settings.

e) The student requires extensive support to perform and participate meaningfully and productively in daily activities in school, home, community, and work environments.

f) The student cannot participate in the MSA even with accommodations.

Students not meeting the criteria above will participate in the MSA, with or without accommodations, as appropriate, based on their IEP.

Eligible students participate in the Alt-MSA in Grades 3-8, and 10. To determine the grade level of a student in an un-graded program for the purpose of accountability in the state assessment program, the following MSDE procedure is used:

> Grade equals the number of years the student has been in school after kindergarten (including the current year) adjusted by subtracting the number of times he/she was not promoted and/or adding the number of times he/she was accelerated.

The number of students that participated in the current administration of the Alt-MSA is provided in Appendix A, Table 1 by gender, ethnicity, grade, and socioeconomic status.

Organizations and Groups Involved

A number of groups and organizations are involved with the Alt-MSA. Each of the major contributors listed below serves a specific function, and their collaborative efforts contribute significantly to the program.

Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

The Division of Accountability and Assessment and the Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services of MSDE have the joint responsibility of implementing the requirements in Maryland for statewide testing of students with disabilities. Together they oversee the development of test administration manuals, accountability and interpretive reports, and instructional videotapes, planning, scheduling, implementation, scoring, and reporting of all Alt-MSA activities and supervise MSDE's current contract with Pearson Educational Measurement. MSDE staff conducts training and professional development for administrative staff in central offices as well as school-based Test Examiners in both the public and non-public special placement schools. In addition, MSDE staff conducts quality-control activities for every aspect of the development and administration of the assessment program and monitors the security provisions of the scoring process.

Pearson Educational Measurement (PEM)

PEM has been the MSDE's primary contractor for the Alt-MSA assessment program since January 2004. Each school year, approximately 5,000 Alt-MSA student tests are administered. PEM distributes test materials to approximately 1,000 schools in Maryland and is responsible for the security of all student materials.

PEM collaborates with the MSDE on all facets of the Alt-MSA. PEM's tasks include the implementation and management of Alt-MSA Online, the electronic system that is used for test development, Mastery Objective review, and Mastery Objective feedback early in the testing process. PEM also produces and distributes testing material, conducts range finding, trains the scoring staff, monitors daily and cumulative performance scoring reports, and generates the final Alt-MSA reports. Finally, PEM provides and oversees call center support for each step of the Alt-MSA Program

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

The Alt-MSA Stakeholder Advisory Committee is comprised of MSDE staff, local school system central office staff, non-public special placement school staff, as well as representatives of institutes of higher education, teachers, parents, and important stakeholder groups. The Stakeholder Advisory Committee provides input by representing the teachers and students most influenced by the Alt-MSA. They consult and make recommendations on all aspects of the Alt-MSA test design and administration and annually review the Test Administration and Coordination Manual to verify that it is clear, concise, and user- friendly.

1.2 Test Design and Blueprint

The Alt-MSA test design and blueprint were developed with input from experts in the areas of Reading and Mathematics content; psychometrics; portfolio assessment for students receiving special education; consultants with a national perspective; Stakeholder Advisory Committee members; special educators; and parents of students who participate in the Alt-MSA.

Review of the Standards

Before making design recommendations for the Alt-MSA, the MSDE and the Stakeholder Advisory Committee reviewed the existing Maryland Content Standards. Committee members worked in small groups to examine the Maryland Reading and Mathematics standards. They also reviewed several examples of extended standards used by other states in their alternate assessments.

Test Design

In consideration of the design for the Alt-MSA, the Stakeholder Advisory Committee reviewed alternate assessments from a variety of different states to examine the following characteristics: test format (e.g., portfolio, checklist, and performance tasks), assessment components, scoring procedures employed, and perspectives regarding the alignment of the alternate assessment to a student's IEP. Throughout this process contributors were reminded that their main goal was to develop an assessment instrument aligned with federal mandates and current best practice in instruction and assessment. A general overview of the current design of the Alt-MSA follows:

- The Alt-MSA assesses and reports student mastery of Reading and Mathematics objectives from the Maryland Content Standards, as incorporated and expressed in the Maryland Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC), that are selected by the student's Test Examiner Team. A student's Test Examiner Team includes teachers, related service providers, instructional assistants and others who are involved in the student's day-to-day instruction. It is the responsibility of this team to construct a portfolio of evidence that demonstrates that the individual student attained the target Mastery Objectives that were written to align with the selected Reading and Mathematics content standard objectives. Scorers review the portfolios to determine if the submitted evidence substantiates that the Mastery Objectives have been attained.

- A cycle of assessment and instruction is intrinsic to the Alt-MSA. Early in the school year the Test Examiner Team uses the Alt-MSA results from the prior year or conducts a pre-assessment to determine what skills the student currently possesses in Reading and Mathematics and what skills they still need to learn. A student's instructional and assessment program is based on the results of this review.

- Based on (1) the review of the prior year's results or the pre-assessment and (2) the content standards, indicators, and objectives specified for Alt-MSA, the team

selects the Reading and Mathematics content standard objectives that the student can be expected to attain with at least 80% accuracy by the beginning of March of the following year. The objectives selected by the team should include current Reading and Mathematics objectives in the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) that have not yet been achieved. Test Examiners then collaborate to develop one Mastery Objective, or assessment task, for each selected objective.

- Students must receive instruction in the selected Reading and Mathematics content standard objectives. A student is assessed when the Test Examiner determines that he or she can demonstrate the skill with at least 80% accuracy. Evidence of mastery is collected by the Test Examiner when the student has mastered an objective. Evidence of mastery may be collected at any time during the test window, which spans from the beginning of September to mid-March. The portfolio is a collection of student work and other documentation that demonstrates that the student has attained the Mastery Objectives.

- Because the Alt-MSA is a record of a student's work, portfolio development involves the student as much as possible. Students work with Test Examiners to chart their learning and select artifacts that demonstrate mastery.

- Active parent/guardian involvement supports the student in learning the selected Reading and Mathematics objectives. Therefore, parents are encouraged to review their child's proposed Alt-MSA Mastery Objectives before assessment. The review allows parents to provide the school with input and feedback that can inform instruction, and helps to ensure that Mastery Objectives are appropriate for the student.

Test Blueprint

The following section delineates the Maryland Content Standards/Topics to be assessed in Reading and Mathematics and their relative emphasis on the Alt-MSA as specified by the MSDE.

For the Reading Alt-MSA, Test Examiners must select at least one indicator and two objectives from each of the content standards or areas listed below for assessment. As defined by MSDE, content standards are the highest levels of content definition within each subject area (e.g., Reading), with areas defined within content standards as necessary. Indicators are attached to standards or areas, and are defined by discrete behaviors. Objectives are expected performance measures of indicators. One artifact is submitted for each objective selected.

Content Standard 1.0 General Reading Processes

- Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, or (*Other*)--Select an indicator and two objectives from Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, or Other.
  Note: If Mastery Objectives (MO) in the area of "Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, or Fluency" are NOT selected due to the nature of the student's instructional program, the TET will select two MOs from another tested area.
- Vocabulary--Select an indicator and two objectives from Vocabulary.

- General Reading Comprehension--Select an indicator and two objectives from General Reading Comprehension.

Content Standard 2.0 Comprehension of Informational Text--Select an indicator and two objectives from Comprehension of Informational Text.

Content Standard 3.0 Comprehension of Literary Text --Select an indicator and two objectives from Comprehension of Literary Text.

For the Mathematics Alt-MSA Test Examiners must select at least one indicator and two objectives from each of the content standards or areas listed below for assessment. One artifact is submitted for each objective selected.

Content Standard 1.0 Algebra, Patterns, And/Or Functions

Content Standard 2.0 Knowledge of Geometry

Content Standard 3.0 Knowledge of Measurement

Content Standard 4.0 Knowledge of Statistics
Data Analysis--Select an indicator and two objectives from Data Analysis.

Content Standard 6.0 Knowledge of Number Relationships or Computation

The selected indicators and objectives are the focus of assessment providing the content and skills to which Mastery Objectives must align. A complete discussion of the Mastery Objective and assessment development process is provided in Chapter 2, as is a description of required Alt-MSA portfolio components and organization (see section 2.4).

2.0 Portfolio Assessment Construction & Administration

2.1 Timeline

The Alt-MSA test construction and administration timeline for 2006 is located in Appendix B.

2.2 Contributors

A number of Local Education Agency and school staff members contribute their time and expertise to promote the success of the Alt-MSA program. A list of these contributors and an overview of their roles and responsibilities relative to the Alt-MSA test construction and administration process are provided in Appendix C.

2.3 Alt-MSA Development and Administration

Alt-MSA Portfolio Planning and Development

Several tasks and activities are conducted each June through September prior to administration of the Alt-MSA to make certain that all stakeholders are well trained, informed, and dedicated to the Alt-MSA assessment effort. These activities provide evidence for the validity of Alt-MSA assessment results and, to the extent possible, standardize the assessment development and administration process. The steps in the Alt-MSA planning and development process are outlined below.

1. Attend Training

   LACs, Alt-MSA Facilitators, and Special Placement School STCs attend in-depth train-the-trainer sessions about the Alt-MSA and become thoroughly familiar with the procedures for developing the Alt-MSA Portfolio.

2. Provide Training

   LACs and Alt-MSA Facilitators conduct required training sessions for STCs to familiarize them with Alt-MSA portfolio development procedures for administration of the Alt-MSA. The STCs, LACs and Alt-MSA Facilitators then provide in-depth training to Test Examiners. Any staff member who teaches or is in some way involved in the instruction of a student participating in the Alt-MSA attends this training. A student's teachers, related service providers, and instructional assistants should be considered members of his/her TET. In addition, teachers who are providing in-home teaching services for students who are identified as participants in Alt-MSA must also attend an in-depth training session about administering the assessment.

   Training includes an overview and discussion of ethical procedures for test administration. It is expected that students will receive the prompts and supports typically used throughout instruction and assessment during the Alt-MSA, however it is a breach of professional ethics for school personnel to: use inappropriate or undisclosed prompts; provide verbal and non-verbal clues of answers that go beyond the degree of support used in instruction; or coach or hint in any way (beyond that used in instruction) that may influence a student's performance during the testing

situation. A breach of ethics may result in invalidation of test results and LEA or MSDE Disciplinary action.

As soon as student portfolios contain student identifying information, student testing materials, and/or student work, they become secure documents and must be treated as such. Therefore, Test Examiners also receive training on the proper handling of secure materials. This includes maintaining student portfolios in a secure, locked area when not in use so that only members of the TET and the STC can access them. It is assumed that Test Examiners and any others who handle test materials are aware of the consequences of test security violations which may include prosecution or penalties imposed by the Maryland State Board of Education and/or the State Superintendent of Schools.

The complete Code of Ethics for the Alt-MSA can be found in Part 1 of the Alt-MSA Handbook.

3. Meet with Test Examiners

The principal or designee, School Test Coordinator, teachers, related service providers, and instructional assistants who teach students who participate in Alt-MSA meet to identify the Test Examiner Team for each student. It is important to include each student's teachers, related service providers, and instructional assistants in the Test Examiner Team. The decisions made by this team determine the content of the student's Alt-MSA Portfolio and components of his/her Reading and Mathematics instructional programs. Students have more and better opportunities to learn and generalize their learning when selected skills are taught across a student's schedule and in different settings by all the student's teachers, related service providers, and instructional assistants.

4. Test Examiner Teams Meet to Review Prior Year's Results or Conduct Pre-Assessment

(4a.) Review Alt-MSA results for students who participated in the prior year's administration

The TET reviews Alt-MSA results from the previous year. For Mastery Objectives that were mastered, the team will identify different objectives to assess for the upcoming Alt-MSA. For Mastery Objectives not mastered in the previous year due to lack of student demonstration of skill, the team considers (1) whether the student should be taught and assessed on objectives similar to those for the prior year, but using different prompts and conditions, or (2) whether it is more appropriate to select objectives for instruction and assessment which differ from those assessed in the prior year. Appendix D provides research results from an examination of student-level Mastery Objective changes between 2005 and 2006.

(4b.) Plan and Conduct the Pre-assessment

If a student did not participate in the Alt-MSA in the prior year (i.e., the student was in a non-assessed grade or is new to the public schools this year), the TET will plan and conduct a pre-assessment to determine what indicators and objectives within selected Reading and Mathematics content standards a student has already mastered.

To formulate the content for a pre-assessment, the team first reviews the Maryland Reading and Mathematics content standards. These are available on http://mdk12.org/instruction/curriculum/Reading/index.html
and
http://mdk12.org/instruction/curriculum/Mathematics/index.html

The TET then identifies the student's potential instructional level by reviewing the previous year's objectives on the Content Standards documents. Next, the TET reviews current formal and informal test results for Reading and Mathematics and indicates those results next to the content standards and objectives selected above. On these lists of objectives, "M" (Mastered) and the date are recorded next to the objectives that have been mastered by the student. "IP" (In Progress) and the date are recorded next to objectives that are in progress and currently part of the student's instructional program.

Finally, the Test Examiners conduct the pre-assessment by informally probing appropriate objectives at the selected instructional grade level to determine if additional objectives in Reading and Mathematics have been attained. Next to mastered objectives, "M" and the date of the pre-assessment is recorded. If a student does not respond to the probe "NR" (No Response) is recorded.

The information gleaned from pre-assessment guides the selection of the objectives for the Alt-MSA Portfolio.

5. Test Examiner Teams Select Indicators and Write Mastery Objectives for the Alt-MSA via Alt-MSA Online

(5a) Select Indicators and Objectives for the Alt-MSA

Based on an analysis of the student's performance on the previous year's Alt-MSA and/or the results of the pre-assessment, the TET selects at least one indicator and two objectives from each of five designated content standards within a subject area. If a pre-assessment was conducted, those objectives marked "NR" and "IP" should be considered for assessment and instruction by the team. Selected content standard indicators and objectives are recorded on the Alt-MSA Reading and Mathematics Test Documents as reflected in Part 4 of the Alt-MSA Handbook. For a given student the Reading and Mathematics Test Documents indicate: the content standards/topics, indicators and objectives selected for assessment; the Mastery Objectives developed to assess the selected objectives (see below); and the types of artifacts (e.g., Data Chart, Student Work, Videotape,

Audiotape) to be submitted as evidence of mastery. Samples of these documents are provided in Appendix E and the entire Handbook is available online at: www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/testing/alt_msa

The process by which the TET selects indicators and objectives and writes Mastery Objectives is completed via an online system called Alt-MSA Online. The benefit of this system is that it prevents the TET from selecting indicators and objectives that are not Alt-MSA tested areas. Part 6 of the Handbook provides TETs with step-by-step instructions for using Alt-MSA Online to enter, review, submit, revise and print the student Mastery Objectives.

(5b) Write Mastery Objectives

Using the objectives selected and recorded on the Alt-MSA test documents, Test Examiners write a clear statement of expected mastery for each objective. Mastery Objectives are not a repetition of the state objectives. Each Mastery Objective must include the following required components:

- The conditions for performing the skill. (The task direction, a verbal direction given by the teacher to initiate the behavior, activity, or task may be part of the condition statement. A task direction is NOT a prompt).
- The observable, measurable response the student is to make.
- The level of mastery expected. For the Alt-MSA, the criterion for a judgment of "mastered" is 80% or greater attainment.
- The level of teacher assistance or prompting to be provided to the student. If a specific prompt type is not indicated the scorer will assume the student did not use any prompts and performed the task independently. The different prompt types are:

  - Gesture prompt – this level of prompt requires the teacher to move his/her finger, hand, arm, or make a facial expression that communicates to the student specific information (e.g., teacher taps scanner switch button).

  - Verbal prompt – this level of prompt requires the teacher to give a specific verbal direction in addition to the task direction. Given a task direction, the student is unable to perform correctly until another, more specific, verbal prompt is provided (e.g., after the teacher gives the task direction and a latency period, the teacher then says, "push the button to turn on the scanner").

  - Model prompt – this level of prompt requires the teacher to demonstrate the correct response for the student, and the student imitates the teacher's model (e.g., the teacher demonstrates how to push the switch and then asks the student to repeat).

- Partial Physical Prompt – this level of prompt requires the teacher to touch the student to elicit a response (e.g., teacher touches the student's hand closest to the scanner switch button).

- Full Physical Prompt – this level of prompt requires the teacher to place his/her hand over the student's hand and move it toward the response

In addition to incorporating each of the above components, each Mastery Objective must align with the Reading and Mathematics VSC indicator and objective being assessed. Although student Mastery Objectives are written at the student's instructional level, the Mastery Objectives and submitted artifacts are required to be aligned with grade level curriculum materials and instructional activities. For example: a 10th grade student counting Beanie Babies is probably not aligned to curriculum materials.

Part 5 of the Alt-MSA Handbook (referenced above) provides both examples of appropriate Mastery Objectives and specifications for achieving each of the required components outlined above. The TET writes these Mastery Objectives via Alt-MSA Online. On the system, a field is provided for each of the required Mastery Objective components to guide the TET to include each of the required components in each Mastery Objective.

The 20 Mastery Objectives for each and every student participating in the Alt-MSA are subjected to a review by the principal (or designee) and the Alt-MSA Contractor to ensure alignment with the VSC and measurability. This process of review of Mastery Objectives is described in numbers 6 and 7, below.

6. Review by Principal and Send to LAC

After the Alt-MSA test documents are completed by the TET, the documents are then submitted for principal review. During the principal review process, the principal (or designee) can review and approve each Mastery Objective individually or can approve all 10 Mastery Objectives for a subject at one time. If the principal requires edits to the individual Mastery Objectives, the principal has the option to send them back to the teacher with comments so that the teacher can make revisions and resubmit them to the principal for final approval. The principal (or designee) is required to approve all 20 Mastery Objectives by a specified date. Once this deadline has passed, the student test documents are then systematically forwarded to the Alt-MSA contractor for technical review.

7. Technical Review of Mastery Objectives

After the principal review process is complete, each Mastery Objective is reviewed by the Alt-MSA contractor to verify that it meets the technical requirements outlined in the Alt-MSA Handbook. These requirements include: alignment to the selected

content standard indicator and objective, clear specification of performance conditions (e.g., prompts needed, mastery criterion of at least 80%), and measurability. The review provides Test Examiners with feedback as to which, if any, of these requirements the proposed Mastery Objectives fail to meet. During operational scoring, Mastery Objectives that do not meet the established criteria will result in the tested objective being scored as "0," so pre-assessment feedback is an extremely important step in the assessment development process.

The process by which the Mastery Objectives are reviewed during the technical review by the contractor is found in section 3.1. In the fall of 2005, the MOR process was planned and implemented in a similar manner to spring scoring at which the portfolios are scored by the contractor. The MOR was completed at the same location as the portfolio scoring. This allowed the same pool of resources to complete the work and the same quality control procedures to be implemented, such as validity, reliability and back reading by a supervisor.

Once the pre-defined MOR period is complete, the contractor review results are posted on Alt-MSA Online for the TET. These results are posted in comment form to provide the TET with the detail needed to make the required edits. The potential comments included one or more of the following

- OK (no edits required)
- Mastery Objective is not aligned with tested indicator or objective. The mastery Objective does not assess the selected content standard indicator and/or objective. OR, the instructional level does not match the student's assigned grade.
- Conditions are not clear. Clarify exactly what is being given to the student to demonstrate the Mastery Objective.
- Materials the student uses are not grade/age appropriate.
- If the student is asked to make a choice, at least two items must be presented to the student.
- Prompt level is not clear.
- Student behavior is not observable and measurable.
- Stated criterion level for mastery is not 80-100% OR the stated criterion level for mastery does not permit required 80% mastery level.

Additional information provided to the TETs as guidance for making edits to the Mastery Objectives can be found in Appendix E.

If edits to the Mastery Objectives are required, the TET will revise the Mastery Objectives on Alt-MSA Online prior to printing the final version of the test documents for inclusion in the student portfolio.

8. Parent/Guardian Review

The "Alt-MSA Test Documents for Reading and Mathematics" are shared with the student's parents/guardians. Parents/guardians are invited to review, provide

suggestions, ask questions, and consider how they could reinforce the skills to be assessed at home and in the community.

Parents are not asked to approve the Mastery Objectives. However, if parents/ guardians indicate that their child has already mastered an objective, the TET must review the use of the Mastery Objective for the Alt-MSA. Parents are asked to sign the cover sheet and return it to the school.

9. Provide Instruction and Assess the Objectives

Teachers and Test Examiners plan for how each objective should be taught and assessed. During this process Test Examiners consult with general education teachers for ideas about how they teach and assess similar objectives. The general education teachers can provide a curricular context for teaching and assessing the objective. This helps Test Examiners teach the objectives and select the type of artifacts to be submitted as evidence of mastery.

All aspects of the Alt-MSA are conducted within the context of the ongoing daily instructional program. The Alt-MSA is a focus for team meetings. Test Examiners are not expected or encouraged to take any component of Alt-MSA portfolio development away from the school. The Alt-MSA portfolio is constructed within the context of daily instruction while involving the student, Test Examiner Team, and the parent/guardian.

Acceptable Evidence of Mastery

For each Mastery Objective, evidence that indicates the student has mastered the objective is included in the portfolio**.** The different types or categories of artifacts that may be submitted as evidence of mastery are described below. Examples are further described and illustrated in Part 7 of the Alt-MSA Handbook.

- **Student Work**
  Student work artifacts are artifacts generated or completed by the student that clearly reflect attainment of the Mastery Objective and provide direct evidence that the student has mastered the objective. Test Examiners are cautioned about submitting worksheets such as an activity sheet from an external source, like a workbook, textbook, or periodical, on which a student is required to recall and repeat information, select a pre-determined response, or provide limited or brief responses (e.g., circle a selection, identify a statement as true/false, fill in a blank). While commercially produced materials may be useful during instruction for the purpose of student practice, it is unlikely that they will completely align with the individualized Mastery Objectives written by the Test Examiners for a specific student.

- **Audiotape**
  When appropriate, Test Examiners may provide audio taped evidence of the student demonstrating the Mastery Objective. If possible, the student must introduce him/herself (or the Test Examiner may introduce him/her) and the

objective being assessed and the date must be stated. If the objective is not stated, the test item on the audiotape is not scored. Audiotapes are scored by rating the student as "mastered" or "not mastered" based on demonstration of the skill in relation to the Mastery Objective for the assessed objective. If the target student behavior is not observed within 5 minutes, the Mastery Objective is scored "not mastered."

- **Original Data Charts**
  Artifacts that display evidence of instruction over time and document student demonstration and attainment of the Mastery Objective are called data charts. Data charts are scored by rating the student as "mastered" or "not mastered" based on the recorded demonstration of the skill in relation to the components of the Mastery Objective for the assessed objective. The Test Examiner records student response(s) to specified target behavior(s) on a chart over a period of time. The data on the data chart must be original, not photocopied, typed or word-processed. It must have a minimum of three consecutive observations occurring/taken on different days prior to demonstration of mastery.

- **Videotape**
  A videotape is a required artifact for the Alt-MSA. Each student must be videotaped demonstrating mastery of at least two objectives, one from a Reading content standard and one from a Mathematics content standard. The videotape is the artifact for these two objectives. Additional objectives may also be videotaped and submitted as evidence of mastery. Videotaped demonstrations of Mastery Objectives should last no longer than five minutes per objective. If the student response is not observed by the scorer within five minutes, the Mastery Objective is scored "not mastered."

  For videotaped artifacts, students must introduce themselves (or a Test Examiner may introduce them) and the objective being assessed and the date must be stated. Videotape artifacts are scored by rating the student as "mastered" or "not mastered" based on demonstration of the skill in relation to the Mastery Objective.

  Parents/guardians are informed that (1) videotapes are required for the Alt-MSA, (2) only scorers who have signed Nondisclosure Agreements will view the videotapes, and (3) the videotapes are secured and destroyed after one year.

  If a parent/guardian states in writing that they will not allow their child to be videotaped, the following procedures must be followed:
  1. Three professional staff members must observe the student demonstrate the selected Reading and Mathematics Mastery Objectives. One observer may be the student's primary teacher, another observer may be a member of the professional instructional

team who is providing direct service to the student or another teacher, and the third observer must be a district representative not working in the particular school.

2. Each observer records a detailed observation of the entire student performance of the target Mastery Objectives. All observers must review their written observations for accuracy and completeness to be certain that all observed components of the written Mastery Objective are included in their observations. Observers print and sign their names at the end of the recorded observations. The student's name, grade, school, and Mastery Objective must be included at the beginning of the observation.

Artifacts that are not scored as evidence of mastery are:

- Checklists;
- Photographs of the student performing the objective;
- a narrative description of the student demonstrating the Mastery Objective; and
- any artifact that does not contain all the required Mastery Objective components (Part 5 of Handbook) or required artifact components (Part 7 of the Handbook).

Students are scored as "not mastered" for the objective if these artifacts are all that is submitted for the given Mastery Objective.

When collecting evidence of a student's attainment of each Mastery Objective, Test Examiner Teams must use judgment in selecting the type of artifact that would best demonstrate the student's mastery. For example, if a student is non-verbal and must indicate choices by pointing or pressing a switch, then an appropriate artifact might be a videotape, as opposed to an audiotape. Choosing an inappropriate artifact to represent attainment of an objective can result in scorers not being able to interpret the artifact and thus rendering the artifact non-scorable and the Mastery Objective receiving a score of "not mastered."

The tables at the end of Appendix F provide the percentage of Mathematics and Reading artifacts scored mastered or not mastered, or assigned a condition code in 2005-2006. For a given grade and subject the data provided in each column of these tables is as follows:

- Number of Students Assessed – the number of students who submitted a portfolio.
- Percent Proficient or Advanced – the percentage of all students who tested that achieved a proficiency level of Proficient or Advanced (i.e., obtained a mastery percentage score of 60 or above).
- Percent Objectives Mastered – the percentage of all submitted Mastery Objectives scored "Mastered".
- Percent of Objectives Not Mastered – the percentage of all submitted Mastery Objectives scored "Not Mastered".
- Percent of Objectives Non-Scorable – the percentage of objectives scored "Not Mastered" that received a "Non-Scorable" condition code.

- Artifacts Not Scorable – the percentage of objectives scored "Not Mastered" receiving each possible condition code (A, B, C, D, E, and F).

Required Artifact Components

Artifacts cannot be scored "mastered" if they are missing any of the required information described below:

1. Student's name
2. Date including month, day, year
3. Mastery Objective being assessed
4. % achievement of assessed Mastery Objective
5. Level of prompt used
6. Key to interpret Test Examiner notations

Eligible Test Examiners

Eligible Test Examiners for the Alt-MSA administration must be state-certified professional school staff and related service providers. Under the supervision of the Test Examiners, special education instructional assistants who typically provide instruction and support to the assessed student may copy documents to be included in portfolios, provide appropriate support to a student during an assessment, videotape and audiotape student demonstration of Mastery Objectives, and observe and record data of student demonstration of Mastery Objectives.

Regular and/or certified staff members who are not eligible as Test Examiners include:

- non-certified instructional assistants and aides who are not regular employees of the school district (e.g., student teachers, parents who serve as regular volunteers); and
- state certified teachers who are not regular employees of the school system and who are not on a substitute list.

2.4 Portfolio Organization

The Alt-MSA Portfolio contents are organized into four sections. The required components of each section are described below. Samples of all forms that must be included in the Alt-MSA Portfolio can be found in the Alt-MSA Handbook. They are also provided in Appendix G of this report.

Section 1: Student Information
This section includes the list of Test Examiners for the student, the final Alt-MSA 2006 Mastery Objectives for the student as revised with attached copies of feedback from Mastery Objective Review Process and the originally submitted "Reading and Mathematics Mastery Objectives," Pre-assessment of the selected grade level for Reading and Mathematics Content Standards if the student did not participate in Alt-MSA 2005, Alt-MSA 2005 Test Document (previous year's) and a copy of the student's IEP goals

and objectives. For a given student the Reading and Mathematics Test Documents indicate: the student's grade; the content standards/topics, indicators and objectives selected for assessment; the specific Mastery Objectives developed to assess the selected objectives; the types of artifacts submitted as evidence of mastery (e.g., Data Chart, Student Work, Videotape, Audiotape); the Test Examiner who administered each Mastery Objective; and the principal or designee's signature (see sample Test Documents in Appendix G).

Section 2: Parent/Guardian Participation

Section 2 contains all parent/guardian review and participation documents. One such document is a signed form indicating parental/guardian review of the selected Reading and Mathematics content standards to be assessed with the Alt-MSA. A Test Examiner sends a copy of the Alt-MSA Test Documents for Reading and Mathematics with a cover form to the parents/guardians. Parents/guardians are invited to review, provide suggestions, and consider how they could reinforce these skills at home and in the community. Parents/guardians are then requested to sign the cover form and return it to the school for inclusion in the portfolio.

Another document included in Section 2 is a signed parental review form indicating review of the final Alt-MSA portfolio. Upon portfolio completion, parents/guardians are asked to review their child's portfolio before it is submitted for scoring. In addition, they are invited to submit further examples of their child's demonstration of the assessed Mastery Objectives. These additional examples are included in the child's portfolio.

Test Examiners monitor and record the occurrence of each review. This information is summarized on the "Parent/Guardian Contacts" sheet which is also provided in Section 2 of the portfolio.

Section 3: Student Mastery of Reading Indicators and Objectives in the Context of Reading

If a student did not participate in the Alt-MSA in the previous year, the first page of this section is the pre-assessment of the selected grade level(s) for the Reading content standards; otherwise it is the Alt-MSA Test Document for Reading. The pages that follow the Test Document are the artifacts which provide evidence of attainment of the Mastery Objectives, including a videotape of the student demonstrating mastery of at least one Reading objective. For each selected objective within a Reading content standard at least one artifact must be included. To be scored, each component of the Mastery Objective must be clearly evident in the artifact submitted. The objective that is being assessed must be stated on the artifact. Every artifact must be dated (month/day/year), and a page number must be placed on the artifact that corresponds to the same page number in the Table of Contents. More than one artifact for each Mastery Objective may be submitted. Scorers do not score artifacts that do not clearly correspond to the Alt-MSA Test Examiner Document.

Section 4: Student Mastery of Mathematics Indicators and Objectives in the Context of Mathematics

If a student did not participate in the Alt-MSA in the previous year, the first page of this section is the pre-assessment of the selected grade level(s) for the Mathematics Content Standards, followed by the Alt-MSA Test Document for Mathematics content standards. The pages that follow the Test Document are the artifacts that are evidence of attainment of the Mastery Objectives. This includes the videotape of the student demonstrating mastery of at least one Mathematics objective. For each selected objective within a Mathematics content standard, or access skill, at least one artifact must be included. To be scored, each component of the Mastery Objective must be clearly evident in the artifact submitted. The objective that is being assessed must be stated on the artifact. Every artifact must be dated (month/day/year), and a page number must be placed on the artifact that corresponds to the same page number in the Table of Contents. More than one artifact for each Mastery Objective may be submitted. Scorers do not score artifacts that do not clearly correspond to the Alt-MSA Test Examiner Document.

Given the rare occurrence that a Mastery Objective is adjusted during the course of instruction, the Test Examiner must document this on the appropriate Test Document and write a new Mastery Objective that aligns with that objective. Such changes are only appropriate under the most exceptional of circumstances.

3.0 Scoring and Reporting

3.1 Scoring the Mastery Objective Review

During the Mastery Objective Review (MOR), the role of scorers is to determine whether the Mastery Objectives meet MSDE-required criteria. The Mastery Objectives are reviewed on alignment, conditions, student response, and criterion. The feedback is then given to the Test Examiners (TE) and they have the opportunity to change the Mastery Objectives based on the feedback from this technical review. In the fall of 2005, the MOR was completed by Pearson Educational Measurement's scoring center. This process was trained by the same Scoring Directors that oversee the portfolio scoring each spring and the goal was to staff the Mastery Objective Review process with as many scorers as possible that would also score the portfolios in the spring.

Recruitment of Scorers and Scoring Supervisors

Priority is given to individuals with previous experience in scoring the Alt-MSA and /or Alt-MSA MOR. This process allows for the selection of only the highest caliber of experienced scorers.

All selected scorers are required to meet the project's qualification standards (acceptable scores on an alignment qualifying set) and are subject to continual monitoring (i.e., back Reading and validity) for quality and accuracy. Back reading is the process by which a scoring supervisor reads a subset of each scorer's work to assess his or her scoring accuracy. Any issues discovered during this process are used for individual and group training. Validity is the process by which responses scored during range finding and approved by MSDE are presented to readers throughout the scoring process. The MOR is done via an online scoring system, which allows validity to be presented blindly to scorers. Scorers' agreement with the true scores assigned to these responses is monitored to ensure that individual scorers are consistently scoring in a manner which produces valid and reliable results.

Range Finding

Range finding is the process by which a wide range of Mastery Objectives are reviewed by a committee of experts for the purpose of selecting exemplars to use in the training, monitoring, and qualification of scorers and for establishing/revising the scoring guidelines. To the extent possible, these Mastery Objectives represent the range of abilities and characteristics in the population tested. The goal is to provide the range finding committee with a sample of Mastery Objectives that is diverse enough to highlight any issues that may be encountered during scoring and therefore should be addressed in training.

The Scoring Directors familiarize themselves with Mastery Objective samples prior to the range finding meeting. The Scoring Directors then meet with the MSDE to further review and discuss these Mastery Objectives, meet with MSDE Reading and Mathematics content experts, and plan how the range finding materials will be presented to the committee. The range finding agenda is finalized at this time.

At the start of the range finding meeting, the committee members, in conjunction with MSDE and PEM Scoring Directors, begin work by reviewing the MOR scoring rules. This helps the committee acquire a common understanding of standards so that they can score the Mastery Objectives accurately and consistently. Next, the range finding committee is introduced to their tasks: 1) reviewing and scoring the range finding Mastery Objectives to be used in the training of scorers, and 2) determining the scoring guidelines.

Throughout the meeting, the Scoring Directors maintain notes and record consensus scores, teacher comments, and discussions of Mastery Objectives. Teacher comments and discussion are used by staff to aid in scorer training. At the end of each day MSDE and Scoring Directors debrief by discussing the committee work and any scoring issues from the day. In addition, the agenda for the next day is discussed and adjusted as needed.

Immediately following the range finding meeting, MSDE and the Scoring Directors conduct a post-range finding session to finalize the scoring guide, training sets (i.e., anchor sets and practice sets), qualifying sets, and a validity set. The scoring guide, training sets, and qualifying sets are submitted to MSDE for approval and sign off before scoring training begins.

Scorer Training

Training begins with an introduction to the overall MOR process. This training introduces potential scorers to the schedule, provides an overview of the training and scoring process, explains general PSC training, scoring and quality control procedures, and gives specific information about Pearson Educational Measurement and the Alternate Maryland School Assessment.

Scorers are trained to score all grade levels in either Reading or Mathematics content areas First, an anchor set of Mastery Objectives, consisting of all training issues, is introduced to scorers. Then, a set of practice Mastery Objectives is used to give the scorers the opportunity to practice scoring. Finally, a set of qualifying Mastery Objectives is administered to the scorers to determine if they have fully grasped the scoring criteria and rules. After qualifying in one content area, live scoring begins and continues until all responses within that content area are scored. At that point the next content area is trained. Qualifying in the first two content areas in both Reading and Mathematics is done on paper. In the rest of the content areas, qualifying is through the online scoring system.

<u>Introduction</u>

During the introduction, hard copies of all training sets are provided to the scorers for review and discussion. Scorers are encouraged to take notes throughout the training process. Scorers are also provided with

- an overview of relevant vocabulary specific to special education and the alternate assessment,

- an introduction to the Maryland State Content Standards in both Reading and Mathematics and an explanation as to how these standards guide the assessed objectives,
- an introduction to terms used in the Mastery Objectives, and
- a description of required Mastery Objective components and sample Mastery Objectives.

At this point, the scorers are divided into two groups; one for Reading and one for Math. The scorers are provided with an in-depth review of the scoring guide for either Reading or Mathematics. Both groups of scorers are trained through the following means.

Anchor Portfolio Set and Scoring Guide

After the general introduction, the Scoring Director introduces the anchor sets of Mastery Objectives in conjunction with the content standards and scoring guide. The Anchor Set is a combination of Mastery Objectives that are exemplary and have common scoring issues. Each anchor Mastery Objective demonstrates a clear, straightforward presentation of some aspect of the concept being trained. The Scoring Director discusses the uniqueness of each Mastery Objective, highlighting critical information that demonstrates exactly why an objective receives a particular score. Anchor sets train scorers to understand the criteria for scoring and provide references for use during live scoring.

Practice Portfolio Sets

Practice portfolio sets allow scorers their first opportunity to practice scoring objectives on their own. Scorers score the practice sets independently using the anchor set, the content standards, and the scoring guide. Practice sets are designed to help scorers hone their skills and the issues presented are, therefore, not as straightforward as the anchor portfolios. This leads the scorers to more fully understand the MOR criteria and content standards. During practice, questions and interactions with the Scoring Director are encouraged so that scorers may further internalize the scoring guidelines. The Scoring Director reviews the scorers' responses and provides the correct scores.

Qualifying Portfolio Sets

After practice and review, scorers take a qualifying set in each content area. Again independently, the scorer uses all training materials to score the qualifying set. Each qualifying set consists of ten objectives. For a scorer to begin live scoring 80% perfect agreement is required within one of two qualifying sets. After each qualifying set, a review of the scores takes place in order for scorers to understand their errors. If a scorer does not qualify on the first set, the scoring director reviews that scorer's errors with him/her before administering a second qualifying set. Scorers not meeting the established guidelines by the end of the training session are dismissed. Once scorers have qualified, they are then divided into teams based on performance on the qualifying sets and prior experience. Scoring supervisors are assigned to teams and, at this point, scorers begin live scoring.

Training of Scoring Supervisors

Scoring supervisors receive the same content and MOR training as scorers, in addition to extra training on supervisory duties.

Scoring Procedure

The MOR takes place using an online scoring system. A single Mastery Objective appears on the computer screen and the scorer assigns a score for alignment, conditions, student response, and criterion. After the scorer submits the four scores, the next Mastery Objective appears on the computer screen. Each Mastery Objective is second scored. If a scorer reads a Mastery Objective that has different issues from those seen during training, he/she sends it to be reviewed by the Scoring Directors and MSDE.

Mastery Objectives for which the first and second scores do not agree are automatically sent for resolution. Resolution scoring is performed by the Scoring Director, Assistant Scoring Director, Scoring Supervisors, or designated scorers (experienced scorers). The Scoring Director supervises all individuals performing resolution readings.

Quality Control

Back Reading

Back reading provides information on scoring accuracy. Back reading is one of several methods of quality control whereby a scoring supervisor reviews a random sampling of responses for readers on their team to assess accuracy. Back reading is trained during scoring supervisor training, is initiated at the beginning of MOR, and continues throughout scoring. Any discrepant MOR scores found by scoring supervisors are used as training opportunities for individual scorers and/or teams. This helps eliminate scorer drift by alerting scorers to their mistakes at the team level and anchors them back to the training materials and scoring rules. Back reading results are documented and recorded by supervisors on back Reading tally forms. Back reading results are also captured electronically via the online scoring system.

Each day scoring supervisors review the training sets and scoring rules with his/her group of scorers. Reviewing the training materials keeps all scorers and scoring supervisors grounded in the guidelines established during training. If a scorer is absent for two days or more, he/she reviews all training materials and scoring rules with a supervisor, updating the scorer on any missed scoring decisions.

Validity Sets

Validity responses have “true scores” that are determined by the Scoring Director and the MSDE. These responses are entered into the online scoring system and are presented randomly to the scorers. The scorer is not aware that the response is a validity response. The percent agreement between readers’ scores and these “true scores” are provided in reports generated by the online scoring system.

Data Generated and Used by PSC Staff to Monitor Scorers and Scoring Accuracy and Control Scorer Drift

The Scoring Directors review and distribute reports daily to evaluate reliability and other scorer statistics. Enhanced summary reports provide team statistics so that these can be compared to the scoring group as a whole. These reports allow MSDE and the Scoring Directors to effectively work together to determine scoring misconceptions, prepare retraining materials and therefore reduce the number of resolutions.

Inter-rater Reliability Reports

The Scoring Director reviews inter-rater reliability reports daily to assess how accurately scorers are reviewing Mastery Objectives and whether the scorers are agreeing with each other, objective-by-objective. These reports are available in either daily or cumulative format.

To determine the source or nature of a potential misconception back reading tally sheets, notes compiled by scoring supervisors, and scores on validity responses are reviewed. The types of questions asked by scorers are also considered. Once the misconception is identified, a course of action is initiated. This may consist of any combination of the following activities; general group review, retraining of a smaller group of struggling scorers, group calibration on the area that scorers have the misconception about, and/or focusing back reading on the specific objective(s) that is being affected.

If inter-rater reliability reports show the group average at or above an acceptable level of 80%, the reliability percent for individual scorers is carefully considered. Any scorers falling below 70% are identified and an individual intervention log is opened. Depending on the nature and degree of disagreement, remediation for individual readers could involve individual review of training materials pertaining to specific scoring issues, retraining of a small group of struggling scorers, and/or focused back reading for poorly performing scorers. Scorers for whom remediation efforts do not show improved performance are released from the project.

Validity Reports

Validity reports document how often a scorer agrees with the "true scores" assigned to a pre-approved set of validity responses (i.e., the validity set).

The Scoring Director reviews the validity reports to identify struggling scorers and determines whether there is any room drift or a particular type of item or issue causing problems. A struggling scorer is defined as one below the Alt-MSA validity requirement of 80% agreement with "true scores" and/or agreement significantly below the room average. When identified, the Scoring Director and scoring supervisors monitor and provide remediation (using any of the previously mentioned tactics) to assist struggling scorers. Room drift occurs when a group of scorers consistently scores an item or set of items (e.g., one dimension such as alignment, conditions, behavior or mastery level) in the validity set incorrectly. If there is strong evidence of room drift, project management may consider retraining or calibration on that particular objective or type of item. There are reports designed specifically to monitor validity and are available in daily and cumulative formats.

All reports are monitored by the Scoring Director and Project Managers throughout the scoring process. The reports are also discussed with the MSDE on a regular basis. Based on these reports, back reading, and trends found in resolution scoring, it may be necessary to retrain on a particular item or create a calibration set. If needed, calibration sets are created by Scoring Directors and approved by MSDE staff. Calibration is a form of training that creates consensus and accuracy within the scoring pool (both scorers and supervisors). A calibration set focuses on one problem or issue. Calibration papers or portfolios are focused with a single, clear purpose. A list of the steps taken by the Scoring Directors to verify scorer accuracy and correct for scoring drift is provided in Appendix H.

Security at the Scoring Site

Providing an environment that promotes the security of the student test documents is of the utmost importance. Therefore, throughout the Alt-MSA MOR scoring process Pearson employs the following standard safeguards for security at the Virginia Beach site:

- Site personnel are stationed at the entrance to verify that only employees or vendors have access to the building.
- Alt-MSA materials may only leave the facility during the project with the permission of MSDE.
- All scoring staff at the Virginia Beach site sign a nondisclosure and confidentiality form in which they agree not to use or divulge any information concerning test documents, scoring guides, or individual student responses.
- All Virginia Beach staff is required to wear identification badges while in the scoring facility.
- No recording or photographic equipment is allowed in the scoring area without the consent of MSDE.
- Any contact made by the press is referred to MSDE.

In addition to site security, the process by which the Mastery Objectives are reviewed also provides test security. All of the Mastery Objectives are reviewed via an online scoring system. This system prevents scoring staff from seeing the student name, teacher name, and school information. The only demographic information that is displayed for the scorer is the student grade – this information is required in order for the scorer to determine whether the Mastery Objective condition utilize age/grade appropriate materials.

3.2 General Portfolio Scoring

The role of scorers is to judge whether the evidence submitted for each Mastery Objective, the artifact, demonstrates that the student has attained the conditions required for mastery of that objective. The following sections outline the procedures implemented by Pearson Educational Measurement's scoring center to verify and maintain the reliability and accuracy of the scoring process and results.

Recruitment of Scorers and Scoring Supervisors

In the selection of candidates for scoring the Alt-MSA, priority is given to (1) individuals with degrees in special education (2) individuals with previous experience in scoring the Alt-MSA and (3) individuals with previous experience in performance scoring. At a minimum, all scorers have a four-year college degree and must complete the formal application process including an interview. Such prescreening of candidates promotes the selection of only the highest caliber of scorers. Regardless of previous experience or education, however, all selected scorers are required to meet the project's qualification standards (acceptable scores on qualifying set) and are subject to continual monitoring (i.e., back reading and validity) for quality and accuracy. Back reading is the process by which a scoring supervisor reads a percentage of each scorer's work to assess his or her reliability. Any issues discovered during this process are used for individual and group training. Validity is the process by which portfolios scored during range finding and approved by MSDE are presented to readers throughout the scoring process. Because the Alt-MSA scoring is via a paper-based process, validity portfolios are not presented blindly to scorers. Scorers' agreement with the true scores assigned to these portfolios is monitored to ensure that individual scorers are consistently scoring in a manner which produces valid and reliable results. In 2005-06, scoring activities occurred at the Virginia Beach, Virginia scoring site; therefore, the majority of scorers resided in this general area. Scoring supervisors are chosen from the larger pool of scorers based on demonstrated expertise with the Alt-MSA scoring process, organizational abilities, and training skills. Individuals chosen to perform these assignments possess leadership abilities and positive interpersonal communication skills. Supervisors also possess the essential capability of helping scorers to understand the particular scoring requirements of the Alt-MSA. A list of all those involved in the Alt-MSA scoring effort and their roles is provided in Appendix I. Scoring supervisors are trained with the general scoring pool. Supervisors are chosen based on their qualification scores and past experience scoring the Alt-MSA.

Recruitment for the Alt-MSA begins approximately six weeks before the onset of scorer training.

Range Finding

Range finding is the process by which a wide range of portfolios are reviewed by a committee of experts for the purpose of selecting exemplars to use in the training, monitoring, and qualification of scorers and for establishing/revising the scoring guidelines. For the Alt-MSA, approximately 35-40 portfolios across all grade levels are chosen by MSDE for review in range finding:

To the extent possible, these portfolios represent the range of abilities and characteristics in the population tested as well as a range of artifact types. The goal is to provide the range finding committee with a sample of portfolios that is diverse enough to exemplify as many of the issues as possible that may be encountered during scoring. The range finding portfolio selection process for the current administration is outlined in Appendix J.

Prior to the range finding meeting, participating Scoring Directors review the training materials and scoring decisions from the previous year's scoring and familiarize themselves with the range finding portfolios. Scoring Directors then meet with the MSDE to further review and discuss these portfolios and plan the order of portfolio presentation. The range finding agenda is finalized at this time. To help maintain consistency in scoring from year to year portfolios from the previous year's training materials are used in the current training sets. Incorporating previously scored material into the current year's range finding and training sets helps to ensure that decisions made by past range finding committees will be communicated to the current year's committee. In 2005-2006, the acceptable prompt level included both the type and the number of prompts. This was not true for 2004-2005; therefore, many portfolios from 2004-2005 training sets required prompt level changes to be used in the training set.

At the start of the range finding meeting, the committee members, in conjunction with the MSDE and PEM Scoring Directors, begin work by reviewing the scoring rules and decisions from the previous year. This helps the committee acquire a common understanding of standards and promote consistency of scoring from year to year. Next, the range finding committee is introduced to their tasks: 1) reviewing and scoring the range finding portfolios to be used in the training of scorers, and 2) determining the scoring guidelines.

Throughout the meeting, PEM's Scoring Directors maintain notes and record consensus scores, teacher comments, and discussions of portfolios. Teacher comments and discussion are used by staff to aid in scorer training. At the end of each day MSDE and the Scoring Directors debrief by discussing the committee work and any scoring issues from the day. In addition, the agenda for the next day is discussed and adjusted as needed.

Immediately following the range finding meeting, the MSDE and the Scoring Directors conduct a post-range finding session to finalize the scoring guide, training sets (i.e., anchor sets and practice sets), qualifying sets, and a validity set. The scoring guide, training sets, and qualifying sets are submitted to MSDE for approval and sign off before scoring supervisor training begins.

At the end of the range finding meeting PEM provides the MSDE with the official range finding record, which includes consensus scores and teacher's comments. Both the MSDE and a scoring center staff member sign this record to certify that the scores have been recorded accurately. The PEM Scoring Director will later add information on the placement of each portfolio in the training and qualifying sets.

Alignment Training and Scoring

Training begins with an introduction to the overall scoring process. This training introduces potential scorers to the schedule, provides an overview of the training and scoring process, explains general PSC training, scoring and quality control procedures, and gives specific information about Pearson Educational Measurement and Alt-MSA.

Alignment Training

Before the general scoring training occurs, the alignment scorers are trained. In the initial phase of training, the alignment scorers are trained on the Maryland content standards and terminology.

Training for "prompt level" and "not enough items" takes place first. Next, alignment for each individual content standard is trained separately through anchor and practice sets. Each topic is trained and qualified on separately. After the anchor and practice papers for each Reading topic have been trained, qualification takes place. There are 10 qualifying papers for each topic for a total of two sets of qualifying papers. Trainees must achieve 80% in each topic to qualify for scoring. A second qualification set will be given for any topic that a trainee does not achieve 80%. Any scorer who does not attain 80% will take a second qualification set after all content standard topics have been trained.

Qualification is required on each of the ten content standard areas. In addition to alignment training, "prompt level" and "not enough items" are also trained and qualification is required in these areas also. Scoring Supervisors are trained with the scorers, but are also trained on specific supervisory duties.

For scorer qualification, potential scorers record their scores for the qualification set on a "scoring monitor" form. The Scoring Director then manually examines the monitor forms to determine whether a scorer has met the qualification criteria.

The Training Process: Explanation of Alignment Scoring

In 2005-2006, alignment scoring is the first step in the scoring process. Alignment scoring refers to checking each Mastery Objective to verify that each Mastery Objective aligns with the Maryland state content standards and that the prompt level is acceptable. PEM reviewed all submitted Mastery Objectives in the fall of 2005. At that time, feedback was given to the Test Examiners with respect to required edits. Based on this feedback, the Test Examiners had the opportunity to revise the Mastery Objectives in order to meet Alt-MSA technical requirements. During alignment scoring, scorers recheck those Mastery Objectives that required edits as a result of the MOR to determine whether the Mastery Objectives align with the Maryland state content standard and if the prompt level is acceptable. After alignment scoring, the portfolios are scored by the general scoring pool. Potential alignment scorers and scoring supervisors are trained on and must qualify in both Reading and Mathematics content areas. Scoring Supervisors are chosen from the pool of qualified scorers. Qualification consists of two sets of 10 objectives that were created using rules established in the fall of 2005. To be considered qualified, trainees must achieve 80% on each topic.

Alignment scorers concentrate on scoring alignment prior to portfolio scoring. Alignment scorers participate during the training and qualifying for general portfolio scoring when the alignment scoring is complete.

The portfolios are 100% second scored. Second scorers are assigned on a random basis to portfolios (i.e., the same second scorer does not always follow a first scorer). Supervisors resolve scores which are not in exact agreement between the first and second scorers.

General Scoring

A separate group of scorers are trained to score all grade levels in both Reading and Mathematics content areas. The Alt-MSA scoring procedures and rubric are presented in context with student portfolios. First, an anchor set of portfolios, consisting of all training issues, is introduced to scorers. Then, a set of practice portfolios is used to give the scorers the opportunity to practice scoring. Finally, a set of qualifying portfolios is administered to the scorers to determine if they have fully grasped the scoring criteria and rules.

Introduction

During the introduction, hard copies of all training sets are provided to the scorers for review and discussion. Scorers are encouraged to take notes throughout the training process. Scorers are also provided with

- an overview of relevant vocabulary specific to special education and the alternate assessment;
- an introduction to the Maryland State Content Standards in both Reading and Mathematics and an explanation as to how these standards guide the assessed objectives;
- an explanation of portfolio contents and organization;
- the criteria for acceptable evidence of mastery;
- a description of required Mastery Objective components and sample Mastery Objectives; and
- an in-depth review and discussion of the scoring procedures and rubric
- a condition code packet with examples of "A" through "E" condition codes.

Anchor Portfolio Set and Scoring Guide

After the general introduction, the Scoring Director introduces the anchor portfolios in conjunction with the content standards and scoring rules. The Anchor Set is a combination of portfolios that are exemplary and portfolios with common scoring issues. Each anchor portfolio demonstrates a clear, straightforward presentation of mastery or non-mastery of the objectives. The Scoring Director discusses the uniqueness of each portfolio, highlighting critical information that demonstrates exactly why an objective is considered mastered or not. Four anchor portfolios train scorers to understand the criteria for scoring and provide references for use during live scoring.

Practice Portfolio Sets

As a part of training, scorers practice score sets of practice portfolios. Through two practice sets of four portfolios each, scorers hone their skills to understand the scoring guidelines, content standards, and evidence of mastery. Scorers score the practice sets independently using the anchor set, condition code packet, the content standards, and the scoring rules as guidelines. Scoring the practice portfolios is not as clear as the anchor portfolios. Practice portfolios contain questionable objectives and artifacts that may not be straightforward. During practice, questions and interaction are encouraged so scorers may further internalize the scoring guidelines. The Scoring Director reviews the scorers' practice portfolios and provides the correct scores. Practice is an essential part of the training procedure.

Qualifying Portfolio Sets

After practice and review, scorers take a qualifying set of three portfolios. Again independently, the scorer uses all training materials to score the qualifying set. Each qualifying set consists of three complete portfolios. For a scorer to begin live scoring 80% perfect agreement is required on each of three portfolios within one of two qualifying sets. After each qualifying set, a review of the scores takes place in order for scorers to understand their errors. If a scorer does not qualify on the first set, the scoring director reviews that scorer's errors with him/her before administering a second qualifying set of three portfolios. Scorers not meeting the established guidelines by the end of the training session are dismissed. The percentage of scorers that qualified to score the current administration and the average qualification score (i.e., percent agreement) overall and by content area is provided in Appendix A, Table 2.

Once scorers have qualified, the Scoring Director trains the portfolio flow, including how to first and second score. Scorers will also be trained on the alert process. At that point, scoring supervisors are chosen based on qualification rate and past experience scoring the Alt-MSA. Scorers are then divided into teams based on performance on the qualifying sets and prior experience. This ensures that less experienced or less expert scorers will receive more individual attention. Two scoring supervisors are assigned to each team and, at this point, scorers begin live scoring.

Training of Scoring Supervisors

Scoring supervisors receive the same content and scoring training as scorers, in addition to extra training on supervisory duties. Each supervisor receives training on the material circulation. A select group of scoring supervisors also receives additional training on resolution scoring.

Distribution of Portfolios to Scoring Teams

Upon arrival at the scoring site material handlers unload and check in student portfolios. Boxes arrive in numbered batches. Material handlers check each portfolio in on a shipping list and then file it in a secure warehouse according to batch number until scoring.

At scoring time, material handlers deliver a batch of approximately 24 portfolios to the scoring supervisor of a team. The supervisor signs off receipt of the batch on the Warehouse Batch Tracking Log. Scorers sign out an individual portfolio on a Batch Tracking Log that remains with each batch. They then transfer completed portfolios to an area designated "first score complete." Material handlers collect the portfolios and bring them to a different scoring team for second scoring. When all of the portfolios associated with a batch have gone through second scoring they are collected from the "second score complete" area and returned to the warehouse to be filed. No team reviews the same batch of portfolios twice.

Scoring Procedure

The Alt-MSA Scoring Process is defined in Appendix F. This document chronologically defines the steps a reader should follow to review a portfolio and score the associated

artifacts. It also delineates the scoring rubric and provides examples of Mastery Objectives/artifacts that would receive a condition code rather than a score.

Each scorer receives an entire portfolio for this process. Each artifact within a portfolio is scored at least two times. Portfolio artifacts for which the first and second scores do not agree are sent to resolution. Resolution readings are identified by the supervisors and performed by the Scoring Director, Assistant Scoring Director, Scoring Supervisors, or designated agent (experienced scorers). Resolution scorers are chosen on the first day of scoring in order to keep up with the number of resolutions being produced. The Scoring Director supervises all individuals performing resolution readings. Some Mastery Objectives may not be scorable according to MSDE criteria. If a scorer believes that a Mastery Objective is not scorable, for whatever reason (i.e., alignment issues, artifact not dated or name missing, or as determined by current administration scoring rules), the scorer brings the portfolio to his/her supervisor for review. If the supervisor is uncertain how to score the objective, the Scoring Director is consulted. If a score or condition code cannot be determined based on established scoring rules, the MSDE is consulted. Any scoring decisions or policy rulings are documented by the Scoring Director.

After the appropriate score or condition code is determined by supervisory staff, the score or code is recorded on both the first and second scoring monitor by the scoring supervisor. (The scoring monitor is the scannable document that allows each student's scores to be captured electronically.) This helps to ensure that a second scorer will not be bringing the same issue to the attention of supervisors and the Scoring Director after it has already been reviewed by supervisory staff.

The percentages of 2005-2006 student artifacts scored mastered or non-mastered, or assigned a condition code are presented by grade at the end of Appendix F.

Quality Control

Back Reading

Back reading is a source of information on scoring accuracy. Back reading is one of several methods used to monitor reader accuracy whereby a scoring supervisor reviews a random sampling of scores assigned by readers on their team to assess accuracy. Back reading is trained during scoring supervisor training, is initiated at the beginning of scoring, and continues throughout scoring. This process is used to monitor scorers, to help eliminate drift by alerting scorers to their mistakes at the team level, and anchoring them back to the training materials and scoring rules. Back reading results are documented and recorded by supervisors on back reading tally forms.

Each day every team reviews the training sets and scoring rules. Reviewing the training materials keeps all scorers and scoring supervisors grounded in the guidelines established during training. If a scorer is absent for two days or more, he/she reviews all training materials and scoring rules with a supervisor, updating the scorer on any missed scoring decisions. The scorer also takes a validity portfolio to verify that he/she is still scoring accurately.

Validity Sets

Validity portfolios are portfolios whose "true scores" have already been determined by the Scoring Director and the MSDE. These validity portfolios are administered on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Every scorer is given the validity portfolio at the same time. The validity scoring monitors are then scanned and the results are given to the supervisors immediately. Scorers that receive less than 80% agreement in Reading or Mathematics receive remediation and review of the validity portfolios. The average percent agreement between readers' scores and the "true scores" for these validity sets is provided in Table 3 of Appendix A for the current administration.

Validity reports and other reports generated by the Electronic Paper Scoring System (ePS) are described below.

Data Generated and Used by PSC Staff to Monitor Scorers and Scoring Accuracy and Control Scorer Drift

The Scoring Directors review and distribute reports daily to evaluate reliability and other scorer statistics. Enhanced summary reports provide team statistics so that these can be compared to the scoring group as a whole. These reports allow MSDE and the Scoring Directors to effectively work together to determine scoring issues and reduce the number of resolutions. Samples of all reports referenced below are provided in Appendix J.

- **Inter-rater reliability reports:**
  The Scoring Director and MSDE review inter-rater reliability reports daily to assess how accurately scorers are assigning scores, objective-by-objective. There are three reports that address inter-rater reliability specifically and these are available in either daily or cumulative format.
  - The first is the "Portfolio Statistics Summary Report." It presents a snap shot at the project level. This report provides a quick, high-level view of how reliably the scorers are scoring overall. It includes data showing what percentage of scores correctly match the true scores assigned by the range finding committee in the Validity % column, what the percent of matching scores is between two scorers in the Reliability % column and how many resolutions were generated by nonadjacent scores. This information is broken down by subject.
  - The second report "Portfolio Statistics by Scorer and Team" provides additional detail. Scoring Directors use this report to look at individual scorer, team, and room totals and determine if any retraining is needed. If a scorer team or the room as a whole has an average agreement below the acceptable level of 80%, it indicates that there is a misconception held by a portion of the scorers that needs to be addressed. Percent agreement on validity sets and the reliability of resolution scores is also provided.
  - The third report that is consulted is the "Portfolio Statistics by Objective." It breaks down reliability, validity and resolution information by objective. This allows Scoring Directors to ascertain whether there is a specific objective is causing difficulty for scorers. In addition, it shows the number of resolutions that were scored "Not Mastered" versus the number that were scored "Mastered."

To determine the source or nature of a potential misconception, back reading tally sheets, notes compiled by scoring supervisors, and scores on validity responses are reviewed. The types of questions asked by scorers are also considered. Once the misconception is identified, a course of action is initiated. This may consist of any combination of the following activities; general group review, retraining of a smaller group of struggling scorers, group calibration on the area that scorers have the misconception about, and/or focusing back reading on the specific score point(s) that is being affected.

If inter-rater reliability reports show the group average at or above an acceptable level of 80%, the reliability percent for individual scorers is carefully considered. Any scorers falling below 70% are identified and an individual intervention log is opened. Depending on the nature and degree of disagreement, remediation for individual readers could involve: individual review of training materials pertaining to specific scoring issues, retraining of a small group of struggling scorers, and/or focused back reading for poorly performing scorers. Scorers for whom remediation efforts do not produce improved performance are released from the project.

- **Frequency distribution reports:**
  Frequency distribution reports document the percentage of scores assigned to each score point (0/1) and condition code (A, B, C, D, E, F) by team, reader and the group overall. These reports are reviewed by the Scoring Director. If a scorer is assigning significantly more or fewer of a particular score point or condition code than the group/room average, retraining may be required. For the Alt-MSA the "Frequency Distribution Report is disaggregated by Objective (e.g., Reading Objective 1). In this way the Objective area(s) for which a scorer is out of sync can be identified to indicate what the emphasis for retraining should be.
  Since this is a fairly lengthy report only the first page is provided for review in Appendix K.

- **Validity reports:**
  Validity reports document how often a scorer agrees with the "true scores" assigned to a pre-approved set of validity responses (i.e., the validity set).

  The Scoring Director and MSDE review the validity reports to identify struggling scorers and determine whether there is any room drift or a particular type of item or issue causing problems. A struggling scorer is defined as one below the Alt-MSA validity requirement of 80% agreement with "true scores" and/or agreement significantly below the room average. When identified, the Scoring Director and scoring supervisors monitor and provide remediation (using any of the previously mentioned tactics) to assist struggling scorers. Room drift occurs when a group of scorers consistently scores an item (artifact) or set of items (e.g., all Reading Objective 1 items) in the validity set incorrectly. If there is strong evidence of

room drift, project management may consider retraining or calibration of that particular objective or type of item.

There are two reports designed specifically to monitor validity and each is available in daily and cumulative formats. They are the "Validity by Portfolio and Reader" and the "Validity by Portfolio" reports. Each of these reports provide the "true score" associated with each Mastery Objective (as agreed on by the range finding committee) and the percent of all scorers taking a particular validity portfolio that agreed with these true scores. In addition, the "Validity by Portfolio and Reader" report shows the percentage of true scores *each scorer* agreed with for a given validity portfolio. In both of these reports agreement data is provided by content area, and for the portfolio overall.

All reports are monitored by the Scoring Director and Project Managers throughout the scoring process. The reports are also discussed with the MSDE on a regular, ongoing basis. Based on these reports, back reading, and trends found in resolution scoring, it may be necessary to retrain on a particular item or create a calibration set. If needed, calibration sets are created by the Scoring Directors and approved by MSDE staff. Calibration is a form of training that creates consensus and accuracy within the scoring pool (both scorers and supervisors). A calibration set focuses on one problem or issue. Calibration papers or portfolios are focused with a single, clear purpose. A list of the steps taken by the scoring center to verify scorer accuracy and correct for scoring drift is provided in Appendix H.

Security at the Scoring Site

Throughout the Alt-MSA scoring process the following standard safeguards are implemented for security at the Virginia Beach site:

- Site personnel are stationed at the entrance to verify that only employees or venders have access.
- Alt-MSA materials may only leave the facility during the project with the permission of the Maryland State Department of Education.
- All PEM staff at the Virginia Beach site sign a nondisclosure and confidentiality form in which they agree not to use or divulge any information concerning tests, scoring guides, or individual student responses.
- All Virginia Beach staff is required to wear PEM identification badges while in the scoring facility.
- No recording or photographic equipment is allowed in the scoring area without the consent of MSDE.
- Any contact made by the press is referred to MSDE.

3.3 Standard Setting

Proficiency levels were established for the Independence Mastery Assessment Program (IMAP) in summer of 2003. IMAP was the predecessor assessment to the Alt-MSA. This process involved Maryland educators applying a portfolio paper sorting method to the 2002-2003 assessment results. In order to ensure uniform performance standards between IMAP and Alt-MSA, a process of equipercentile linear transformation was used to

translate the IMAP growth score proficiency level cut points to the Alt-MSA mastery percentage proficiency level cut points. This process resulted in two performance standards on the mastery percentage scale that define the basic, proficient, and advanced proficiency levels described below.

***Basic**: Students at this level demonstrate 0% to 59% mastery of the skills tested in Reading and Mathematics.*

***Proficient**: Students at this level demonstrate 60% to 89% mastery of the skills tested in Reading and Mathematics.*

***Advanced**: Students at this level demonstrate 90% or greater mastery of the skills tested in Reading and Mathematics.*

3.4 Reports

A variety of reports are described and listed in this section. Samples of some of these reports can be found in Appendix J of this document.

Description and Interpretation of Scores

The following scores are calculated and reported to students, schools, and/or districts that participate in the Alt-MSA.

Mastery Objective Score

Each student who participates in the Alt-MSA is assessed on 20 unique Mastery Objectives: 10 for each subject area. A Mastery Objective is a clear statement of the specific response a student must provide (and the conditions under which it must be provided) in order to demonstrate mastery of a particular objective. For each Mastery Objective assessed, an appropriate artifact is submitted in the student's Alt-MSA portfolio for scoring. The artifact is scored as either exhibiting mastery or non-mastery of the associated objective. If mastery status cannot be determined the student is assigned a not-scorable condition code for that Mastery Objective (see Appendix F).

By themselves Mastery Objective scores provide only an indication of whether or not the artifact submitted for a given Mastery Objective met the requirements for mastery. Unless a condition code is provided, no further information can be gleaned from this score. Specific information regarding how and why mastery was (or was not) obtained must be determined from the submitted artifact and its accuracy score (i.e., the value compared to the 80% mastery criterion).

Given the purpose of the Alt-MSA, and therefore the manner in which Mastery Objectives are developed and assessed, one must be careful not to generalize Mastery Objective scores beyond the specifics of the task assessed. Although Mastery Objectives are developed to map back to the Maryland State Content Standards, success on a specific Mastery Objective may not generalize to a similar task measuring the same underlying objective. In order to make generalizations regarding a student's knowledge and skills with respect to an underlying objective further evidence of success is typically

required. Average Mastery Objective scores for the current administration can be found in Appendix A, Tables 4 and 5 for Reading and Mathematics, respectively. For each content standard/indicator the value provided indicates the percentage of all artifacts associated with that content standard/indicator that were scored as "mastered." For example, if the average Mastery Objective score associated with the Phonics/Phonemic Awareness indicator were 0.85, this would indicate that 85% of the submitted Mastery Objectives associated with this indicator were scored "mastered."

Mastery Percentage Score

Within each subject area the proportion of Mastery Objectives scored as "mastered" (i.e., that have an artifact that meets the criteria outlined for mastery) is the mastery percentage score for that subject. Mastery percentage scores are used to categorize students into one of three different proficiency levels: Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. Each proficiency level identifies a particular range of mastery percentage scores that corresponds to a level of academic achievement. (See section 3.2 of this document for a description of standard-setting process and the resulting proficiency level definitions.) The ultimate goal of NCLB is for all students to reach the Proficient or Advanced level.

The Alt-MSA is intended to assess each student on a set of skills and objectives that are appropriate, yet challenging. As a result, the specific set of Mastery Objectives assessed is different for each student. This would seem to suggest that a given student's mastery percentage should not be compared to that of another student or the state/system/school average. To an extent this is true. It is quite possible that the set of Mastery Objectives developed for a given student could be much different than the set developed for another student, after taking into account their respective levels of functioning. If, however, each student is assessed on a set of tasks developed to be at the *appropriate level of difficulty*, as the developers of the Alt-MSA intended, mastery percentage comparisons may be appropriate. The goal is for all students to be held to the same standards relative to a set of challenging and appropriate objectives. Therefore, the work or degree of educational growth required by a student to achieve a 60% mastery percentage (the score needed to be deemed proficient) should be approximately equivalently challenging for all students regardless of the specific tasks assessed.

Appendix A, Tables 6 and 7 provide mastery percentage frequency distributions in Reading and Mathematics for the current administration. Average mastery percentage scores are provided in Table 8. In addition, the percentage of students classified in each proficiency level given these mastery percentages can be found in Appendix A, Tables 9-11 and 12-14 for Reading and Mathematics, respectively. The tables provide counts and percentages for the total group tested, as well as broken out by socioeconomic status (i.e., free/reduced lunch) and ethnicity.

Reports

All districts receive the following standard reports:

Home Report
The Alt-MSA home report provides parents/guardians information about their child's overall performance on the Mathematics and Reading objectives assessed in the current

administration. These reports provide the student's mastery percentage score and corresponding proficiency level for each subject area. The average mastery percentage score for the student's school and district and the state overall is also reported.

The overall purpose of these reports is to provide parents/guardians feedback as to the percentage of submitted Mastery Objectives scored mastered within each subject and how these percentages translate into proficiency levels. In addition, the normative school, district and state percentages allow parents to compare the performance of their child to the average performance of those students taking the Alt-MSA in their school, district, and the state overall. When making such comparisons, however, it is important to remember that each student is assessed on a different set of tasks specifically designed to meet his/her educational goals.

Label
A label is produced for each student who participates in the Alt-MSA. The label includes the student's name, gender, ethnicity, LEA, and school name, as well as his/her Mathematics and Reading proficiency level.

Report to Principals
The Principal's report provides a general description of the Alt-MSA program, including the process used to score portfolios and the means by which proficiency level cut-scores were established. This report also provides principals with guidelines for using the provided Alt-MSA results to support instructional planning and overall program evaluation.

The Principal's report includes a section with student portfolio feedback. This section provides information for principals and teachers about a student's performance relative to each Mastery Objective assessed. For each Mastery Objective within a subject area the report indicates whether it was mastered, not mastered, or not scorable. For those Mastery Objectives deemed not scorable the condition code assigned is provided and defined. Student portfolio feedback reports are used in conjunction with student portfolios to help Test Examiner Teams identify those indicators and objectives that should be the focus of assessment for individual students in the upcoming year.

School/System/State Summary Report
The format of the school, system, and state summary reports is identical. These reports differ only in the population of students used to calculate the reported results. The summary report provides a general description of the Alt-MSA program, a description of the scoring process, and some guidelines for the use and interpretation of assessment results. In addition to this informative text, a data driven sub-report providing the percentage of submitted artifacts (in the school, system, or state) for Mathematics and Reading considered mastered, not mastered, and not scorable by grade level is produced. This data is intended to inform instructional planning, support program and resource evaluation, and identify topics for professional development.

4.0 Reliability and Validity

4.1 Reliability

Reliability is quantification of the consistency of results from a measurement. The ability to measure consistently is a necessary prerequisite to making appropriate score interpretations (i.e., showing evidence of valid use of the results). For an alternate assessment such as the Alt-MSA there are several conceptualizations of reliability that might be considered. One is the consistency of the observed outcomes associated with a given skill (Schafer, 2005), generally known as test homogeneity. If a student has truly mastered a skill, mastery should be evident over occasions, settings and even tasks. If this is not the case, it suggests that the student was either scored incorrectly (i.e., he/she did not really display mastery), or that mastery interpretations cannot be generalized beyond the conditions of the original assessment task (e.g., occasion, setting, etc.).

Another important aspect of reliability is the consistency with which the specified scoring process can be employed by scorers, generally known as interrater reliability. Pearson Educational Measurement (PEM) uses several procedures to verify that all Alt-MSA portfolios are scored reliably.

- Training procedures and materials are standardized for all participating scorers. This is true not only within an administration year, but to the extent possible, across administrations.
- The scoring process and scoring rules are clearly documented so there is no ambiguity as to how scoring issues should be handled.
- Validity and reliability reports are reviewed on a regular basis to identify scorer drift, outliers, and general scoring misconceptions (as defined by the portfolios in the validity set). These reports are used to inform scorers of their validity and reliability scores. The scoring director analyzes the reports and informs the supervisor of any concerns. The scoring supervisor in turn reviews any pertinent reports with the scorer. Supervisors monitor these scorers by back reading more frequently and checking their reliability and validity rates.

Reader Agreement

As previously discussed, the monitoring of reader agreement begins during reader training. After practice and review readers must meet the standard qualification criteria set forth by the MSDE in order to begin live scoring. Specifically, readers must achieve at least 80% agreement, objective-by-objective, with a set of pre-established "true" scores determined by the MSDE on one of two qualifying sets of portfolios (see Chapter 3). Agreement for a given reader is calculated as the percentage of "true" artifact scores associated with a given portfolio (20 total: 10 each for Math and Reading) that the reader matched during scoring.

During live scoring every portfolio is read at least twice by different readers, therefore agreement between the readers is a common measure of reliability. These data are monitored on a daily basis by PEM during the scoring process. Daily inter-rater reliability

reports show the percent perfect agreement of each reader against all other readers. Agreement at the group level is expected to be at least 80%. If group agreement is less that 80% mediation is initiated starting with those scorers exhibiting the lowest reliability. If group agreement is above 80%, individuals with less than 70% receive intervention (see section 3.1).

Tables 15-17 in Appendix A summarize reader agreement for each subject area by content standard/topic and overall for the current test administration. Reader agreement rate is expressed in terms of exact agreement (i.e., the percentage of cases in which the first reader's score equals the second reader's score). High inter-reader agreement implies that the scoring process and scoring rules are being applied consistently across readers.

Scoring Consistency 2005-2006

In order to make valid interpretations about school/district improvement as reflected in changes in the percentage of students at each proficiency level, students must be held to the same standards, or standards that have been changed as planned from one year to the next. In the context of the Alt-MSA this requires reliable scoring procedures and systematic standards (i.e., standards that are a part of the MSDE system for improvement) be used to determine the mastery/non-mastery of assessment tasks. Changes in the percentage of students at each proficiency level across years must be considered within the context of planned change for the system.

A research study was conducted to examine and document the consistency of the Alt-MSA scoring process by examining agreement, given planned improvements to the system, between the scores assigned to a set of portfolios (artifacts) in 2005 and 2006. In this context the scoring process refers specifically to the process by which readers are selected, trained, qualified, and monitored. If the scoring process is well defined and reliable in both 2005 to 2006 we would expect estimates of within year agreement (i.e., interrater reliability) to be similar and estimates of across year agreement to reflect improvements in the system. Results from the study support adequate levels of agreement within 2005 and 2006, and expected across year agreement for mastery scoring, objective-by-objective, for a sample of 269 portfolios. Full results of the study are reported in Appendix L.

4.2 Validity

As previously stated, assessment results must show evidence of reliability for the purpose for which they were intended before they can show evidence of validity. Validity relates to the appropriateness or strength of the assessment results for making specific interpretations about what students know and can do. As documented in Standard 1.1 of the Standards for Educational and Psychological Measurement (1999), validity evidence should be collected for every intended interpretation and use of the scores resulting from a measurement instrument.

The purpose of the Alt-MSA is multifold, as outlined in the first chapter of this document. The assessment is intended to provide a measure of student progress to inform parents and to allow evaluation of instructional programs, to inform ongoing instruction by helping teachers plan instruction for the following year, and to comply with federal

mandates. A student's Alt-MSA results and portfolio should help teachers determine his/her level of functioning at the time of the assessment, indicate specific skills acquired and those requiring continued instruction, and identify supports and assistive technologies previously employed. This information can be used to inform the review and revision of a student's IEP and supports the construction of a well-structured plan for instruction and assessment in the upcoming year. In addition, by reviewing previously submitted portfolios in conjunction with historical data, teachers can get an indication of a student's rate of progress relative to certain subject and content standard areas.

According to Messick (1993), and supported by PEM's applied and scientific efforts in the field, all sources of validity evidence must be considered as a whole and validation of an assessment for a purpose is an ongoing process. With this in mind, PEM and MSDE have taken a formative-summative evaluation approach to validation of the Alt-MSA In a formative approach, face and content validity have been built into the Alt-MSA through careful content alignment with the MSA standards. As noted above and in other sections of this report, PEM and MSDE have focused their portfolio development materials and training efforts on establishing strong relationships between the Alt-MSA and the Maryland standards, hereby creating content validity. Likewise, content validity is strengthened in the Alt-MSA through Mastery Objective development and review. This process is intended to hold teachers/schools/districts accountable for implementing standards-based curriculum and using assessment results to improve student learning. The annual Alt-MSA development and administration process helps to make certain that teachers/schools/districts are focused on the development, instruction, and assessment of challenging performance goals that are aligned with the state content standards. Alt-MSA results should inform and support program evaluation at the classroom, school, and district levels. This includes identification of both resources that may further support instruction, and topics for professional development of staff. Also in a formative manner, valid interpretation and use of Alt-MSA results have been emphasized in report development at every level. In addition, for the 2005-2006 assessment, staff from PEM reviewed each Mastery Objective to verify alignment to, and appropriate representation of, the underlying objective identified by the Test Examiner. This review provided feedback to Test Examiners regarding how the Mastery Objective could be improved and whether alignment was an issue.

Summative evaluation of Alt-MSA validity currently consists of a series of four research studies. These studies include two reported in this volume, one examining Mastery Objective tasks over time, and the other examining scoring consistency over time. A third study, currently in the planning stage, will be a collaborative effort between MSDE, PEM and the University of Maryland to assess the extent to which the skills outlined in a student's IEP are being assessed with the Alt-MSA. Or, in other words, the extent to which a student's Alt-MSA mastery objectives align to the educational goals in his/her IEP. A fourth study is in development and will examine the consequential validity of the Alt-MSA.

Consequential Validity Evidence

When establishing evidence to support the appropriateness of a test relative to a set of assessment goals, it is important to evaluate both the intended and unintended consequences of the assessment process and results (Messick, 1993). This is especially the case for a portfolio-based assessment such as the Alt-MSA where the assessment development and administration process can be relatively complex and labor-intensive.

In addition to providing information about how the Alt-MSA is perceived by stakeholders, a periodically administered survey may assist the MSDE in making inferences about the consequences of the Alt-MSA (both positive and negative). For example, one of the open-ended questions posed to teachers and test coordinators in 2004 was: "Next year as test coordinator/teacher I plan to . . ." If, in reviewing the responses to this question, we find a significant number of teachers stated that they "plan to develop assessment tasks that better reflect their student's general education curriculum activities," the MSDE has some evidence that the assessment process is influencing instruction. In this case the process is working as intended by increasing the alignment between the assessment tasks and the student's general education curriculum activities. In a similar manner, survey responses may shed light on some unintended, negative consequences of the Alt-MSA that can be addressed before the next administration.

Finally, Appendix M presents analysis results regarding the overall types of issues that have been seen by the scorers during portfolio scoring. These results can provide MSDE with an overview of the areas in which teachers appear to be having difficulty. This information will also allow MSDE to focus on any weaknesses that need to be addressed through teacher training. Because scorers come in contact with a wide variety of portfolios, their feedback can provide useful insight about test examiners' misconceptions and/or weaknesses in building portfolios.

References

AERA/APA/NCME (1999). *The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.* Washington DC: American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education.

Maryland State Department of Education (2004). *Alternate- Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA) Handbook: 2004-2005*. Maryland: Author.

Messick, S. (1993). Validity. In R.L. Linn (ed.), *Educational Measurement*, (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Schafer, William D. (2005). Technical Documentation for Alternate Assessments. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 10(10). Available online: http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=10&n=10

Appendix A

Table 1. Participation by Grade, Gender, Ethnicity, and SES

(N = 4,896)

Grade	Frequency	Percent of Students Participating in Alt-MSA	Percent of Total Statewide Enrollment per Grade
3	575	11.74	0.94
4	524	10.70	0.84
5	571	11.66	0.89
6	722	14.75	1.10
7	793	16.20	1.18
8	919	18.77	1.34
10	792	16.18	1.13
Total	4896	100.00	1.07

Gender	Frequency	Percent of Students Participating in Alt-MSA	Percent of Total Statewide Enrollment Across Grades
Male	3112	63.56	1.32
Female	1784	36.44	0.80
Total	4896	100.00	1.07

Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent of Students Participating in Alt-MSA	Percent of Total Statewide Enrollment Across Grades
American Indian	15	0.31	0.81
Asian American	171	3.49	0.71
Black	2326	47.51	1.33
White	2110	43.10	0.95
Hispanic	274	5.6	0.78
Total	4896	100.00	1.07

Free/Reduced Lunch	Frequency	Percent of Students Participating in Alt-MSA	Percent of Total Statewide Enrollment Across Grades
NO--does not participate	2624	53.59	0.85
YES--does participate	2270	46.36	1.51
No Response	2	0.05	NA
Total	4896	100.00	1.07

Table 2. Scorer Qualification Results
(N =84)

	Percentage Meeting Qualification Criterion (80% agreement)	Average Qualification Score (percent agreement) by Content Area and Overall		Standard Deviation
Scorers/Scoring Supervisors	89	Reading	88.77	8.68
		Mathematics	84.86	9.95
		Overall	86.82	5.54

**Note: N refers to total number of readers who met qualification standards. Ten readers did not qualify; the qualification score results reflect the performances of the 84 scores who qualified. Averages are based on 212 percent-agreement scores generated by these readers during the qualification process.

Table 3. Summary of Performance on Validity Sets
(N=434)

Average Percent Agreement on Validity Portfolios by Content Area and Overall		Standard Deviation
Reading	90.83	10.50
Mathematics	83.41	12.62
Overall	87.09	9.38

**Note: N refers to the total number of validity portfolios scored over readers.

Table 4. Percentage of Mastery Objectives Scored "Mastered" by Reading Content Standard/Topic
(N = 9,792)

Content Standard/Topic	Mean	Standard Deviation
Phonemic Awareness/Phonics	0.62	0.41
Vocabulary	0.64	0.42
General Reading Comprehension	0.63	0.42
Comprehension of Informational Text	0.62	0.42
Comprehension of Literary Text	0.62	0.43

**Note: N refers to the number of artifacts associated with each content standard.

Table 5. Percentage of Mastery Objectives Scored "Mastered" by Mathematics Content Standard
(N = 9,792)

Content Standard	Mean	Standard Deviation
Algebra/Patterns/Functions	0.67	0.41
Geometry	0.66	0.41
Measurement	0.66	0.41
Statistics	0.63	0.43
Number Relationships/Computation	0.66	0.41

**Note: N refers to the number of artifacts associated with each content standard.

Table 6. Reading Mastery Percentages for All Students Tested
(N=4,896)

Proficiency Level	Reading Mastery Score	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Advanced	100	1057	21.59	1057	21.59
	90	782	15.97	1839	37.56
Proficient	80	562	11.48	2401	49.04
	70	386	7.88	2787	56.92
	60	327	6.68	3114	63.60
Basic	50	266	5.43	3380	69.04
	40	239	4.88	3619	73.92
	30	245	5.00	3864	78.92
	20	230	4.70	4094	83.62
	10	323	6.60	4417	90.22
	0	479	9.78	4896	100.00

Table 7. Mathematics Mastery Percentages for All Students Tested
(N = 4,896)

Proficiency Level	Mathematics Mastery Score	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Advanced	**100**	1281	26.16	1281	26.16
	90	809	16.52	2090	42.69
Proficient	**80**	498	10.17	2588	52.86
	70	378	7.72	2966	60.58
	60	298	6.09	3264	66.67
Basic	**50**	282	5.76	3546	72.43
	40	223	4.55	3769	76.98
	30	201	4.11	3970	81.09
	20	201	4.11	4171	85.19
	10	305	6.23	4476	91.42
	0	420	8.58	4896	100.00

Table 8. Average Reading and Mathematics Mastery Percentage Scores for All Students Tested
(N = 4,896)

			Reading Mastery Percentage Score		Mathematics Mastery Percentage Score	
		N	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaskan Native	15	54.67	34.82	56.67	34.16
	Asian/Pacific Islander	171	61.11	34.94	64.27	33.83
	African American	2326	59.62	35.41	62.62	35.15
	White	2110	66.08	33.40	69.32	33.00
	Hispanic	274	59.64	34.72	63.72	34.38
Free/Reduced Lunch	NO	2624	60.29	35.18	63.60	34.95
	YES	2270	64.90	33.83	67.90	33.38
	Not Provided	2	100.00	0.00	90.00	14.14
Total Group		**4896**	**62.44**	**34.63**	**65.61**	**34.29**

Table 9. Reading Proficiency Level Frequencies
(N = 4,896)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Advanced	1839	37.56	1839	37.56
Proficient	1275	26.04	3114	63.60
Basic	1782	36.40	4896	100.00

Table 10. Reading Proficiency Level Frequencies by Free/Reduced Lunch Designation (Percentages)
(N = 4,896)

Participating in Free/Reduced Lunch	Proficiency Level			
	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	Total
NO--Not Participating	1015 (38.68)	691 (26.33)	918 (34.98)	2624
YES--Participating	767 (33.79)	584 (25.73)	919 (46.48)	2270
Not Provided	0 (----)	0 (----)	2 (100.00)	2

Table 11. Reading Proficiency Level Frequencies by Ethnicity (Percentages)
(N = 4,896)

Ethnicity	Proficiency Level			Total
	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	7 (46.67)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	15
Asian/ Pacific Islander	64 (37.43)	45 (26.32)	62 (36.26)	171
African American	929 (39.94)	581 (24.98)	816 (35.08)	2326
White	677 (32.01)	564 (26.73)	869 (41.18)	2110
Hispanic	105 (38.32)	81 (29.56)	88 (32.12)	274

Table 12. Mathematics Proficiency Level Frequencies
(N = 4,896)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Advanced	1632	33.33	1632	33.33
Proficient	1174	23.98	2806	57.31
Basic	2090	42.69	4896	100.00

Table 13. Mathematics Proficiency Level Frequencies by Free/Reduced Lunch Designation (Percentages)
(N =4.896)

Participating in Free/Reduced Lunch	Proficiency Level			Total
	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	
NO--Not Participating	938 (35.75)	628 (23.93)	1058 (40.32)	2624
YES--Participating	694 (30.57)	545 (24.01)	1031 (45.42)	2270
Not Provided	0 (----)	1 (50.00)	1 (50.00)	2

Table 14. Mathematics Proficiency Level Frequencies by Ethnicity (Percentages)
(N = 4,896)

Ethnicity	Proficiency Level			Total
	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	7 (46.67)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	15
Asian/ Pacific Islander	65 (38.01)	37 (21.64)	69 (40.35)	171
African American	847 (36.41)	584 (25.11)	895 (38.48)	2326
White	615 (29.15)	484 (22.94)	1011 (47.91)	2110
Hispanic	98 (35.77)	65 (23.72)	111 (40.51)	279

Table 15. Percent Perfect Reader Agreement by Reading Content Standard/Topic
(N = 9,792)

Content Standard/Topic	Mean
Phonemic Awareness/Phonics	92.05
Vocabulary	93.20
General Reading Comprehension	92.00
Comprehension of Informational Text	92.75
Comprehension of Literary Text	92.35

**Note: N refers to the number of artifacts associated with each content standard/topic.

Table 16. Percent Perfect Reader Agreement by Mathematics Content Standard
(N = 9,792)

Content Standard	Mean
Algebra/Patterns/Functions	92.15
Geometry	92.70
Measurement	92.25
Statistics	91.85
Number Relationships/Computation	92.35

**Note: N refers to the number of artifacts associated with each content standard/topic.

Table 17. Percent Perfect Reader Agreement Over All Students
(N = 48,960)

	Mean
Reading	0.93
Mathematics	0.92

**Note: N refers to the total number of artifacts associated with each content area.

Appendix B

Alt-MSA Timeline 2005-2006

[Directions that Differ for Special Placement Schools are indicated by bold italics]

June 7, 2005	LACs and AMFs attend MSDE train-the-trainer on Alt-MSA administration and development of Mastery Objectives.
June 8, 2005	***LEA 24 STCs attend MSDE training on Alt-MSA administration and development of Mastery Objectives.***
September 1, 2005 − March 15, 2006	2005−2006 Test Window. There will be no extensions of the test window due to adjustments in the school calendar for weather-related closings. Dates of Mastery on artifacts must be within the test window.
June − September, 2005	LACs and AMFs provide training or information sessions in Alt-MSA administration to principals, STCs, and TEs ***(STCs).***
September 1, 2005 − October 4, 2005	LACs and LEA 24 STCs submit Alt-MSA materials order online.
September 1 − 30, 2005	Principal, STC, and TE meet to: • identify TEs (teachers, related service providers, and instructional assistants) who will form the TET for each participating student. Complete TE form for each student. • identify roles and responsibilities for each member of the TET. • develop an implementation schedule and monitoring plan to assure portfolio completion by March 15, 2006.
September 1, 2005 – October 15, 2005	Student's TET • selects Reading and Mathematics indicators and objectives that will be assessed, based either on 2005 Alt-MSA test results or on a pre-assessment. • completes Alt-MSA Test Documents for Reading and Mathematics; writes Mastery Objectives for each content standard and topic to be assessed, identifies TEs for each Mastery Objective and the type of artifact. • sends copy of Alt-MSA Test Documents for Reading and Mathematics to parent/guardian with cover form. • Arranges for principal or designee review of Mastery Objectives to assure they are measurable and aligned with the state content standards and topics to be assessed. Mastery Objectives that do not have the mandatory components should be returned to TEs for revision.
October 15, 2005	Submit Alt-MSA Test Documents/Mastery Objectives for Reading and Mathematics for each student participating in Alt-MSA to test contractor for technical adequacy review.
October 24, 2005 − November 15, 2005	Alt-MSA test contractor reviews Mastery Objectives. Test documents and feedback posted by November 15.

November, 2005	LACs ***(STCs)*** submit pretest file for students in grades 3−8 and 10 who will participate in Alt-MSA (combined MSA/Alt-MSA file, submitted to Alt-MSA test contractor's SchoolHouse website).
March 15, 2006	STC collects all Alt-MSA portfolios and unused test materials and packs for pickup from school. • For schools selected for Range finding, portfolios and unused materials will be picked up on March 16, 2006. • Test contractor will pick up Alt-MSA test materials from all schools March 17, 2006 through March 21, 2006.
March, 2006	Range finding and preparation of scoring guides by MSDE and test contractor.
April 17 − 21, 2006	LAC ***(STC)*** submits post-test file to MSDE.
April − May, 2006	Alt-MSA Portfolios are scored.
June, 2006	Alt-MSA results and home reports sent to schools.

Appendix C

Contributors to the Alt-MSA Development and Administration Process: Roles and Responsibilities

Local Accountability Coordinator

LACs in each school system[1] have the following responsibilities:

- participate in Alt-MSA training conducted by MSDE and the test contractor and sign Certification of Training Form.
- send 2004 Test Documents to School Test Coordinators (STCs).
- submit pretest and posttest files.
- provide Alt-MSA training for STCs and appropriate information to principals about Alt-MSA requirements, including their role and responsibilities.
- ensure that STCs, schools, and Test Examiners have access to the appropriate and necessary materials to complete the assessment (e.g., Alt-MSA Handbook, portfolio supplies, etc.).
- ensure that STCs train Test Examiner Teams and Test Examiners appropriately for the Alt-MSA administration.
- answer questions from schools and Test Examiners regarding the Alt-MSA.
- forward issues in need of resolution related to the assessment to MSDE.
- ensure that the testing is administered appropriately and within the state-specified timeframe.
- ensure that all materials are returned for scoring as specified in the Alt-MSA Handbook.

Principal

The principal in each school has the following responsibilities:

- becomes familiar with Alt-MSA procedures and responsibilities.
- establishes the Test Examiner Team for each student and monitors the portfolio development process.
- facilitates opportunities for Test Examiner Teams to meet and plan Alt-MSA implementation.
- ensures compliance with test procedures.
- secures resources needed for Alt-MSA.
- reviews Test Examiner Documents, signs, and forwards to LAC.

School Testing Coordinator

STCs in each school have the following responsibilities:

- participate in Alt-MSA training conducted by the LAC and Alt-MSA Facilitator or other local school system representative and sign Certification of Training Form.

[1] In addition to students in the public schools, students who are in special placements in non-public settings but supported by public funding also participate in the Alt-MSA. (These schools are commonly referred to in Maryland as "Special Placement Schools.")

- provide Alt-MSA training for Test Examiner Teams and Test Examiners and provide every Test Examiner their own copy of the Alt-MSA Handbook.
- read appropriate sections of the Alt-MSA Handbook.
- order materials and provide access to necessary materials for use in the assessment and arrange for additional materials to be supplied if needed by coordinating with the LAC.
- ensure that Test Examiner Teams have the student Test Documents from the prior testing year in order to inform the selection of Mastery Objectives for the current assessment year.
- monitor the construction of student Mastery Objectives by the Test Examiner Teams and ensure that they are submitted on a timely basis in the proper format for review and signoff by the principal.
- ensure that completed, approved objectives are submitted to the test contractor in a timely manner.
- ensure that Test Examiner Teams receive and integrate feedback from the test contractor into revised Mastery Objectives.
- answer questions from Test Examiner Teams and Test Examiners, and forward to the LAC questions/issues which the STC does not know the proper response.
- apply preprinted student barcode labels to all Alt-MSA student materials, or train and directly supervise individuals who will apply the labels to student materials (e.g., student portfolio, videotape, audiotape, etc.).
- monitor portfolio construction during the testing period and ensure that portfolios are being constructed appropriately throughout the testing period.
- facilitate creation by Test Examiner Teams of videotape artifacts for at least one Reading and one Mathematics Mastery Objective for each student portfolio.
- collect completed portfolios from all Test Examiners at the end of testing.
- pack scorable portfolio materials and unused portfolio materials and ship in accordance with the timing and instructions provided in the Alt-MSA Handbook.

Test Examiner Teams (TETs)

Each Test Examiner Team (TET) has the following responsibilities:

- participates in Alt-MSA training as conducted by the LAC and Alt-MSA Facilitator, STC, principal or other local school system representative and signs Certification of Training Form.
- reads the Alt-MSA Handbook.
- constructs appropriate Mastery Objectives for each student considering the student's Mastery Objectives from the prior year, and performance on the prior-year Alt-MSA Mastery Objectives, or the pre-assessment results, and current IEP.
- completes Mastery Objectives according to the timeline as presented in the Alt-MSA Handbook and submits the objectives for review.
- assures that Test Documents are sent to Parents/Guardians and they are invited to review the Alt-MSA Portfolio.
- receives feedback provided by the Test Contractor on Mastery Objectives and integrates that feedback, as appropriate, into revisions of the Mastery Objectives for each student.

- plans and identifies individual Test Examiners responsibilities for the Alt-MSA Portfolios and records on Test Documents.
- provides guidance and support to Test Examiners in construction of the student Alt-MSA Portfolio.
- coordinates and conducts videotaping of one Reading and one Mathematics Mastery Objective artifact for each student.
- monitors construction of the Alt-MSA portfolio to ensure that it is being completed on a timely and appropriate basis by the Test Examiner.

Test Examiners

Each Test Examiner (TE) has the following responsibilities:

- participates in Alt-MSA training as conducted by the LAC and Alt-MSA Facilitator, STC, principal or other local school system representative and signs Certification of Training Form.
- reads the Alt-MSA Handbook.
- constructs appropriate Mastery Objectives for each student considering the student's Mastery Objectives from the prior year, and performance on the prior-year Alt-MSA Mastery Objectives, or the pre-assessment results, and current IEP.
- completes Mastery Objectives according to the timeline as presented in the Alt-MSA Handbook and submits the objectives for review.
- assures that Test Documents are sent to Parents/Guardians and they are invited to review the Alt-MSA Portfolio.
- receives feedback provided by the Test Contractor on Mastery Objectives and integrates that feedback, as appropriate, into revisions of the Mastery Objectives for each student.
- plans and identifies individual Test Examiners responsibilities for the Alt-MSA Portfolios and records on Test Documents.
- provides guidance and support to Test Examiners in construction of the student Alt-MSA Portfolio.
- coordinates and conducts videotaping of one Reading and one Mathematics Mastery Objective artifact for each student.
- monitors construction of the Alt-MSA portfolio to ensure that it is being completed on a timely and appropriate basis by the Test Examiner.

Instructional Assistants

Each Instructional Assistant has the following responsibilities:

- attends training provided by School Test Coordinator and signs Certification of training form.
- reads the Alt-MSA Handbook.

Under the supervision of the Test Examiners, instructional assistants participate as a member of the Test Examiner Team and are allowed to:

- copy documents to be included in portfolios.
- provide appropriate support to students during assessment.
- videotape and audiotape student demonstration of Mastery Objectives.

- observe and record data of student demonstration of Mastery Objectives.
- send forms to parent/guardian and document contact with parent/guardian.

Student

Students participate in the development of their portfolios. It is the assessment of their mastery of Reading and Mathematics skills. The principles of self-determination are critical for students who participate in the Alt-MSA.

Parents/Guardians

Active parent/guardian participation in student learning reinforces the school instructional program. Parents/guardians are invited to review, provide suggestions, ask questions, and consider how the objectives can be applied at home and in the community. Parents are asked to sign and return the cover form and submit examples of their child's demonstration of the Mastery Objectives. A sample of the forms reviewed and signed by parents is provided in Appendix D.

Alt-MSA Facilitator

The Alt-MSA Facilitator in each local school system has the following responsibilities:

- participates in Alt-MSA training conducted by MSDE and the test contractor and signs Certification of Training Form.
- attends Alt-MSA Facilitator meetings scheduled by MSDE.
- collaborates with the LAC to plan and implement in-depth training for school test coordinators and Test Examiners; and provides information to principals.
- contacts appropriate MSDE staff for answers to questions.
- provides professional development relating to Alt-MSA in local school system.

Appendix D

Multi-Year Review of Mastery Objectives

Purpose

One of the main goals of the Alt-MSA is to provide teachers with information that will inform future instruction. Consequently, we propose that teachers reference Alt-MSA assessment results when outlining instructional goals and developing assessment activities for the upcoming year, and adjust Mastery Objective tasks for a student from year to year accordingly. A student's portfolio and his/her associated artifact scores are extremely beneficial in this regard because they describe what a student can or can not do relative to a set of well-defined mastery objective tasks. Further, a review of previously submitted portfolios in conjunction with historical data may provide some indication of a student's rate of progress relative to certain subject and content standard areas.

This research study rests on the assumption that teachers *change* Mastery Objective tasks for a student across years, versus using the same tasks across years. This routine would not only follow best practices in general for pedagogy and assessment with the severely mentally disabled (SMD) populations, but specifically, it follows the Alt-MSA philosophy and training. Given the lack of recent research on the nature of tasks used to build evidence for alternate assessment portfolios in general and on the stability of task selection in particular, the current research study focuses on this basic building block of the Alt-MSA. From these results, we can infer with some confidence the extent to which Alt-MSA results influence instruction as reflected in the progression of student Mastery Objectives from one year to the next for a sample of students. Or, synonymously, how/if the Mastery Objectives in one year influence the content of the Mastery Objectives assessed the following year for a given sample of students. If a student's assessment results suggest he/she is ready is ready to move forward with regard to a given objective or task, we propose that this would be reflected in the Mastery Objective tasks developed for that student for the following year. Evidence that such readiness was being acknowledged may be, for example, if a previously assessed mastery objective was modified to reflect a higher degree of difficulty the following year. Evidence to the contrary might be if a previously mastered mastery objective was assessed again the following year.

In order to examine change in the development of Mastery Objective tasks, we first organized a taxonomy of how Mastery Objectives (within a given content standard) could change from one year to the next. This categorization scheme was based on PEM's existing knowledge base, developed by a group of alternate assessment experts, and finalized with MSDE staff and technical experts. Categories within the taxonomy are listed below.

1. No change–mastery objective is identical to that assessed last year
2. Heightened mastery level criterion–same overall task but with an increased performance expectation for mastery
3. Reduced mastery level criterion–same overall task but with a decreased performance expectation for mastery.

4. Reduced support–same overall task but with a decreased level of allowable support (fewer supports and/or a lessened degree of prompting).
5. Enhanced support–same overall task but with an increased level of allowable support (more supports and/or a greater degree of prompting)
6. Related task, new observable measurable response–related mastery objective requiring a different observable, measurable student behavior.
7. Completely new task–no obvious link between the mastery objective assessed this year and those assessed last year for a given content standard.
8. Same overall task but done with different words, letters, numerals, etc. For example, student will order numbers 1 to 5. Following year, student will order numbers 1 to 7. Another example, student will recognize the letters A, B, and C. Following year, student will recognize the letters D, E, and F.

This taxonomy is useful for our present research needs, as well as future work in this area, for it not only provides categories for general, unspecified changes in tasks, but can also be used to further classify changes in tasks into four meaningfully different, distinct types:

a. no change in task (i.e., category 1),
b. task changes that show academic growth or increased demand on the student (i.e., categories 2, 4 and 6),
c. task changes that show need for academic remediation or decreased demand on the student (i.e., categories 3 and 5), or
d. changes for which directionality cannot be determined (i.e., categories 7 and 8).

Type "d" highlights the fact that it will not always be possible to determine whether a change in the mastery objectives associated with a given content standard reflects growth or need for remediation, or is only an indication that Mastery Objective tasks have changed-- which is the basic question in this study. In addition to identifying general change in tasks within portfolios across years, this research will provide initial evidence of the utility of our taxonomy for future Alt-MSA research describing the nature of task change in detail longitudinally.

Design and Methodology

A representative sample of 260 Alt-MSA portfolios from 2005 for which 2006 portfolios were available were selected for use in the current research. This sample represents approximately 5% of the student population assessed for Alt-MSA. The selected sample represented a range of ability levels (most impacted, medium impacted, and highest-functioning students), gender, ethnicity groups and geographic locations. Students were selected from three grade level pools – elementary, middle, and high school. The sample consisted of 260 of the 269 students with portfolios in the *Alt-MSA Scoring Consistency* research study (see Appendix L). This feature of the research design provides information about the sample that is useful for interpreting the results across studies, as well as provides links to be made between these data for future research. Demographics for the overall *Alt-MSA Scoring Consistency* sample are provided in Table D.1.

Table D.1 Sample demographics compared to 2005 population

	Research Sample(N=269)				2005 Population (N=5047)			
	Freq	Percent	Cum. Freq	Cum. Percent	Freq	Percent	Cum. Freq	Cum. Percent
Race								
Amer. Indian	0	0	0	0	16	0.32%	16	.32%
Asian Amer.	8	3%	8	3%	167	3%	183	4%
Black	135	50%	143	53%	2432	48%	2615	52%
White	115	43%	258	96%	2181	43%	4796	95%
Hispanic	11	4%	269	100%	251	5%	5047	100%
Gender								
Male	174	65%	174	65%	3224	64%	3224	64%
Female	95	35%	269	100%	1823	36%	5047	100%
Grade								
3	22	8%	22	8%	517	10%	517	10%
4	35	13%	57	21%	536	11%	1053	21%
5	31	12%	88	32%	683	14%	1736	34%
6	16	6%	104	39%	777	15%	2513	50%
7	43	16%	147	55%	892	18%	3405	67%
8	28	10%	175	65%	830	16%	4235	84%
10	94	35%	269	100%	812	16%	5047	100%
LEP Services Indicator								
E	1	0.37%	1	0.37%	33	1%	36	1%
N	264	98%	265	99%	4966	98%	5002	99%
Y	4	1%	269	100%	45	1%	5047	100%

Note. E = Exited the program, not currently receiving LEP Services within last 2 years; N = No, not receiving LEP services; Y = Yes, currently receiving LEP services.

The 2005 and 2006 student portfolios for this sample were compiled and provided to the Pearson Scoring Director who trained the portfolio scoring in the spring of 2006. The Scoring Director trained a team of reviewers to compare Mastery Objectives across portfolios and provide ratings data. The trained scoring team reviewed each Mastery Objective from 2006, compared it to the Mastery Objectives associated with the same content standard in 2005 and categorized how or if it had changed. The change category (i.e., defined above) for each Mastery Objective was then entered into a rating sheet (see Appendix D.1) which also captured the student's unique ID.

Additionally, two other ratings were captured for Reading and Math, plus a third for Reading only. The first two of these ratings focused on the age/grade appropriateness of the Mastery Objectives each year, and the degree to which that aspect of the portfolio changed across years. The third ratings for Reading only focused on if the Mastery Objective used phonics or phonemic awareness for either or both years. Upon completion of the primary ratings, 100% of the Mastery Objectives were recoded by a second trained in order to verify the reliability of the classification process. Mastery Objectives for which the two scorers disagreed were resolved by the Scoring Director.

Rules for categorizing tasks included:

- When assessing the objectives, both objectives within each content area must be considered. For example, within "algebra, patterns, and functions" the scorer will have to check both objectives 1 and 2 from both years, because objectives 1 and 2 are within "algebra, patterns, and functions." The examiner may have written objective 1 from 2005 and it matches objective 2 in 2006.
- Data for Categories 1-8 will be collected together. If a mastery objective comparison falls into more than one category, then more than one category will be noted in the research. There is NOT a hierarchy for gathering data in Categories 1-8. Category 2, for example, does not take priority over category 4.

Eight experienced scorers conducted ratings for the Alt-MSA *Multi-Year Review of Mastery Objectives* research study. These scorers were all supervisors on the Alt-MSA operational assessment in the spring, 2006. For this research study, scorers were trained through a training set using a scoring rubric. They were presented mastery objectives in an anchor set and were given the opportunity to score individually through practice sets. Each set consisted of mastery objectives from 2005 that were compared to Mastery Objectives from 2006. Training also took place on prompt levels provided to students and the Maryland state content standards in both reading and math. Instructions given to scorers are provided below.

- The scorer will bubble the appropriate category 1-8 bubbles for each Mastery Objective comparison. In some cases, the scorer may bubble more than one bubble on one of the Mastery Objective rows.
- On the phonics/phonemic awareness row, the scorer will bubble:
  - 0 if they used phonics/phonemic awareness in 2005 but not 2006
  - 1 if they used phonics/phonemic awareness in 2006 but not 2005
  - 2 if they had no change in the use of phonics/phonemic awareness
- On the grade/age appropriate line, the scorer will bubble:
  - 0 for less (if 2006 has fewer Mastery Objectives that are age/grade appropriate)
  - 1 for same (if 2006 and 2005 have the same # of age/grade appropriate Mastery Objectives)
  - 2 for more (if 2006 has more Mastery Objectives that are age/grade appropriate)
- On the grade/age appropriate line, the scorer will also write the number more or number less. This number will not prompt resolution (only the 0, 1, or 2 noted above will generate a resolution on this row).

Analysis and Results

After the Mastery Objectives for all 260 portfolios were coded, the 100% recode was complete, and discrepancies were resolved, several frequency distributions (e.g., overall, by content area, and by Mastery Objective) describing the number and percentage of mastery objectives classified in each change category (1-8) were generated.

Inter-rater reliability

Absolute agreement between raters one and two for all codes assigned to each of the ten Mastery Objectives for Reading and each of the ten Mastery Objectives for Math was necessary for resolution to not occur. Resolution was conducted by a Scoring Director and was used as the

final rating when existing. Absolute agreement between raters one and two averaged 93% across all Mastery Objective ratings for Reading, and 86% across all Mastery Objective ratings for Math.

Frequency of category code use

Frequencies of the use of each category code by raters are provided in Table D.2. There was little to no variability in code use, that is, virtually all of the raters used code #7 (i.e., "Completely new task–no obvious link between the mastery objective assessed this year and those assessed last year for a given content standard") for all 260 of the 2005-2006 portfolio pairs across all 20 Mastery Objectives. In over 95% of the ratings, category #7 was used. The next most used codes were #6 and #8, each accounting for slightly more than 2% of the total code use.

Slight differences in code use distributions were found across subject areas. For Reading only, over 98% of the ratings were a category #7 code ($m = 252$). The next most used codes in Reading were #6 and #8, each accounting for slightly less than 1% of the total code use ($m = 2$). For Math only, 92% of the ratings received a category #7 code ($m = 232$). And the next highest used codes were again, #6 and #8, each accounting for nearly 4% of the total code use ($m = 10$).

Little to no differences in code use were found by Mastery Objective in Reading, with practically no difference in the use of code #7 across the ten Reading objectives ($m = 252$, $sd = 2.5$). A similar result was found for Math, with little practical difference in the use of code #7 across the ten Math objectives ($m = 236$, $sd = 8$). The data were examined for trends in the use of codes other than #7, both by objective and by person. No trends were found, that is, there were not a few cases in which codes other than #7 were used.

Table D.2. Frequency of category code use by subject area

	Total frequency of category use in rating 260 portfolios with 10 Mastery Objectives per subject	
Category	Reading	Math
1. No change–mastery objective is identical to that assessed last year	**3**	**3**
2. Heightened mastery level criterion–same overall task but with an increased performance expectation for mastery	**2**	**1**
3. Reduced mastery level criterion–same overall task but with a decreased performance expectation for mastery.	**0**	**0**
4. Reduced support–same overall task but with a decreased level of allowable support (fewer supports and/or a lessened degree of prompting).	**3**	**3**
5. Enhanced support–same overall task but with an increased level of allowable support (more supports and/or a greater degree of prompting)	**2**	**9**
6. Related task, new observable measurable response–related mastery objective requiring a different observable, measurable student behavior.	**18**	**102**
7. Completely new task–no obvious link between the mastery	**2517**	**2361**

objective assessed this year and those assessed last year for a given content standard.		
8. Same overall task but done with different words, letters, numerals, etc. For example, student will order numbers 1 to 5. Following year, student will order numbers 1 to 7. Another example, student will recognize the letters A, B, and C. Following year, student will recognize the letters D, E, and F.	**21**	**101**

Phonemic awareness

The use of "phonemic awareness, phonics" objectives within and across years was an important category to examine for the Reading subject area. If in 2005, "phonemic awareness, phonics" objectives were used, but in 2006 the teacher did not use "phonemic awareness, phonics" objectives, but substituted other content standards for objectives 1 and 2 or vice versa, this was coded on the rating sheet (Appendix D.1) as follows:

- On the phonics/phonemic awareness row, the scorer will bubble:
  - 0 if they used phonics/phonemic awareness in 2005 but not 2006
  - 1 if they used phonics/phonemic awareness in 2006 but not 2005
  - 2 if they had no change in the use of phonics/phonemic awareness

Results of this analysis are presented in Table D.3. Unlike the results from the analysis of frequency of category code by objective, where the objectives were nearly always changed, here the use of phonics did not change 73% of the time. Change appears to be primarily toward the use of phonics for objectives and not the opposite.

Table D.3. Phonics/phonemic awareness use

Category	Frequency	Percent
"0" used phonics/phonemic awareness in 2005 but not 2006	62	23.85%
"1" used phonics/phonemic awareness in 2006 but not 2005	9	3.46%
"2" no change in the use of phonics/phonemic awareness	189	72.69%
Total	260	100.00%

Grade/age appropriateness of Mastery Objectives

The grade/age appropriateness of objectives and how that differed across years was the final focus of our analysis. The ratings were accomplished as outlined below:

- On the grade/age appropriate line, the scorer will bubble:
  - 0 for less (if 2006 has fewer Mastery Objectives that are age/grade appropriate)
  - 1 for same (if 2006 and 2005 have the same # of age/grade appropriate Mastery Objectives)
  - 2 for more (if 2006 has more Mastery Objectives that are age/grade appropriate)

- On the grade/age appropriate line, the scorer will also write the number more or number less. This number will not prompt resolution (only the 0, 1, or 2 noted above will generate a resolution on this row).

Tables D.4 and D.5 include the results from the grade/age appropriateness analysis. For Reading, 93% of the portfolios included at least as many, if not more Mastery Objectives that were grade/age appropriate in 2006 as 2005, but the most likely state was that the portfolio would have more Mastery Objectives that were grade/age appropriate in 2006 than in 2005. The number of Math Mastery Objectives that were grade/age appropriate in 2005 was much more likely to be constant in 2006, than increased or decreased. A very small percent of cases included more grade/age appropriate Mastery Objectives (i.e., 8%) in 2006 than 2005, and nearly no portfolios included fewer grade/age Mastery Objectives in 2006.

Table D.4 Grade/age appropriateness of Reading Mastery Objectives

Category	Freq	Percent	Number of MO's more/less
' 2006 has fewer MOs that are age/grade appropriate	16	6%	Range 1-10 fewer MO's Average of 3 fewer MO's grade/age appropriate
' 2006 and 2005 have the same # of age/grade appropriate MOs	81	31%	
' 2006 has more MOs that are age/grade appropriate	161	62%	Range 1-10 more MO's Average of 4 more MO's grade/age appropriate
Total	258	100%	

Table D.5 Grade/age appropriateness of Math Mastery Objectives

Category	Freq	Percent	Number of MOs more/less
' 2006 has fewer MOs that are age/grade appropriate	7	3%	Range 0-1 fewer MO's Average of 1 fewer MO grade/age appropriate
' 2006 and 2005 have the same # of age/grade appropriate MOs	231	89%	
' 2006 has more MOs that are age/grade appropriate	22	8%	Range 1-9 more MO's Average of 2 more MO's grade/age appropriate
Total	260	100%	

Conclusions

The results of this study support the categorization of Mastery Objectives used in Alt-MSA portfolios according to change across years. Raters had strong agreement on the use of the categories with little to no resolution necessary. The use of codes did not appear to trend according to portfolio, or rater, providing evidence that variance in ratings was due to differences in Mastery Objective task evidence, and not the teacher, student, or rater.

It may not be surprising that nearly all of the Mastery Objective tasks were categorized as changed between 2005 and 2006. This supports an assertion that the training of teachers on the Alt-MSA is successful, in that the teachers are not using the exact same tasks every year. It may also support anecdotal evidence from scorers and scoring directors that Alt-MSA portfolios are improving over time. The degree to which change reflects the use of the previous year's scores will require additional research, incorporating student scores across years with ratings of change.

Phonics and phonemic awareness use in Mastery Objectives for Reading appears to be either stable, or on the rise in almost all cases. Very few portfolios included Mastery Objectives that incorporated phonics in 2005, but not in 2006. This may support the assertion that Mastery Objectives change as are appropriate, but not just for the sake of change. Likewise, this trend was identified in the grade/age appropriateness results. Most of the Mastery Objectives were grade/age appropriate in both 2005 and 2006, and those that changed from 2005 to 2006 did so in a direction that supports more grade/age appropriateness and not less.

There are some minor differences in category code use and grade/age appropriateness of Mastery Objectives between Reading and Math, but the implications remain practically the same. The nature of Reading content may support more changes while maintaining the same task meaning than can be true for Math content.

APPENDIX D.1
Alt-MSA Portfolio Task Rating Form

Student Name:																				
Student Barcode:																				
Scorer ID:																				
Score:		①	②	③																
Reading Objective 1		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Reading Objective 2		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Reading Objective 3		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Reading Objective 4		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Reading Objective 5		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Reading Objective 6		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Reading Objective 7		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Reading Objective 8		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Reading Objective 9		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Reading Objective 10		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Phonics/Phonemic Awareness	⓪	①	②																	
Reading: Grade/Age Appropriate	⓪	①	②							number:										
Math Objective 1		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math Objective 2		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math Objective 3		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math Objective 4		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math Objective 5		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math Objective 6		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math Objective 7		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math Objective 8		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math Objective 9		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math Objective 10		①	②	③	④	⑤	⑥	⑦	⑧											
Math: Grade/Age Appropriate	⓪	①	②							number:										

Appendix F

Maryland State Department of Education 2006 Alt-MSA Scoring Procedures and Rubric

Mastery Objective Alignment & Prompt Level Verification:

Locate the original Mastery Objective Review and Revisions in Section 1

The findings on the "**Alt-MSA Mastery Objective Review**" document relating to alignment or prompt level takes precedence over other the test documents reviewed by contractor.

1. Previously Reviewed by Contractor

a. Alignment

1) If Mastery Objective was determined to be not aligned during Mastery Objective review, check

a) to determine if the Mastery Objective was revised or

b) if a different content standard indicator/objective was selected.

2) If a revised Mastery Objective is aligned with the assessed content standard, **place a checkmark next to the objective to indicate that objective has been checked.**

3) If the revisions do not meet the criteria for alignment, score "**A.**"

b. Prompt Level

If comments for conditions state "conditions not clear", or "prompt level not clear," check to see if revisions were made.

1) If revisions were made and the prompt level gives the number and type of prompt (OK if a prompt is not stated), **place a checkmark next to the objective.**

2) If not revised correctly, score "**A**."

c. Not Enough Items

If comments for conditions state, "conditions not clear", or "prompt level not clear," or "if the student is asked to make a choice, at least two items are not presented to the student" (not enough items), check to see if revisions were made.

1) If revisions were made and the student is given at least 2 choices, **place a checkmark next to the objective.**

2) If not revised or not revised correctly, place "N" next to the objective.

2. Not Previously Reviewed by Contractor

a. Alignment

Review all Mastery Objectives for alignment with content standards.

1) If a Mastery Objective is aligned with the assessed content standard, **place a checkmark next to the objective to indicate that objective has been checked.**

2) If a Mastery Objective is not aligned with the assessed content standard, score "**A.**"

b. Prompt Level/

Review all Mastery Objectives for prompt level.

1) If the prompt level gives the number and type of prompt (OK if a prompt is not stated), **place a checkmark next to the objective.**

2) If the prompt level does not give the number and type score **"A."**

c. Not Enough Items

Review all Mastery Objectives for enough items.

1) If the student is given at least 2 choices, **place a checkmark next to the objective.**
2) If the student is not given at least 2 choices **place "N" next to the objective.**

Review artifacts: Present and Acceptable

If the artifact is present and acceptable, continue scoring.

1. **Missing Artifact**

   If a Mastery Objective does not have an artifact, score "**B**".

2. **Type of Artifact**

   a. **Acceptable artifacts -** The only types of artifacts that may be used as evidence of mastery are (1) student work, (2) data chart, (3) videotape, (4) audiotape.

Student Work	Student written responses (original, not photocopied) or student dictated responses (sentence length and with Test Examiner's signature) recorded verbatim by the Test Examiner.
Data Chart	Test Examiner records student response to specified target behavior on a chart over a period of time. The data on the data chart must be original, not photocopied, typed or word-processed. It must have a minimum of **three** consecutive observations occurring/taken on different days **prior** to demonstration of mastery.
Videotape	A visual and auditory record on any type of media of a student demonstrating the target behavior. Each artifact on media should be shorter than 5 minutes. However, if there is a note that states the length of media is longer or if the student is steadily continuing to display target behavior, continue to view media.
Audiotape	An auditory record of a student verbalizing the target behavior.

   b. **Unacceptable artifacts** include checklists, photographs, narrative descriptions, checklists or homework; score "**B**"

Artifact Complete

If the artifact is complete, continue scoring.

1. Student's name

Student's name must be recorded directly on the artifact

a. The student's name may be in the Mastery Objective posted directly on the artifact.

b. If no student name on artifact, score "**C**".

2. Date

Every artifact must have a date that includes month, day, and year

a. If artifact is not dated with month, day, and year OR

b. If dates on artifact are prior to September 1, 2005 or after March 15, 2006, score

"**C**". (Evidence of instruction on a data chart may be dated prior to September 1, 2005.)

3. Mastery Objective

Every artifact must have a stated Mastery Objective. If there is no reasonable way to determine the Mastery Objective for an artifact, score "**C**"

a. **No Mastery Objective** written on the artifact, or
b. **No objective number** written on the artifact, or
c. **No page number** that corresponds to the Table of Contents

4. No reasonable way to interpret key or notations on artifacts, score "**C**"

Determine if artifact is evidence of mastery or the components of the Mastery Objective are evident, if so continue scoring.

Score 0 if the Test Examiner states that it is not mastered or gives an accuracy score that is less than 80 %.

1. Artifact Alignment

a. If the artifact aligns with and measures the Mastery Objective, continue scoring
b. Artifact does **not** align with and measure the Mastery Objective, score "**D**"

2. Components of the Mastery Objective

Scorer must score what is stated in the Mastery Objective.

a. If all components of Mastery Objective are evident in the artifact, continue scoring. For videotape, score according to Mastery Objective stated in the test document.
b. If components of the Mastery Objective are **not** evident in the artifact, score "D".
   1) If MO specifies a number of student demonstrations of target behavior, i.e., number of items or trials, this must be evident in the artifact. If less than specified number, score "**D**.
   2) If there is a lack of evidence of observable, measurable student response on the artifact, it is unclear what student did, or it is not an acceptable dictated response, or the student is not given a choice, score **"D."**
   3) If an objective has N on the scoring monitor, check to make sure the student was given more than one choice. If only one choice is provided, score "D."

   The following are data chart examples of one concept and are acceptable:

   - Which is more, less, main character, setting, main idea?
   - If there are two or more behaviors, the observable, measurable student response for each behavior must be recorded on the data chart for each observation. The following are examples of student behaviors that must specifically be recorded on a data chart that are not concepts and must have each behavior stated.
   - If data for these behaviors are not recorded for each observation, score D.

   4) If either the visual or auditory component is absent from a videotape artifact, score "**D**"

3. Full Physical Prompt

If documentation is included, continue scoring.

a) If full physical prompt is stated in the Mastery Objective, locate documentation for instruction toward less intrusive prompts **and** use of assistive technologies that reduce need for full physical.

b) If this documentation is not present, score "**D**".

Evidence of Instruction on a Data Chart

On a **data chart**, **3** non-mastered attempts **prior** to mastery must be recorded.

1. If there is evidence of instruction recorded on a minimum of three observations occurring/taken on different days **prior** to demonstration of mastery, continue scoring.
2. If there are less than three observations occurring prior to mastery, score **"E."**

Accuracy Score

If the accuracy score reported is less than 80 %, score "0."

1. Accuracy score must reflect the prompt level stated in Mastery Objective
2. Every artifact must have an accuracy score reported, and may include:
    a. Percent accurate
    b. Number correct/number of items
    c. Marks next to each item indicating correct/incorrect but not added
    d. On a data chart, Test Examiner records next to, or on a specific date "mastered", or highlights this date and the student's accuracy score.
    e. On media, a verbal statement by Test Examiner of accuracy score or after **each** student response, Test Examiner states a positive comment, indicating the item is correct.
    f. Test Examiners must include a key to the notations they make on artifacts. However, if there is not a key, but it is clear how to interpret Test Examiner notations, continue scoring. Note: If Test Examiner notations are not understood, record this issue on the "Issue Form" for the supervisor to review.
3. Verify the reported accuracy score by reviewing the artifact.
    a. If accuracy score is not stated, score "**F**";
        - No marks or statement that indicates the percent or number accurate on an artifact.
        - Statement of only "excellent" or "good job".
    b. If reported accuracy score does not reflect the evidence in the artifact and accuracy is below 80%, score "**F**".
    c. Prompt level
        - If no prompt is stated in the Mastery Objective and the prompt is not stated or recorded as "independent" on the artifact, continue scoring.
        - If the **type** of prompt reported on the artifact is less intrusive than that stated in the Mastery Objective, continue scoring.
        - If the prompt in the Mastery Objective is gesture, verbal and/or model and there is no statement of prompt on the artifact, continue scoring.
        - Any prompt in the Mastery Objective that includes partial physical or full physical prompt must have some indication of prompts used on the student work or data chart. If it is not reported, score "**F**."

- If the objective is not mastered and the student has not been given the prompts listed in the MO during the instructional time, continue scoring and put a blue review sheet on the outside of the portfolio.

d. If a more intrusive prompt is used that is not consistent with the percent accuracy reported on the artifact, score "**F**."

Finally, If accuracy score is 80-100% and prompt level *is the* ***same or less intrusive (less intrusive means that a TYPE of prompt is less intrusive as that stated in the Mastery Objective) and both are verified, score "1."***

Video Presence

- Artifact on video is present and there's been an attempt to "capture" student's Mastery Objectives in Reading and Mathematics, score "1"
- Artifact on video is not present, score "0"

Evidence of grade level content, materials, tasks?

- What same grade non-disabled peers would be reading, using, or doing but with reduced complexity.

  Reading
  Mathematics
  Science
  Social Studies
  Physical Education
  Art
  Music
  Health
  - If so, score "1".
  - If not, score "0"

Objective Scoring Summary Report for 2005-2006: Reading							
						Artifacts Not Scorable	
Grade	Number of Students Assessed	Percent Proficient or Advanced	Percent Objectives Mastered	Percent of Objectives not Mastered	Percent of Objectives Non-scorable	Reason	Percent Not Scorable by Reason
3	575	61%	59%	41%	37%	A	8%
						B	3%
						C	1%
						D	11%
						E	13%
						F	1%
4	524	61%	60%	40%	37%	A	7%
						B	3%
						C	1%
						D	14%
						E	12%
						F	1%
5	571	62%	63%	37%	33%	A	9%
						B	3%
						C	1%
						D	9%
						E	10%
						F	1%
6	722	61%	61%	39%	36%	A	9%
						B	4%
						C	2%
						D	10%
						E	9%
						F	1%
7	793	67%	65%	35%	31%	A	7%
						B	4%
						C	2%
						D	8%
						E	8%
						F	1%
8	919	66%	65%	35%	32%	A	8%
						B	4%
						C	1%
						D	9%
						E	8%
						F	2%
10	792	64%	63%	37%	34%	A	10%
						B	4%
						C	1%
						D	8%
						E	8%
						F	2%

Objective Scoring Summary Report for 2005-2006: Mathematics							
						Artifacts Not Scorable	
Grade	Number of Students Assessed	Percent Proficient or Advanced	Percent Objectives Mastered	Percent of Objectives not Mastered	Percent of Objectives Non-scorable	Reason	Percent Not Scorable by Reason
3	575	62%	61%	39%	35%	A	6%
						B	2%
						C	1%
						D	12%
						E	11%
						F	1%
4	524	62%	63%	37%	34%	A	6%
						B	2%
						C	1%
						D	14%
						E	10%
						F	1%
5	571	65%	66%	34%	30%	A	7%
						B	2%
						C	1%
						D	10%
						E	10%
						F	1%
6	722	65%	64%	36%	32%	A	6%
						B	3%
						C	2%
						D	11%
						E	9%
						F	2%
7	793	71%	68%	32%	28%	A	5%
						B	3%
						C	2%
						D	9%
						E	7%
						F	2%
8	919	69%	68%	32%	29%	A	6%
						B	3%
						C	1%
						D	11%
						E	7%
						F	1%
10	792	68%	67%	33%	30%	A	5%
						B	4%
						C	2%
						D	9%
						E	8%
						F	2%

Notes:

Number of Students Assessed – the number of students who submitted a portfolio.

Percent Proficient or Advanced – the percentage of all students tested that achieved a proficiency level of Proficient or Advanced (i.e., obtained a mastery percentage score of 60 or above)

Percent Objectives Mastered – the percentage of all submitted Mastery Objectives scored "Mastered".

Percent of Objectives Not Mastered – the percentage of all submitted Mastery Objectives scored "Not Mastered".

Percent of Objectives Not Scorable – the percentage of Mastery Objectives scored "Not Mastered" that received a "Not Scorable" condition code.

Artifacts Not Scorable – the percentage of Mastery Objectives scored "Not Mastered" receiving each "Not Scorable" condition code (A, B, C, D, E, F)

2006 Alt-MSA Condition Codes (Summary)

Field Title	Condition Code Description
A	**Mastery objective not aligned or reviewed** or **Prompt Not Clear** • Mastery objective was determined to be not aligned during Mastery Objective Review and no revisions were made and Mastery Objective is still not aligned, or • Mastery Objective not reviewed during Mastery Objective Review and it is not aligned, and/or • Number and/or type of prompt are not specified
B	**Artifact is missing or unacceptable** • Mastery Objective does not have an artifact, or • Mastery Objective has an unacceptable artifact
C	**Artifact is incomplete** • No student name on artifact, and/or • Artifact not dated with day, month and year, and/or • Dates on artifact are out of acceptable range, and/or • No reasonable way to determine the Mastery Objective for the artifact, and/or • No reasonable way to interpret key or notations on artifact
D	**Artifact does not align or components of Mastery Objective are not evident** • Artifact does not align with or measure the Mastery Objective, and/or • Components of the Mastery Objective are not evident in the artifact a. Target number of student behaviors is not evident b. Lack of evidence of observable, measurable student response on artifact, not an acceptable dictated response or the student is not given a choice c. Either the visual or auditory is absent from the videotape artifacts, or • The prompt level is stated as "Full Physical", but the documentation for instruction toward less intrusive prompts and assistive technologies that reduce the need for full physical is not included
E	**Data Chart does not show a minimum of three consecutive observations occurring/taken on different days prior to demonstration of mastery**
F	**Accuracy scores not reported or reported incorrectly** • Accuracy score is not stated, or • Verification of reported accuracy score does not reflect evidence in the artifact and accuracy is less than 80%, or • A more intrusive prompt is used that is not consistent with the percent accuracy reported on the artifact

Appendix G

Samples of Required Forms

REQUIRED Alt-MSA FORMS

The forms described in the *Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook* Part 4 must be included in each student's Alt-MSA Portfolio. These forms are available as electronic templates at: www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/testing/alt_msa/.

For Alt-MSA 2006, student Mastery Objectives ***must*** be entered and submitted for review using MSDE's web application, Alt-MSA Online, at www.Alt-MSA.com. Use of this web site will ensure that TETs have access to electronic tools to help them in constructing Mastery Objectives and will also ensure timely submission and review of Mastery Objectives, as well as ease in revising objectives to incorporate review feedback. Additional information on creation and submission of Mastery Objectives is located in Part 5 and Part 6 of this *Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook*.

Test Examiners (TEs) who have questions about completing any of the required forms should first contact their School Test Coordinator (STC) and principal, or their system's Local Accountability Coordinator (LAC) and Alt-MSA Facilitator.

Questions or comments may also be e-mailed directly to MSDE at Alt-MSA@msde.state.md.us.

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Table of Contents (Sec. 1 & 2)

The Table of Contents is the first item in the Alt-MSA 2006 Portfolio, placed before the first tab.

- Use the Table of Contents to guide the correct placement of all portfolio components.
- For the table of contents form for Sections 3 and 4 of the portfolio, place a page number in the column on the right that corresponds to the page number assigned to the documents and artifacts. Items in portfolio sections 1 and 2 have pre-designated letter identifications as indicated below.
- Note: Portfolio Scorers will NOT search the portfolio for a document or artifact: All items must be clearly labeled and/or numbered and in the correct order.
- Do NOT place portfolio pages and artifacts in plastic sleeves, unless the item is student work requiring the plastic sleeve to hold the item in place.

Alt-MSA 2006 TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sections	**Designation/Page in Portfolio**
TABLE OF CONTENTS	**Prior to First Tab**
PORTFOLIO SECTION 1	
____ Test Examiner Team Signatures	**A**
____ Revised Reading and Mathematics Test Documents	**B**
____ Feedback on Test Documents originally submitted	**C**
____ Original Test Documents submitted for review	**D**
____ Pre-assessments for Reading and Mathematics (if student did not take Alt-MSA 2005)	**E**
____ Copy of Previous Year's (Alt-MSA 2005) Test Documents	**F**
____ Copy of Student's IEP Goals and Objectives	**G**
PORTFOLIO SECTION 2	
____ Signed Parent/Guardian Review of Alt-MSA Reading and Mathematics Objectives	**H**
____ Signed Parent/Guardian Review of Alt-MSA Portfolio	**J**
____ Documented Parent/Guardian Contacts for Alt-MSA	**K**

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Table of Contents (Section 3)

Sections **Page in Portfolio**

PORTFOLIO SECTION 3

Artifacts for Reading Objectives

General Reading Processes

Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, or Other
Objective 1 ____
Objective 2 ____

Vocabulary
Objective 3 ____
Objective 4 ____

General Reading Comprehension
Objective 5 ____
Objective 6 ____

Comprehension of Informational Text

Objective 7 ____
Objective 8 ____

Comprehension of Literary Text

Objective 9 ____
Objective 10 ____

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Table of Contents (Section 4)

Sections **Page in Portfolio**

PORTFOLIO SECTION 4

Artifacts for Mathematics Objectives

Algebra, Patterns, or Functions

Geometry

Measurement

Statistics: Data Analysis

Number Relationships or Computation

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Test Examiner Team (A)*

The staff listed below comprises the Test Examiner Team for

_____
Student's Name

Signatures indicate (1) attendance at Alt-MSA training, (2) involvement in the development of the Alt-MSA portfolio for this student, (3) that the Mastery Objectives are based on Alt-MSA 2005 test results or a pre-assessment, (4) that the 2006 Test Documents were not submitted for Alt-MSA 2005 administration and (5) Mastery Objectives have not been previously mastered. The Test Examiners for this student will print and sign their name, indicate their position, and date. This form should be completed near the beginning of the test window.

	Name	Signature	Position	Date
1.	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	_____	_____

School Test Coordinator:

Name	Signature	Position	Date
_____	_____	_____	_____

Principal/Education Director:

Name	Signature	Position	Date
_____	_____	_____	_____

*Letter A refers to the designation of this item in Section 1 of the Portfolio.

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Reading Pre-Assessment (E)*

Pre-assessment: Reading 2006

If the student did not participate in Alt-MSA 2005, a pre-assessment must be conducted.

Use www.mdk12.org/instruction/curriculum/reading/index.html to select the grade-level Reading content standards objectives that will comprise the Reading pre-assessment.

A detailed description of the pre-assessment procedures is in Part 2 of the *Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook.*

In Section 1 of the student's Alt-MSA Portfolio, include only a copy of the Test Examiner-notated pages of the Reading content standards used for the pre-assessment. **Do NOT include the entire Voluntary State Curriculum document.**

*Letter E refers to the designation of this item in Section 1 of the Portfolio.

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Reading Mastery Objectives (B/D)*

Student Name_____ Grade_____

READING Alt-MSA 2006 TEST DOCUMENT
Maryland Content Standards, Indicators, Objectives,
and Mastery Objectives to be Assessed

(Note: This form will be entered electronically into the Alt-MSA Online system, printed, and inserted into the portfolio. Part 5 of the *Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook* contains instructions and guidelines for construction of measurable Mastery Objectives, and Part 6 of the *Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook* contains instructions for entering and submitting Mastery Objectives electronically using the Alt-MSA Online web site.)

The Test Examiner Team will:
(1) record the selected indicator and objectives to be assessed,
(2) record a Mastery Objective for each selected objective,
(3) identify the type of evidence that will be collected, and
(4) identify the Test Examiner who will obtain the artifact.

READING CONTENT STANDARDS	
1.0 General Reading Processes (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, or Other) (If instruction in Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, or Sight words (in Fluency) is inappropriate for this student, state the Content Standard/Topic that will replace these Topics) **Other Content Standard/Topic_____**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**
Indicator **Objective 1** **Mastery Objective 1**	
Indicator **Objective 2** **Mastery Objective 2**	
1.0 General Reading Processes: Vocabulary	
Indicator **Objective 3** **Mastery Objective 3**	
Indicator **Objective 4** **Mastery Objective 4**	

*Letters B or D refer to the designation of this item in Section 1 of the Portfolio.

1.0 General Reading Processes: Comprehension	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**
Indicator **Objective 5** **Mastery Objective 5**	
Indicator **Objective 6** **Mastery Objective 6**	
2.0 Comprehension of Informational Text	
Indicator **Objective 7** **Mastery Objective 7**	
Indicator **Objective 8** **Mastery Objective 8**	
3.0 Comprehension of Literary Text	
Indicator **Objective 9** **Mastery Objective 9**	
Indicator **Objective 10** **Mastery Objective 10**	

I have reviewed the Test Documents for this student's Alt-MSA 2006 Portfolio. (This must be reviewed and signed by October 14, 2005, prior to submission to the Test Contractor for review).

_____ _____

Principal or Designee's Signature Date

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Mathematics Pre-Assessment (E)*

Pre-assessment: Mathematics 2006

If the student did not participate in Alt-MSA 2005, a pre-assessment must be conducted.

Use http://www.mdk12.org/instruction/curriculum/Mathematics/index.html to select the grade-level Mathematics content standards objectives that will comprise the Mathematics pre-assessment.

A detailed description of the pre-assessment procedures is in Part 2 of the Alt-MSA Handbook.

In Section 1 of the student's Alt-MSA Portfolio, include only a copy of the Test Examiner-notated pages of the Mathematics content standards used for the pre-assessment. **Do NOT include the entire Voluntary State Curriculum document**

*Letter E refers to the designation of this item in Section 1 of the Portfolio.

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Mathematics Mastery Objectives (B/D)*

Student Name_____ **Grade_____**

MATHEMATICS: Alt-MSA 2006 TEST DOCUMENT
Maryland Content Standards, Indictors, Objectives,
and Mastery Objectives to be Assessed

(Note: This form will be entered electronically into the Alt-MSA Online system, printed, and inserted into the portfolio. Part 5 of the *Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook* contains instructions and guidelines for construction of measurable Mastery Objectives, and Part 6 of the *Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook* contains instructions for entering and submitting Mastery Objectives electronically using the Alt-MSA Online web site.)

The Test Examiner Team will:
(1) record the selected indicator and objectives to be assessed,
(2) record a measurable Mastery Objective for each selected objective,
(3) identify the type of evidence that will be collected, and
(4) identify the Test Examiner who will obtain the evidence.

MATHEMATICS CONTENT STANDARDS	
1.0 Knowledge of Algebra, Patterns, And Functions **7.0 Process of Mathematics: Communication: Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology.**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**
Indicator **Objective 1** **Mastery Objective 1**	
Indicator **Objective 2** **Mastery Objective 2**	
2.0 Knowledge of Geometry **7.0 Process of Mathematics: Communication: Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology.**	
Indicator **Objective 3** **Mastery Objective 3**	
Indicator **Objective 4** **Mastery Objective 4**	

*Letters B or D refer to the designation of this item in Section 1 of the Portfolio.

3.0 Knowledge of Measurement **7.0 Process of Mathematics: Communication: Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology.**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**
Indicator **Objective 5** **Mastery Objective 5**	
Indicator **Objective 6** **Mastery Objective 6**	
4.0 Knowledge of Statistics: Data Analysis **7.0 Process of Mathematics: Communication: Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology.**	
Indicator **Objective 7** **Mastery Objective 7**	
Indicator **Objective 8** **Mastery Objective 8**	
6.0 Knowledge of Number Relationships or Computation **7.0 Process of Mathematics: Communication: Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology.**	
Indicator **Objective 9** **Mastery Objective 9**	
Indicator **Objective 10** **Mastery Objective 10**	

I have reviewed the Test Documents for this student's Alt-MSA 2006 Portfolio. (This must be reviewed and signed by October 14, 2005, prior to submission to the Test Contractor for review).

_____ _____

Principal or Designee's Signature Date

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Parent/Guardian Review of MOs (H)*

Parent/Guardian Review
Alt-MSA 2006 Reading and Mathematics

The Reading and Mathematics objectives from the Maryland Content Standards listed on the enclosed Test Documents were selected by your child's teachers to be one focus of your child's instruction and the Alt-MSA Portfolio.

- These objectives were selected based on what your child already knows and what your child needs to learn.
- The Test Documents list the specific skills on which your child will be assessed.
- The enclosed brochure provides more detail about the Alt-MSA Portfolio.

Please review these objectives and let your son's/daughter's teachers know if you have suggestions or questions about the objectives.

- Your child's Alt-MSA Portfolio is one component of his/her instructional program. The instructional program also includes instruction in the IEP goals and objectives, academic content, and skills in communication, decision-making, interpersonal, career/vocational, community, recreation/leisure, and personal management.

Please sign below to indicate you have reviewed the Reading and Mathematics objectives for your son's/daughter's Alt-MSA Portfolio. Please keep the Test Documents for your use at home.

____ I have reviewed the Test Documents selected for Alt-MSA 2006.
____ Suggestions and questions I have about the selected objectives:

_____
_____
_____
_____

At home, we can do the following to aid in my child's instruction:

_____
_____
_____
_____

_____ _____
Parent/Guardian Signature Date

*Letter H refers to the designation of this item in Section 2 of the Portfolio.

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Parent/Guardian Portfolio Review (J)*

Parent/Guardian Review of Alt-MSA Portfolio 2006

Your child's Alt-MSA Portfolio was developed between September 1, 2005 and March 15, 2006. Evidence of your child's attainment of the Reading and Mathematics Mastery Objectives is included in his/her Alt-MSA Portfolio. The Mastery Objectives were sent to you earlier in the school year.

Student's Name_____

____ I have reviewed the contents of my child's Alt-MSA Portfolio.

Comments I have for my son/daughter, if any:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Comments I have for the teachers, if any:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Signature of Parent/Guardian Date

*Letter J refers to the designation of this item in Section 2 of the Portfolio.

Required Alt-MSA 2006 Form: Parent/Guardian Contacts (K)*

PARENT/GUARDIAN CONTACTS: Alt-MSA 2006 PORTFOLIO

		Date
____	Sent home the Alt-MSA Reading and Mathematics Test Documents, brochure, and cover form for review and signature.	_____
____	Responded to suggestions and questions received.	_____
____	Contacted to request return of signed cover form.	_____
____	Sent invitation to review Alt-MSA 2006 Portfolio.	_____

*Letter K refers to the designation of this item in Section 2 of the Portfolio.

NOTE: The data chart format below may be used to record student responses when using data charts as artifacts. If the TET elects to use the data chart format below, the specific, observable and measurable target student response must be recorded in the "Student Behavior" column.

Blank Data Charts for Multiple Steps/Trials

Key: (prompts, accuracy, etc.)

Student Name:			**Date Instruction Started:**			
Mastery Objective:						
Steps/Student Behavior:	**Date:**	**Date:**	**Date:**	**Date:**	**Date:**	**Date:**
Totals Accurate:						
Percent Accurate:						

NOTE: The data chart format below may be used to record student responses when using data charts as artifacts. The data chart may be used to document instruction using less than full physical prompts. The specific, observable and measurable target student response must be recorded in the "Student Behavior" column.

Data Chart

Student: **Date Instruction Started:**

Mastery Objective:

Key: I-Independent, G-Gesture, V-Verbal, M-Model, PP-Partial Physical, FP-Full Physical; Recorded number of prompts provided, (e.g. V 2)

Response: "+": student demonstrated desired response, "—": student did not demonstrate desired response

Assistive Technology:

Steps/Student Behavior	Date:		Date:		Date:		Date:	
1.	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response
2.	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response
3.	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response
4.	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response
5.	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response	Prompt I G V M PP FP	Response
Total Accurate:								
Percent Accurate:								

NOTE: This data chart format may be used to record student responses when using data charts as artifacts. If TETs elect to use the data chart format below, <u>the specific, observable and measurable target student response must be recorded in the "Trials/Steps" column</u>. Multiple data charts that document instruction over multiple days prior to attainment of the Mastery Objective must be included.

Data Chart

Student Name:	**Date Instruction Started:**					
Mastery Objective:						
Date:						
Trials/Steps:	**Task Direction**	**Independent**	**Gesture**	**Verbal**	**Model**	**Partial Physical**
Totals:						
% Correct:						
Student Name:	**Date Instruction Started**:					
Mastery Objective:						
Date:						
Trials/Steps:	**Task Direction**	**Independent**	**Gesture**	**Verbal**	**Model**	**Partial Physical**
Totals:						
% Correct:						

Key: **(+)= Correct (-)=Incorrect (5)=Independent (4)=Gesture Prompt (3)=Verbal Prompt (2)=Model Prompt (1)=Partial Physical Prompt (0)=No Response after Physical Prompt**

NOTE: This data chart format may be used to record student responses when using data charts as artifacts. If the TET elects to use the data chart format below, t<u>he specific, observable and measurable target student response must be recorded in the "Trials/Steps" column</u>. Multiple data charts that document instruction over multiple days prior to attainment of the Mastery Objective must be included.

Data Chart

Student Name				**Date Instruction Started:**		
Mastery Objective						
Date						
Trials/Steps	**Task Direction**	**Independent**	**Gesture**	**Verbal**	**Model**	**Partial Physical**
Totals						
% Correct						

Key: **(+)= Correct (-)=Incorrect (5)=Independent (4)=Gesture Prompt (3)=Verbal Prompt (2)=Model Prompt (1)=Partial Physical Prompt (0)=No Response after Physical Prompt**

Test Administration and Certification of Training Form

This form must be signed by all individuals directly involved in MSDE-sponsored testing including:

- School Test Coordinators,
- Teachers serving as Test Examiners or others who support a test administration,
- Instructional Assistants providing special education, limited English proficient, or Section 504 accommodations, and
- Anyone else with access to test materials or involvement in administrations.

Only personnel who are employees or agents of the school district and who have signed this form may supervise, administer, or assist with the administration of the test.
This is to certify that:

- I have been trained for my role in the upcoming testing by a trainer authorized by my school district. I am familiar with the district test administration policy and have received a copy of it.
- I understand that it is a breach of professional ethics to provide verbal or nonverbal clues or answers, teach items on the test, share prompts, coach, hint, or in any way influence a student's performance during the testing. The only materials students may use are those authorized in the test's Test Administration and Coordination Manual or Examiner's Manuals. Alt-MSA Test Examiners may provide students the prompts and accommodations consistent with the student's Mastery Objectives.
- I know that copies of test materials, including items and other documents that are labeled as secure, are confidential and must be kept secure at all times. Unauthorized use, transportation, duplication, or reproduction of any portion of these assessment materials is prohibited.
- I know that I may not inaccurately report a student's accuracy scores, submit artifacts and forms from previous test years, submit artifacts not completed within the test window, misrepresent or change dates on artifacts, falsify artifacts, falsify signatures, "coach" a student to provide correct answers, misrepresent Mastery Objective review documents, or submit portfolios that are not developed in compliance with the guidelines presented in the current test year Alt-MSA Handbook.
- I know that accommodations for Section 504 or English Language Learner students must be limited to those stated in *Requirements for Accommodating, Excusing, and Exempting Students in Maryland Assessment Programs.* In addition, accommodations for special education students must be limited to those that appear on the student's IEP and are used for classroom instruction.
- I know that the test must be administered on the dates specified within the allowed window. I know that, unless part of the directions for administration, I may not read any activity to a student unless part of an allowable accommodation. Students unsure of the question or an answer should be told only to reread the question and give their best response. Although I know I can encourage students to respond to each question, I know I cannot tell students to change their responses.
- I have thoroughly read the above and have been prepared for my role in this test administration. I know that violations of test administration and security provisions may result in invalidation of test results, cost assessed to my district, and disciplinary actions against me by my district or certificate suspensions or revocations by the MSDE.

Signature	Date	School
Name (Please print)	Name of Test	

Non- Disclosure Agreement

This form is required for all personnel other than Test Examiners who work with tests administered by or through MSDE. The school system must retain completed forms for at least three years following the last contact of the named person with any MSDE assessment material.

It is my understanding that MSDE assessment materials are confidential. I agree to abide by all of the regulations governing test administration and data reporting policies and procedures in COMAR 13A.03.04 (attached). As part of these regulations, I know that I am:

- Not to duplicate test materials for any reason except as authorized by MSDE directly or through the LAC.
- Not to make written notes about the topics or content of the test materials unless requested to do so by MSDE directly or through the LAC.
- Not to provide any part of the test materials for examination or other use by any other party.
- Not to disseminate any of the test materials to any other party.
- Not to discuss the topics and/or specific content of the test materials with any other party.
- To return the test materials to the representative authorized by the MSDE by the agreed-upon date.

Name:_____ Title: _____

Agency: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____

Appendix H

Steps Taken to Monitor Scoring Accuracy and to Remedy Drift 2005-2006

- Daily review of scoring rules, training sets, scoring decisions and updates.
- Scoring Supervisors back read portfolios scored by readers on their team and inform the Scoring Director of any scoring trends or issues identified.
- During resolution scoring, trends and issues discovered are brought to the Scoring Director's attention.
- Calibration of scorers occurs when new scoring decisions are made.
- Calibration of scorers occurs when trends, issues, or drift is noticed.
- At daily Scoring Supervisors' meetings, trends and issues are discussed along with methods to correct them.
- Scoring Supervisors are given reports on a daily basis so they may inform scorers of their reliability, validity and rate.
- Scoring Supervisors address trends, issues or drift with individual scorers alerting them to their mistakes. When needed, supervisors or scoring director will work with scorer on an individual basis to help improve their accuracy.
- Scorers not meeting project requirements for reliability and validity after intervention are released from the project.

Appendix I

A PROCESS FOR PORTFOLIO SELECTION FOR RANGE FINDING

Select Portfolios that are examples of:

- good data charts
- unacceptable data charts
- checklists
- not grade/age appropriate
- prompt level more intrusive
- full physical prompts with documentation
- full physical prompts without documentation
- Evidence of mastery with less intrusive prompts than stated in the Mastery Objective. For example, the MO states 1 partial physical and the artifact shows 3 verbal and 2 model).
- dates outside the test window
- "C" where there is no reasonable way to determine the MO for the artifact
- unacceptable artifacts (homework, photograph of student doing work
- No reasonable way to interpret key or notations on artifact

	SMALL LEA		MID-SIZE LEA		LARGE LEA	
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	**Clear**	**Close Review**	**Clear**	**Close Review**	**Clear**	**Close Review**
High functioning student (less supports)						
Low functioning students (intensive supports						
MIDDLE SCHOOL						
High functioning student (less supports)						
Low functioning students (intensive supports						
HIGH SCHOOL						
High functioning student (less supports)						
Low functioning students (intensive supports						
SPECIAL CENTER						
High functioning student (less supports)						
Low functioning students (intensive supports						

Appendix J

Sample Reports

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Achievement Matters Most

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA)
2006 Reading and Mathematics: Grade 10
Home Report

Student Name
School Name
LEA Name

About the Alternate Maryland School Assessment Program (Alt-MSA) Home Report

In the 2005-2006 school year, your child took the Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA). Alt-MSA is the Maryland assessment in which students with significant cognitive disabilities participate if the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team determines that a student is participating in extended Maryland content standards in reading and mathematics and cannot participate in the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) even with accommodations. Alt-MSA assesses and reports student attainment of individually written objectives based on the Maryland reading and mathematics content standards. These content standards are available online at http://mdk12.org. A portofolio is constructed for each student consisting of artifacts (such as student work samples) that document the student's mastery of the assessed reading and mathematics objectives.

This report reflects your child's degree of attainment of the reading and mathematics Mastery Objectives that your child's teachers selected to assess, using the supports your student typically needs during instruction. During the school year you were asked to review both your child's Mastery Objectives as well as your child's completed Alt-MSA Portfolio prior to its submission for scoring. Understanding your child's performance is best done in consultation with your child's teachers and the members of the IEP team.

The charts below present (1) the percentage of objectives your child mastered in reading and mathematics, (2) your child's performance in one of three performance levels-Basic, Proficient, or Advanced, and (3) comparative performance of other students on the Alt-MSA at your child's school, in the school system, and in the state. Additional information on school and school system performance is available online at http://mdreportcard.org.

Alt-MSA Performance Level Descriptions

Advanced: Students at this level demonstrate 90% or greater attainment of their identified mastery objectives in reading and mathematics (attainment of 9 or 10 of the student's Mastery Objectives in a given content area).

Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate at least 60% but less than 90% attainment of their identified mastery objectives in reading and mathematics (attainment of 6 to 8 of the student's Mastery Objectives in a given content area). The goal for all students is to reach the proficient or advanced level.

Basic: Students at this level demonstrate 0% to less then 60% attainment of their identified mastery objectives in reading and mathematics. (attainment of up to 5 of the student's Mastery Objectives in a given content area).

Your Child's Alt-MSA Mastery Percentages and Performance Levels

Reading

	Mastery Percentage	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Student Name	100%			
School Name	100%			
LEA Name	80%			
Maryland	70%			

Mathematics

	Mastery Percentage	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Student Name	100%			
School Name	100%			
LEA Name	90%			
Maryland	80%			

School/System/State Alt-MSA Performance

Reading

Percentage of Students at	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
School Name	0%	20%	80%
LEA Name	9%	45%	45%
Maryland	36%	26%	38%

Mathematics

Percentage of Students at	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
School Name	20%	0%	80%
LEA Name	9%	27%	64%
Maryland	32%	22%	46%

Publication Date: May 30, 2006
0000027

BACKGROUND

Students with significant cognitive disabilities participate in the Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA) if their IEP team determines they meet the participation guidelines (refer to the Alt-MSA Handbook for a copy of these guidelines). The Alt-MSA assesses student mastery of selected reading and mathematics objectives from the Maryland content standards. For the 2006 assessment, each student's Test Examiner Team (TET) selected the assessed objectives by using the results of Alt-MSA 2005 or a pre-assessment that determined the student's skills in the Maryland content standards. The TET constructed a portfolio containing artifacts that were evidence of mastery of the assessed objectives.

This report provides general information about the Alt-MSA and the process used to score the portfolios. In addition, individual student data and aggregated data are presented in attachments to support the TET in

(a) instructional planning for individual students,
(b) examination of current instructional practice within the school, and
(c) improvement of the portfolio development process based on non-scorable and not mastered objectives.

Although the student's reported Alt-MSA proficiency levels reflect achievement in Maryland's reading and mathematics content standards, these data should be used in conjunction with other measures of student performance (such as IEP progress report data, teacher observations, and other formal and informal assessments) in making instructional decisions.

SCORING THE Alt-MSA PORTFOLIO

Prior to scoring, Maryland teachers who were involved in administering Alt-MSA participated in range finding. During range finding, they identified and scored the portfolios representing the range of performance across grades and contents. These scored portfolios became the basis of scoring guides, training materials, and practice scoring sets which were used to ensure consistency and reliability in portfolio scoring. During scoring, two readers independently scored every Alt-MSA portfolio. Using the scoring rubric, readers scored the artifacts in Sections 3 and 4. An objective was scored "mastered" if the artifact reflected that the student has attained at least 80% mastery of the objective. Mastered objectives count towards Proficiency. An objective was scored "not mastered" if the artifact did not reflect that the student had attained 80% mastery of the objective. "Not mastered" objectives do not count towards Proficiency.

An objective was "non-scorable" if:

A Mastery objective not aligned or **Prompt Not Clear**
- Mastery Objective was determined to be not aligned during Mastery Objective review and no revisions were made and Mastery Objective is still not aligned <or>
- Mastery Objective not reviewed during Mastery Objective review and it is not aligned <and/or>
- Number and/or type of prompt are not specified

B Artifact is missing or unacceptable
- Mastery Objective does not have an artifact <or>
- Mastery Objective has an unacceptable artifact

C Artifact is incomplete
- No student name on artifact <and/or>
- Artifact not dated with day, month and year <and/or>
- Dates on artifact are out of acceptable range <and/or>
- No reasonable way to determine the Mastery Objective for the artifact <and/or>
- No reasonable way to interpret key or notations on artifact

D Artifact does not align or components of Mastery Objective are not evident

Artifact does not align with or measure the Mastery Objective <and/or>
Components of the Mastery Objective are not evident in the artifact
a. Target number of student behaviors is not evident
b. Lack of evidence of observable, measurable student response on artifact
c. Either the visual or auditory is absent from the videotape artifacts <or>
The prompt level is stated as "Full Physical", but the documentation for instruction toward less intrusive prompts and assistive technologies is not included <or>
Does not meet the criteria for dictated response

E Data Chart does not show a minimum of three consecutive observations occurring/taken on different days prior to demonstration of mastery

F Accuracy scores not reported or reported incorrectly

Accuracy score is not stated <or>
Verification of reported accuracy score does not reflect evidence in the artifact and accuracy less than 80% <or>
A more intrusive prompt is used that is not consistent with the percent accuracy reported on the artifact

Objectives that were non-scorable are by definition "not mastered" and do not count towards Proficiency.

USING Alt-MSA SCORES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING

Use the aggregated school-level data and the individual student data accompanying this report to discuss and plan instructional interventions with your staff. Although the student's reported Alt-MSA proficiency levels reflect achievement in Maryland's reading and mathematics content standards, these data should be used in conjuction with other measures of student performance, such as IEP progress report data, teacher observations and other formal and informal assessments, in making instructional decisions. Refer to the state's website, http://mdk12.org for further guidance in understanding standards, assessments, and AYP; leading the school improvement process; analyzing and using data; and teaching and assessing the content standards.

Step 1: Examine Alt-MSA Student and School Data

- Identify areas of strength: the objectives that have been mastered in reading and mathematics.
- Identify areas of improvement: the objectives that are not mastered in reading and mathematics.
- Identify issues related to artifacts that were non-scorable and therefore were reported as not mastered.

Step 2: Use Alt-MSA Student and School Data to Examine and Plan Instruction for Students

- Plan the selection of reading and mathematics objectives for future instruction and assessment based on 2006 Alt-MSA results.
- Examine whether all members of the TET are actively engaged in reading and mathematics instruction.
- Examine current instructional practice for alignment with grade-level reading and mathematics objectives. How can instruction in reading and mathematics be connected with other areas of instruction such as science, social studies, art, music, physical education, health, therapies, career/vocational, community, personal management, and recreation/leisure, both in-school and outside-school communities?
- Identify the assistive technologies provided to students and consider adjustments that may foster student learning.

- Examine whether students' current IEP goals and objectives support access to the grade level Maryland content standards.
- Record current levels of Alt-MSA performance on the next developed IEP to guide the selection of IEP goals and objectives that support access to grade-level content standards.
- Identify practices to link daily instruction with assessment in reading and mathematics.
- Examine how instructional learning time is used.
- Ascertain whether all members of the TET have ready access to copies of the general education curriculum.

Step 3: Evaluate School-based Implementation of Alternate Assessment

- Evaluate implementation of each component of the alternate assessment in your school.
  - Did a TET develop objectives and submit artifacts or did the classroom teacher assume this responsibility?
  - Did the school test coordinator perform their assigned roles and responsibilities?
  - Did staff request and receive technical support when needed?

Step 4: Use Alt-MSA Student and School Data to Identify Resources Needed to Support Instruction

- Identify instructional resources that support instruction in reading and mathematics content standards (some examples include books, print materials, non-print materials, math manipulatives, and assistive technologies).
- Identify strategies to structure time for TET collaboration.

Step 5: Use Alt-MSA Student and School Data to Identify Topics for Professional Development of Staff

Potential areas for staff development include the following:

- Teaching reading and mathematics to students with significant cognitive disabilities.
- Increasing knowledge and understanding of Maryland reading and mathematics content standards.
- Collecting data and using it to make instructional decisions.
- Developing the Alt-MSA Portfolio: rationale, practices to organize the development of the portfolio, strategies to engage the student in the portfolio development process.
- Selecting mastery objectives relating to grade level content standards.
- Collaborating within test examiner and instructional teams; involving all instructional staff in TETs.
- Aligning instruction with the grade-level general education curriculum.
- Applying principles of self-determination to instruction and assessment.
- Connecting reading and mathematics instruction to other critical areas of instruction including science, social studies, art, music, physical education, health, therapies, career/vocational, community, personal management and recreation/leisure.

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Achievement Matters Most

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA)
Student Portfolio Summary Report
2006 Reading and Mathematics

Student:
School:
LEA:
Code:
Grade:

Reading	Proficiency Level: Advanced		
Objective	**Mastered**	**Not Mastered**	**Not Scorable**
1	X		
2	X		
3	X		
4	X		
5	X		
6	X		
7	X		
8	X		
9	X		
10	X		
Summary	10	0	0

Mathematics	Proficiency Level: Advanced		
Objective	**Mastered**	**Not Mastered**	**Not Scorable**
1	X		
2	X		
3	X		
4	X		
5	X		
6	X		
7			E
8	X		
9	X		
10	X		
Summary	9	0	1

Notes:
A Mastery Objective is scored as **Mastered** if all of the components of the scoring rubric are present, as outlined on page 7-4 through 7-8 of the Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook and the Mastery Objective:

1) Aligns with the selected reading or mathematics objective AND
2) The artifact is evidence of an observable and measurable student response directly related to the assessed objective AND
3) The artifact reflects that the student has attained at least 80% mastery of the objective

An objective is scored as **Not Mastered** if the artifact did not reflect that the student had attained 80% mastery of the assessed objective.

A mastery objective is **Non-Scorable and therefore Not Mastered** if one or more of the following conditions occur:

A Mastery objective not aligned or **Prompt Not Clear**
- Mastery Objective was determined to be not aligned during Mastery Objective review and no revisions were made and Mastery Objective is still not aligned <or>
- Mastery Objective not reviewed during Mastery Objective review and it is not aligned <and/or>
- Number and/or type of prompt are not specified

B Artifact is missing or unacceptable
- Mastery Objective does not have an artifact <or>
- Mastery Objective has an unacceptable artifact

C Artifact is incomplete
- No student name on artifact <and/or>
- Artifact not dated with day, month and year <and/or>
- Dates on artifact are out of acceptable range <and/or>
- No reasonable way to determine the Mastery Objective for the artifact <and/or>
- No reasonable way to interpret key or notations on artifact

Continued on Next Page

Continued From Previous Page

D Artifact does not align or components of Mastery Objective are not evident

- Artifact does not align with or measure the Mastery Objective <and/or>
- Components of the Mastery Objective are not evident in the artifact
  a. Target number of student behaviors is not evident
  b. Lack of evidence of observable, measurable student response on artifact
  c. Either the visual or auditory is absent from the videotape artifacts
  <or>
- The prompt level is stated as "Full Physical", but the documentation for instruction toward less intrusive prompts and assistive technologies is not included
  <or>
- Does not meet the criteria for dictated response

E Data Chart does not show a minimum of three consecutive observations occurring/taken on different days prior to demonstration of mastery

F Accuracy scores not reported or reported incorrectly

- Accuracy score is not stated <or>
- Verification of reported accuracy score does not reflect evidence in the artifact and accuracy less than 80% <or>
- A more intrusive prompt is used that is not consistent with the percent accuracy reported on the artifact

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA)

School System Summary Report

2006 Reading

LEA:

Code:

Reading							
						Artifacts Not Scorable	
Grade	Number of Students Assessed	Percent Proficient or Advanced	Percent of Objectives Mastered	Percent of Objectives NOT Mastered	Percent of Objectives Non-scorable	Reason	Percentage Not Scorable by Reason
3	1	100%	80%	20%	20%	A	20%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	0%
						E	0%
						F	0%
4	4	100%	80%	20%	15%	A	8%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	0%
						E	8%
						F	0%
5	2	100%	85%	15%	10%	A	5%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	5%
						E	0%
						F	0%
6	3	100%	100%	0%	0%	A	0%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	0%
						E	0%
						F	0%
7	4	100%	100%	0%	0%	A	0%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	0%
						E	0%
						F	0%
8	8	88%	91%	9%	9%	A	1%
						B	1%
						C	5%
						D	0%
						E	1%
						F	0%
10	4	50%	65%	35%	35%	A	15%
						B	3%
						C	0%
						D	10%
						E	8%
						F	0%

Alternate **M**aryland **S**chool **A**ssessment (Alt-MSA) LEA:
School System Summary Report Code:
2006 Mathematics

Mathematics							
						Artifacts Not Scorable	
Grade	Number of Students Assessed	Percent Proficient or Advanced	Percent of Objectives Mastered	Percent of Objectives NOT Mastered	Percent of Objectives Non-scorable	Reason	Percentage Not Scorable by Reason
3	1	100%	90%	10%	10%	A	0%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	0%
						E	0%
						F	10%
4	4	75%	70%	30%	28%	A	0%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	3%
						E	25%
						F	0%
5	2	100%	65%	35%	30%	A	20%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	5%
						E	5%
						F	0%
6	3	100%	100%	0%	0%	A	0%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	0%
						E	0%
						F	0%
7	4	100%	100%	0%	0%	A	0%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	0%
						E	0%
						F	0%
8	8	88%	89%	11%	11%	A	1%
						B	3%
						C	3%
						D	1%
						E	4%
						F	0%
10	4	100%	85%	15%	15%	A	0%
						B	0%
						C	0%
						D	8%
						E	3%
						F	5%

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Achievement Matters Most

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA)

Middle School Summary Report by Grade

2006 Reading

School:
LEA:
Code:

Reading						
					Artifacts Not Scorable	
Grade	Number of Students Assessed	Percent Proficient or Advanced	Average Percent of Objectives Mastered	Average Percent of Objectives NOT Mastered	Reason	Percentage Not Scorable by Reason
6	4	100%	100%	0%	A	0%
					B	0%
					C	0%
					D	0%
					E	0%
					F	0%
7	8	75%	75%	25%	A	4%
					B	13%
					C	0%
					D	4%
					E	5%
					F	0%
8	4	100%	88%	13%	A	13%
					B	0%
					C	0%
					D	0%
					E	0%
					F	0%

Notes:
A Mastery Objective is scored as **Mastered** if all of the components of the scoring rubric are present, as outlined on page 7-4 through 7-8 of the Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook and the Mastery Objective:

1) Aligns with the selected reading or mathematics objective AND
2) The artifact is evidence of an observable and measurable student response directly related to the assessed objective AND
3) The artifact reflects that the student has attained at least 80% mastery of the objective

An objective is scored as **Not Mastered** if the artifact did not reflect that the student had attained 80% mastery of the assessed objective.

A mastery objective is **Non-Scorable and therefore Not Mastered** if one or more of the following conditions occur:

A Mastery objective not aligned or **Prompt Not Clear**
- Mastery Objective was determined to be not aligned during Mastery Objective review and no revisions were made and Mastery Objective is still not aligned <or>
- Mastery Objective not reviewed during Mastery Objective review and it is not aligned <and/or>
- Number and/or type of prompt are not specified

B Artifact is missing or unacceptable
- Mastery Objective does not have an artifact <or>
- Mastery Objective has an unacceptable artifact

C Artifact is incomplete
- No student name on artifact <and/or>
- Artifact not dated with day, month and year <and/or>
- Dates on artifact are out of acceptable range <and/or>
- No reasonable way to determine the Mastery Objective for the artifact <and/or>
- No reasonable way to interpret key or notations on artifact

Continued on Next Page

Continued From Previous Page

D Artifact does not align or components of Mastery Objective are not evident

- Artifact does not align with or measure the Mastery Objective <and/or>
- Components of the Mastery Objective are not evident in the artifact
  a. Target number of student behaviors is not evident
  b. Lack of evidence of observable, measurable student response on artifact
  c. Either the visual or auditory is absent from the videotape artifacts
  <or>
- The prompt level is stated as "Full Physical", but the documentation for instruction toward less intrusive prompts and assistive technologies is not included
  <or>
- Does not meet the criteria for dictated response

E Data Chart does not show a minimum of three consecutive observations occurring/taken on different days prior to demonstration of mastery

F Accuracy scores not reported or reported incorrectly

- Accuracy score is not stated <or>
- Verification of reported accuracy score does not reflect evidence in the artifact and accuracy less than 80% <or>
- A more intrusive prompt is used that is not consistent with the percent accuracy reported on the artifact

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Achievement Matters Most

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA)

Middle School Summary Report by Grade

2006 Mathematics

School:
LEA:
Code:

Mathematics						
					Artifacts Not Scorable	
Grade	Number of Students Assessed	Percent Proficient or Advanced	Average Percent of Objectives Mastered	Average Percent of Objectives NOT Mastered	Reason	Percentage Not Scorable by Reason
6	4	100%	93%	8%	A	5%
					B	0%
					C	0%
					D	3%
					E	0%
					F	0%
7	8	75%	75%	25%	A	0%
					B	13%
					C	0%
					D	4%
					E	9%
					F	0%
8	4	75%	83%	18%	A	15%
					B	0%
					C	0%
					D	3%
					E	0%
					F	0%

Notes:
A Mastery Objective is scored as **Mastered** if all of the components of the scoring rubric are present, as outlined on page 7-4 through 7-8 of the Alt-MSA 2006 Handbook and the Mastery Objective:

1) Aligns with the selected reading or mathematics objective AND
2) The artifact is evidence of an observable and measurable student response directly related to the assessed objective AND
3) The artifact reflects that the student has attained at least 80% mastery of the objective

An objective is scored as **Not Mastered** if the artifact did not reflect that the student had attained 80% mastery of the assessed objective.

A mastery objective is **Non-Scorable and therefore Not Mastered** if one or more of the following conditions occur:

A Mastery objective not aligned or **Prompt Not Clear**
- Mastery Objective was determined to be not aligned during Mastery Objective review and no revisions were made and Mastery Objective is still not aligned <or>
- Mastery Objective not reviewed during Mastery Objective review and it is not aligned <and/or>
- Number and/or type of prompt are not specified

B Artifact is missing or unacceptable
- Mastery Objective does not have an artifact <or>
- Mastery Objective has an unacceptable artifact

C Artifact is incomplete
- No student name on artifact <and/or>
- Artifact not dated with day, month and year <and/or>
- Dates on artifact are out of acceptable range <and/or>
- No reasonable way to determine the Mastery Objective for the artifact <and/or>
- No reasonable way to interpret key or notations on artifact

Continued on Next Page

Continued From Previous Page

D Artifact does not align or components of Mastery Objective are not evident

- Artifact does not align with or measure the Mastery Objective <and/or>
- Components of the Mastery Objective are not evident in the artifact
  a. Target number of student behaviors is not evident
  b. Lack of evidence of observable, measurable student response on artifact
  c. Either the visual or auditory is absent from the videotape artifacts
  <or>
- The prompt level is stated as "Full Physical", but the documentation for instruction toward less intrusive prompts and assistive technologies is not included
  <or>
- Does not meet the criteria for dictated response

E Data Chart does not show a minimum of three consecutive observations occurring/taken on different days prior to demonstration of mastery

F Accuracy scores not reported or reported incorrectly

- Accuracy score is not stated <or>
- Verification of reported accuracy score does not reflect evidence in the artifact and accuracy less than 80% <or>
- A more intrusive prompt is used that is not consistent with the percent accuracy reported on the artifact

Appendix K

Sample Performance Scoring Center (PSC) Reports

Run Date: 5/22/2006

Run Time: 2:36:04PM

Report Date: 5/22/2006

ALT-MSA Test Edition 2005-2006

Cumulative Portfolio Statistics Summary Report

Report #: MD2

Page 1 of 1

Date	# Validity Port Reads	Validity %		# Port Read	# Port Read Twice	Reliability%		Resolutions				
		Reading	Math			Reading	Math	# Port	Total # Obj	# Obj Reading	# Obj Math	# Obj Complete
4/8/06	0	0.0	0.0	6	6	93.3	100.0	2	2	2	0	2
4/17/06	0	0.0	0.0	300	300	89.7	91.6	47	145	73	72	2
4/18/06	54	92.4	79.1	534	534	90.6	92.5	109	307	164	143	2
4/19/06	56	92.5	79.1	780	780	90.1	91.3	182	549	276	273	79
4/20/06	109	90.0	74.9	906	906	90.1	91.1	212	654	333	321	320
4/21/06	113	89.7	74.7	1,424	1,424	90.9	91.1	334	1,034	518	516	686
4/22/06	113	89.7	74.7	1,718	1,718	91.0	90.9	383	1,171	578	593	782
4/24/06	113	89.7	74.7	2,260	2,260	90.3	90.0	612	2,025	1,010	1,015	1,270
4/25/06	169	90.2	78.5	2,644	2,644	90.3	89.9	747	2,470	1,213	1,257	1,717
4/26/06	169	90.2	78.5	3,043	3,043	90.4	90.0	846	2,779	1,364	1,415	2,440
4/27/06	224	89.3	78.2	3,457	3,457	90.1	89.9	965	3,206	1,581	1,625	2,815
4/28/06	224	89.3	78.2	3,845	3,845	90.3	90.1	1,069	3,522	1,737	1,785	3,158
4/29/06	224	89.3	78.2	4,136	4,136	90.4	90.1	1,118	3,703	1,829	1,874	3,416
5/1/06	224	89.3	78.2	4,700	4,700	90.5	90.5	1,273	4,192	2,085	2,107	3,790
5/2/06	290	90.6	80.6	5,241	5,241	90.7	90.6	1,416	4,626	2,302	2,324	4,244
5/3/06	294	90.6	80.7	6,077	6,077	91.2	91.1	1,598	5,145	2,562	2,583	4,811
5/4/06	363	91.5	81.9	6,714	6,714	91.6	91.4	1,739	5,504	2,719	2,785	5,249
5/5/06	364	91.4	81.9	7,469	7,469	91.9	91.6	1,930	6,067	2,993	3,074	5,718
5/8/06	364	91.4	81.9	8,196	8,196	92.1	91.9	2,089	6,552	3,238	3,314	6,232
5/9/06	433	90.8	83.4	8,977	8,977	92.3	92.1	2,259	6,930	3,414	3,516	6,707
5/10/06	434	90.8	83.4	9,666	9,666	92.5	92.3	2,440	7,460	3,682	3,778	7,331
5/11/06	434	90.8	83.4	9,674	9,674	92.5	92.3	2,445	7,480	3,687	3,793	7,480

Run Date: 5/22/2006
Run Time: 2:50:06PM
Report Date: 5/22/2006

ALT-MSA Test Edition 2005-2006
Cumulative Portfolio Statistics by Scorer and Team

Report #: MD4
Page 1 of 3

Team	Scorer	# Validity Port Reads	Validity %		# Port Read	# Port Read Twice	Reliability%		Resolutions					Res Agree%	
			Reading	Math			Reading	Math	# Port	Total # Obj	# Obj Reading	# Obj Math	# Obj Complete	Reading	Math
Totals		**434**	**90.8**	**83.4**	**9,790**	**9,790**	**92.5**	**92.3**	**4,890**	**14,960**	**7,374**	**7,586**	**14,960**	**41.4**	**42.6**
	0000	0	0.0	0.0	1	1	100.0	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A
	Team Totals	**0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**1**	**1**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**N/A**	**N/A**
1															
	1002	7	90.0	85.7	254	254	93.5	93.5	132	328	164	164	328	43.3	44.5
	1004	6	81.7	75.0	145	145	88.5	87.4	90	349	167	182	349	38.3	40.1
	1027	7	87.1	80.0	192	192	89.2	91.7	112	367	207	160	367	28.5	30.0
	1055	7	97.1	90.0	157	157	96.2	94.8	50	142	60	82	142	45.0	52.4
	1060	7	91.4	88.6	237	237	93.7	93.5	106	305	150	155	305	48.0	60.0
	1080	3	90.0	80.0	51	51	92.5	90.6	28	86	38	48	86	55.3	54.2
	1082	3	86.7	93.3	73	73	95.8	93.6	37	78	31	47	78	51.6	48.9
	1087	3	90.0	93.3	83	83	95.5	94.6	31	82	37	45	82	56.8	51.1
	Team 1 Totals	**43**	**89.5**	**85.1**	**1,192**	**1,192**	**92.8**	**92.6**	**586**	**1,737**	**854**	**883**	**1,737**	**41.1**	**45.5**
2															
	1003	7	88.6	84.3	161	161	94.0	93.0	81	210	97	113	210	45.4	52.2
	1016	7	85.7	80.0	145	145	91.0	91.1	77	260	131	129	260	29.0	32.6
	1042	7	94.3	78.6	140	140	92.9	91.7	72	216	100	116	216	46.0	43.1
	1051	7	90.0	88.6	54	54	98.3	95.6	11	33	9	24	33	22.2	37.5
	1067	7	90.0	80.0	150	150	93.4	92.8	78	207	99	108	207	39.4	25.0
	1071	6	88.3	75.0	168	168	93.5	93.0	84	228	110	118	228	34.5	44.1
	1077	3	86.7	86.7	42	42	97.6	99.8	6	11	10	1	11	60.0	0.0
	1081	3	96.7	93.3	123	123	93.4	93.3	61	164	81	83	164	30.9	43.4
	1091	3	90.0	83.3	112	112	94.5	94.8	52	120	62	58	120	48.4	36.2
	Team 2 Totals	**50**	**89.8**	**82.4**	**1,095**	**1,095**	**93.6**	**93.2**	**522**	**1,449**	**699**	**750**	**1,449**	**38.3**	**39.5**
3															
	1015	7	84.3	71.4	165	165	91.6	90.1	88	301	138	163	301	21.0	36.8
	1017	6	93.3	75.0	133	133	93.8	92.8	67	179	83	96	179	39.8	42.7
	1032	6	93.3	76.7	114	114	91.0	93.0	47	183	103	80	183	35.9	31.3
	1033	7	90.0	82.9	267	267	91.5	90.5	137	482	228	254	482	34.2	37.8
	1040	6	88.3	88.3	104	104	98.3	98.0	16	39	18	21	39	66.7	71.4
	1046	6	83.3	85.0	183	183	90.7	89.2	96	368	171	197	368	39.8	31.5
	1062	7	94.3	88.6	80	80	94.5	96.0	27	76	44	32	76	61.4	50.0
	1083	3	93.3	90.0	91	91	93.3	91.4	39	139	61	78	139	27.9	24.4
	1089	3	90.0	90.0	110	110	94.4	95.3	50	114	62	52	114	24.2	40.4
	Team 3 Totals	**51**	**89.8**	**82.2**	**1,247**	**1,247**	**92.7**	**92.2**	**567**	**1,881**	**908**	**973**	**1,881**	**34.8**	**36.5**
4															
	1029	7	92.9	87.1	84	84	97.6	96.2	24	52	20	32	52	45.0	46.9
	1037	6	93.3	85.0	197	197	91.7	90.9	97	343	163	180	343	36.2	36.1
	1039	6	90.0	88.3	107	107	90.9	91.5	64	188	97	91	188	47.4	51.6
	1050	7	87.1	90.0	174	174	95.3	93.8	82	190	82	108	190	47.6	55.6
	1052	7	92.9	81.4	146	146	95.2	95.8	46	131	70	61	131	35.7	37.7

Run Date: 5/22/2006
Run Time: 2:36:21PM
Report Date: 5/22/2006

ALT-MSA Test Edition 2005-2006
Cumulative Portfolio Statistics by Objective

Report #: MD8
Page 1 of 1

	Objective	# Validity Port Reads	Validity %	# Reliability Reads	Reliability %	Resolutions		Resolution FD	
						Total # Obj	# Obj Complete	Not Mastered (0)	Mastered (1)
Reading									
	Reading Objective 1		87.8		92.2	762	762	30	142
	Reading Objective 2		92.9		91.9	792	792	26	153
	Reading Objective 3		93.1		93.0	684	684	32	109
	Reading Objective 4		91.5		93.4	644	644	21	107
	Reading Objective 5		89.4		92.6	728	728	24	140
	Reading Objective 6		98.4		91.4	842	842	38	150
	Reading Objective 7		94.2		93.0	690	690	32	138
	Reading Objective 8		77.6		92.5	738	738	27	141
	Reading Objective 9		89.6		92.2	762	762	29	132
	Reading Objective 10		93.8		92.5	732	732	30	134
Reading totals			**90.8**		**92.5**	**7,374**	**7,374**	**289**	**1,346**
Math									
	Math Objective 1		79.7		92.7	714	714	22	166
	Math Objective 2		95.4		91.6	818	818	29	160
	Math Objective 3		65.9		92.2	764	764	26	150
	Math Objective 4		91.2		93.2	670	670	23	123
	Math Objective 5		85.5		92.3	756	756	29	159
	Math Objective 6		90.8		92.2	766	766	26	147
	Math Objective 7		73.7		91.8	802	802	21	150
	Math Objective 8		77.6		91.9	794	794	29	151
	Math Objective 9		91.7		92.5	736	736	40	140
	Math Objective 10		82.5		92.2	766	766	41	141
Math totals			**83.4**		**92.3**	**7,586**	**7,586**	**286**	**1,487**
Totals		**434**	**87.1**	**4,895**	**92.4**	**14,960**	**14,960**	**575**	**2,833**

Run Date : 5/22/2006
Run Time : 2:36:08PM

Alt-MSA

Cumulative Frequency Distribution Report by Item

Item Name	Reader	Total Read	Score Distribution of Total Read 0 %	1 %	6 %	A %	B %	C %	D %	E %	F %
Reading Objective 1											
	0000	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Team		**1**	**0.0**	**100.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
	1002	254	4.7	64.6	0.0	4.7	2.8	1.2	9.4	11.4	1.2
	1004	145	2.1	67.6	0.0	8.3	2.8	2.1	6.9	9.7	0.7
	1027	192	2.1	75.5	0.0	5.2	1.6	2.1	4.2	8.9	0.5
	1055	157	3.8	51.6	0.0	8.9	5.1	1.3	17.8	9.6	1.9
	1060	237	3.8	60.3	0.0	7.6	5.5	3.0	10.5	8.4	0.8
	1080	51	11.8	64.7	0.0	3.9	2.0	0.0	5.9	11.8	0.0
	1082	73	0.0	57.5	0.0	4.1	6.8	4.1	6.8	17.8	2.7
	1087	83	2.4	69.9	0.0	8.4	3.6	0.0	8.4	6.0	1.2
Team 1		**1,192**	**3.5**	**64.1**	**0.0**	**6.5**	**3.7**	**1.8**	**9.2**	**10.0**	**1.1**
	1003	161	5.0	62.1	0.0	5.6	5.0	0.0	11.8	8.7	1.9
	1016	145	2.8	58.6	0.0	6.9	9.7	2.1	9.0	7.6	3.4
	1042	140	2.9	55.0	0.0	7.9	2.9	0.7	14.3	13.6	2.9
	1051	54	5.6	33.3	0.0	18.5	16.7	3.7	9.3	9.3	3.7
	1067	150	2.0	58.0	0.0	8.7	2.7	2.7	17.3	6.0	2.7
	1071	168	3.0	67.3	0.0	7.1	4.2	0.6	7.7	7.7	2.4
	1077	42	0.0	26.2	0.0	19.0	14.3	4.8	23.8	9.5	2.4
	1081	123	2.4	68.3	0.0	3.3	2.4	0.8	10.6	12.2	0.0
	1091	112	2.7	67.0	0.0	6.3	5.4	0.0	8.9	9.8	0.0
Team 2		**1,095**	**3.0**	**59.4**	**0.0**	**7.7**	**5.6**	**1.3**	**11.8**	**9.2**	**2.1**
	1015	165	2.4	71.5	0.0	8.5	2.4	1.8	5.5	6.7	1.2
	1017	133	2.3	61.7	0.0	8.3	5.3	1.5	12.8	8.3	0.0
	1032	114	2.6	67.5	0.0	7.9	6.1	0.0	4.4	10.5	0.9
	1033	267	4.1	70.4	0.0	10.1	3.0	1.5	4.9	5.6	0.4
	1040	104	2.9	24.0	0.0	18.3	13.5	9.6	18.3	11.5	1.9
	1046	183	4.4	69.9	0.0	8.2	4.4	1.1	6.0	4.9	1.1
	1062	80	5.0	47.5	0.0	7.5	20.0	1.3	5.0	10.0	3.8
	1083	91	4.4	73.6	0.0	6.6	2.2	1.1	1.1	8.8	2.2
	1089	110	4.5	64.5	0.0	5.5	7.3	0.0	9.1	5.5	3.6
Team 3		**1,247**	**3.6**	**63.7**	**0.0**	**9.1**	**5.9**	**1.8**	**7.1**	**7.4**	**1.4**
	1029	84	1.2	38.1	0.0	4.8	10.7	3.6	20.2	17.9	3.6
	1037	197	1.5	73.1	0.0	8.6	5.1	0.0	5.6	5.6	0.5
	1039	107	6.5	57.9	0.0	8.4	3.7	0.0	9.3	12.1	1.9
	1050	174	2.3	68.4	0.0	4.0	6.3	0.6	8.6	6.9	2.9
	1052	146	4.1	59.6	0.0	11.6	3.4	1.4	13.0	5.5	1.4
	1059	296	3.0	58.4	0.0	8.4	1.7	2.0	14.2	10.5	1.7
	1065	127	2.4	68.5	0.0	3.1	3.9	1.6	9.4	9.4	1.6
	1066	21	19.0	33.3	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	23.8	14.3	4.8
	1068	171	0.6	69.0	0.0	7.6	2.3	1.8	8.2	9.9	0.6
	1085	30	6.7	80.0	0.0	3.3	3.3	0.0	3.3	3.3	0.0
Team 4		**1,353**	**3.0**	**63.0**	**0.0**	**7.2**	**4.0**	**1.3**	**10.8**	**9.1**	**1.6**
	1006	232	4.7	60.8	0.0	7.3	6.0	0.4	9.9	10.3	0.4
	1007	200	4.5	56.5	0.0	7.0	7.5	1.0	11.5	11.0	1.0
	1038	127	4.7	59.8	0.0	10.2	2.4	0.8	10.2	11.0	0.8
	1056	250	2.0	72.8	0.0	5.6	2.4	0.8	7.6	7.2	1.6
	1072	132	4.5	62.1	0.0	6.8	5.3	2.3	10.6	5.3	3.0
	1073	145	2.1	55.2	0.0	7.6	4.1	2.1	14.5	12.4	2.1
	1075	60	3.3	58.3	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	1.7	6.7	0.0
	1095	88	10.2	61.4	0.0	4.5	5.7	0.0	8.0	8.0	2.3
Team 5		**1,234**	**4.1**	**61.8**	**0.0**	**6.6**	**6.0**	**1.0**	**9.8**	**9.2**	**1.4**
	1034	149	3.4	62.4	0.0	9.4	2.0	0.7	11.4	10.7	0.0
	1063	87	0.0	64.4	0.0	3.4	9.2	3.4	5.7	13.8	0.0
	1070	157	1.9	65.6	0.0	5.1	3.2	0.0	8.9	12.1	3.2
	1074	181	2.8	63.0	0.0	5.5	1.7	0.6	11.6	13.8	1.1
	1079	58	3.4	53.4	0.0	8.6	5.2	1.7	8.6	17.2	1.7
	1086	77	3.9	66.2	0.0	5.2	1.3	2.6	9.1	10.4	1.3
	1094	103	3.9	70.9	0.0	4.9	3.9	1.9	4.9	7.8	1.9
	1097	21	0.0	66.7	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	23.8	4.8	0.0
Team 6		**833**	**2.6**	**64.2**	**0.0**	**6.0**	**3.2**	**1.2**	**9.5**	**11.9**	**1.3**
	1012	121	5.0	65.3	0.0	7.4	1.7	0.0	12.4	6.6	1.7
	1022	83	4.8	67.5	0.0	4.8	4.8	0.0	9.6	7.2	1.2
	1044	87	2.3	64.4	0.0	9.2	2.3	1.1	10.3	9.2	1.1

Run Date: 5/22/2006
Run Time: 2:50:23PM
Report Date: 5/22/2006

ALT-MSA Test Edition 2005-2006
Cumulative Validity by Portfolio and Reader

Report #: MD10
Page 1 of 31

Reader ID	Sheet ID	Reading Objectives										Math Objectives										% Agree Reading	% Agree Math	% Agree
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
True Score	**P000100001**	1	1	A	1	1	1	D	1	D	1	D	1	1	1	D	D	D	1	1	1			
Reader Total		87.7	100.0	98.2	100.0	89.5	98.2	84.2	93.0	73.7	100.0	64.9	93.0	98.2	100.0	86.0	78.9	8.8	86.0	82.5	94.7	**92.5**	**79.3**	**85.9**
1000	P000100001	E	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*			
Reader Total																						90.0	90.0	90.0
1002	P000100001	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*			
Reader Total																						90.0	90.0	90.0
1003	P000100001	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*			
Reader Total																						100.0	80.0	90.0
1004	P000100001	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	D	*	D			
Reader Total																						80.0	70.0	75.0
1005	P000100001	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	F	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Reader Total																						100.0	90.0	95.0
1006	P000100001	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	F	*	*	*			
Reader Total																						100.0	80.0	90.0
1007	P000100001	*	*	*	*	E	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	1	*	*	*			
Reader Total																						90.0	80.0	85.0
1009	P000100001	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			
Reader Total																						100.0	100.0	100.0
1011	P000100001	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	1	*	1	*	*	*	*	1	1	D	*	*			
Reader Total																						80.0	60.0	70.0
1012	P000100001	*	*	*	*	D	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*			
Reader Total																						90.0	90.0	90.0
1015	P000100001	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	1	*	B	*	*	*	1	1	1	*	*	*			
Reader Total																						80.0	60.0	70.0
1016	P000100001	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	E	D			
Reader Total																						100.0	70.0	85.0
1017	P000100001	E	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	*	*	*	F	1	*	E	*			
Reader Total																						90.0	60.0	75.0
1018	P000100001	*	*	*	*	D	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*	C	*			
Reader Total																						90.0	80.0	85.0

Appendix L

Alt-MSA Scoring Consistency: 2005 to 2006

Purpose

In order to make reliable inferences about student/school/district improvement as reflected by change in proficiency level on the Alt-MSA, student portfolios must be compared to equivalent, or rationally linked performance standards from one year to the next. The Alt-MSA program, as is true of any large scale alternate assessment, is comprised of many components and making inferences within or across years requires:

1. Clear, consistent and accessible user instructions for Alt-MSA
2. Reliable test-related materials
3. Effective training of
    a. Teachers,
    b. Test Examiner Teams, and
    c. Scoring staff
4. Consistent performance standards established for the Alt-MSA in a transparent and rational manner and linked across years
5. Well-defined processes for
    a. Gathering portfolio evidence,
    b. Communicating portfolio evidence from classrooms to scoring centers,
    c. Scoring portfolios in a consistent manner,
    d. Assigning performance levels to portfolios, and
    e. Communicating performance results back to classrooms.

With these complexities in mind, the goal of the current research is to examine and document one aspect of the system: the consistency of the Alt-MSA scoring process across years (i.e., 2005-2006). In the system outlined above, the scoring process refers specifically to the component where scores or condition codes on Mastery Objectives are assigned by trained scorers within a reliable system of double scoring with back readings when necessary for resolution. In a process where scoring is stable across years (i.e., 2005 to 2006), and changes in training and scoring rules are minor and accounted for, we would expect estimates of between year agreements to be similar to estimates of within year agreement (i.e., inter-rater reliability).

However, the Alt-MSA program operates within a continuous improvement paradigm, where the MSDE and PEM consistently improve all processes—including the scoring process. In this situation, we expect across year agreement to be lower than within year agreement when all scoring decisions are considered, with lower percentages of students reaching the proficient level of performance due to improved scoring rules, but similar agreement within and across years when only Mastery scoring decisions are considered. In the next section we provide background for why we expect this outcome and why it is positive for the Alt-MSA.

Historical Background

The current portfolio-based Alternate Maryland School Assessment program was first administered during the 2003-2004 academic year. In an effort to improve the Alt-MSA, substantive changes were made to the assessment design and the associated scoring rules between 2004 and 2005. Subsequent changes were also made between 2005 and 2006. Given these changes, we know that some 2005 portfolios would receive different scores at the artifact and portfolio level if rescored in 2006, most notably due to a stricter use of condition codes in 2006. In contrast, the definition of mastery versus non-mastery scoring at the objective level remained relatively constant between 2005 and 2006 which would provide stability to this scoring aspect. A list of some of the condition code changes and an explanation as to how they could have resulted in different scores in 2006 relative to 2005 is provided below.

Condition Code A.

In 2005, only alignment was scored under this condition code. In 2006, not only alignment, but an incorrect prompt level (the prompt level must have the number and type of prompt) was scored under this code. In 2005, the results of Mastery Objective Review (MOR) were often scored as "aligned" when in actuality were not aligned as seen during operational scoring. In 2006, the training for Mastery Objective Review (MOR) was quite intense with training and qualifying on each individual content standard. Therefore, recognizing alignment was more complete. In 2005, scorer training included alignment training as part of the general scoring training and was not as specific or refined as in 2006. Also in 2006, the MOR scorers became the alignment scorers during operational scoring and were intensively trained (3 days) and qualified in each content area. Therefore, alignment scorers thoroughly understood the content standards and could clearly apply alignment concepts. In 2005, mastery objectives were completely written by the test examiner without the help of an online program. In 2006, there was an online process for entering the mastery objectives. The online entry of mastery objectives made it easier for test examiners to choose indicators and objectives.

Condition Code B.

In 2005, checklists were acceptable, but in 2006 they were scored under this condition code.

Condition Code C.

In 2005, the accuracy score not evident or verified was scored under this condition code but in 2006 it received a new condition code ("F").

Condition Code D.

In 2005, data charts with no evidence of instruction but multiple times of mastery scored a "1." Yet in 2006, they were scored an "E." In 2006, also added to this condition code were not enough items presented, unacceptable dictated response, data is not recorded for each observation, the visual or auditory is missing from the videotape and no documentation for full physical **and** use of assistive technology

Condition Code E.
In 2005 this condition code was not used and in 2006 it was added.

Condition Code F.
In 2005 this condition code was not used and in 2006 it was added.

It appears that differences in the Alt-MSA scoring rules from 2005 to 2006 were considerable due to changes in condition code definitions and in going from four condition codes to six condition codes. Other considerations regarding scoring consistency between 2005 and 2006 are rooted in consistent improvements to the testing program, according to alternate assessment experts at PEM.

For example, over the past three years Alt-MSA improvements can be seen in alignment, prompt level, and mastery level in written mastery objectives. Improvement has also occurred at the artifact level. The required elements for the artifact are more complete and the components of the mastery objective are evident. Acceptable data charts with observable and measurable behavior done over time have also improved. These improvements have occurred because the *Alt-MSA Handbook* is annually revised to sharpen expectations regarding portfolio development. Revisions should result in less score variance due to differences in teacher portfolio development expertise and increased emphasis on measuring student achievement. Every year the *Alt-MSA Handbook* is re-written to clarify the expectations of what is acceptable within the mastery objectives and within the artifacts in the portfolio for that particular year. Once it is clearly stated within the handbook, the test examiners can be held accountable for following the handbook in the upcoming assessment.

The extent to which these changes will influence the agreement between 2005 and 2006 scores is unknown, but these factors would need to be considered when interpreting 2005-to-2006 scoring consistency results. Given the scoring differences between these two years, the analysis and results reported here concerning scoring consistency will be useful for score interpretation, comparison, and program planning.

Design and Methodology

Following the 2006 Alt-MSA scoring window student scoring consistencies and the impact of scoring rule changes from 2005 to 2006 were assessed. In addition to the condition code changes specified above, changes to scoring rules included the following:

- In 2005, certain artifacts were specified to be "authentic mastery objectives in authentic settings" and in 2006 this was replaced by a requirement that all mastery objectives reflected a linkage to the grade-level content standards and used grade- and age-appropriate materials.
- Specific guidance for data charts was given for the 2006 test, which was not provided for the 2004 and 2005 tests
- Authentic artifacts are associated with objectives 7 and 9 in Reading and 5 and 9 in Mathematics in 2005 (dropped for 2006)

Research Portfolios

In order to estimate consistency of scoring, a 5% sample (N=269) representative of the 2005 Alt-MSA population was drawn from the 2005 student portfolios and was re-scored in 2006. This rescored sample was, to the extent possible, representative of school level (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school), gender, ethnicity, schools, and LEAs from the total Alt-MSA population. All materials from the 2005 portfolios and used in scoring were available to the scorers in 2006.

Scoring

The 2005 scored student portfolios from the sample were rescored as 2006 portfolios at the end of live 2006 scoring. These were each scored by one of a random sample of 12 raters (all had scored the 2005 Mastery Objective Review as well as the 2006 general assessment) and received second scores from one of a group of randomly assigned second raters. Any issues that arose during the scoring of these portfolios were clearly documented by the scoring supervisors. Scoring was conducted using the same procedures as were used for 2006 live scoring, in that two scorers provided ratings for each portfolio with a third resolution rating if the first two raters did not agree.

Analysis and Results

The first step of our analysis was to calculate the demographic characteristics of the research sample and compare this to the 2005 Alt-MSA student population. Results from these analyses are provided in Table L.1. The only significant demographic difference between the sample and the 2005 student population was in the distribution of grade levels in the sample. Sixth grade portfolios made up 6% of the sample while this grade comprises 15% of the population, and 35% of the sample portfolios were from 10th grade while this grade defines only 16% of the Alt-MSA examinee population. Overall, demographic characteristics of the sample show that it is representative of the Alt-MSA population.

Table L.1 Sample demographics compared to 2005 population

	Research Sample(N=269)				2005 Population (N=5047)			
	Freq	Percent	Cum. Freq	Cum. Percent	Freq	Percent	Cum. Freq	Cum. Percent
Race								
Amer. Indian	0	0	0	0	16	0.32%	16	.32%
Asian Amer.	8	3%	8	3%	167	3%	183	4%
Black	135	50%	143	53%	2432	48%	2615	52%
White	115	43%	258	96%	2181	43%	4796	95%
Hispanic	11	4%	269	100%	251	5%	5047	100%
Gender								
Male	174	65%	174	65%	3224	64%	3224	64%
Female	95	35%	269	100%	1823	36%	5047	100%
Grade								
3	22	8%	22	8%	517	10%	517	10%
4	35	13%	57	21%	536	11%	1053	21%
5	31	12%	88	32%	683	14%	1736	34%
6	16	6%	104	39%	777	15%	2513	50%
7	43	16%	147	55%	892	18%	3405	67%

8	28	10%	175	65%	830	16%	4235	84%
10	94	35%	269	100%	812	16%	5047	100%
LEP Services Indicator								
E	1	0.37%	1	0.37%	33	1%	36	1%
N	264	98%	265	99%	4966	98%	5002	99%
Y	4	1%	269	100%	45	1%	5047	100%

Note. E = Exited the program, not currently receiving LEP Services within last 2 years; N = No, not receiving LEP services; Y = Yes, currently receiving LEP services.

In the second step of the analysis we computed Mastery Percentage frequency distributions by subject area (i.e., Reading and Math) for the research sample across 2005 and 2006. These results are presented in Table L.2. Comparing the percent of portfolios at each decile of Percent Mastery, the largest difference is at the "0%", particularly when the non-scorable portfolios (i.e., portfolios with 10 out of 10 Mastery Objectives within a subject with condition codes, no "1" or "0"for any mastery objective) from 2006 are added into the "0%" category. This results in 28% more portfolios in the "0%" category for Reading and 32% more for Math in 2006 than in 2005. Differences of similar magnitude, but in an opposite direction are found in the highest Percent Mastery levels across 2005 and 2006, with 18% more portfolios receiving 100% Mastery scores for Reading in 2005 than in 2006, and 13% more at 100% Mastery for Math in 2005 than in 2006.

Table L.2 Comparison between 2005 and 2006 Distribution of Overall Reading Scores

	2006 Reading Overall Score Distributions					**2005 Reading Overall Score Distributions**			
		Freq	**Percent**	**Cum.**	**Cum.**	**Freq**	**Percent**	**Cum.**	**Cum.**
Proficiency Level				**Freq**	**Percent**			**Freq**	**Percent**
	NonScor	75	28%	75	28%	-	-	-	-
Basic	0	17	6%	92	34%	20	7%	20	7%
	10	40	15%	132	49%	7	3%	27	10%
	20	19	7%	151	56%	5	2%	32	12%
	30	15	6%	166	62%	6	2%	38	14%
	40	13	5%	179	67%	10	4%	48	18%
	50	18	7%	197	73%	20	7%	68	25%
Proficient	60	17	6%	214	80%	31	12%	99	37%
	70	13	5%	227	84%	29	11%	128	48%
	80	20	7%	247	92%	34	13%	162	60%
Advanced	90	10	4%	257	96%	48	18%	210	78%
	100	12	4%	269	100%	59	22%	269	100%
Proficiency Level	**2006 Math Overall Score Distributions**					**2005 Math Overall Score Distributions**			
	NonScor	86	32%	86	32%	-	-	-	-
Basic	0	13	5%	99	37%	20	7%	20	7%
	10	23	9%	122	45%	9	3%	29	11%

	20	25	9%	147	55%	8	3%	37	14%
	30	18	7%	165	61%	12	4%	49	18%
	40	9	3%	174	65%	21	8%	70	26%
	50	19	7%	193	72%	17	6%	87	32%
Proficient	60	13	5%	206	77%	18	7%	105	39%
	70	17	6%	223	83%	27	10%	132	49%
	80	17	6%	240	89%	41	15%	173	64%
Advanced	90	16	6%	256	95%	47	17%	220	82%
	100	13	5%	269	100%	49	18%	269	100%

Note. NonScor = Non-scorable and indicates students receiving condition codes on all 10 objectives in 2006.

The third and fourth analyses focused on rater agreement within and between years for the research sample, first by Mastery Objective, and then by performance level. Results at the Mastery Objective level are presented in Table L.3. The Percent Agreement for Mastery Score columns provide inter-rater agreement for 2006, and across 2005 and 2006 scores on the portfolio sample, calculated by the percent of cases scored "1" (i.e., Mastery) out of only those scored "0" or "1" (i.e., portfolios receiving condition codes for the objective were not included in this calculation of inter-rater agreement for that objective). Using the conventional criteria of 80% agreement, 2006 inter-rater agreement is acceptable for every Mastery Objective, and only one Mastery Objective falls below 80% agreement across 2005 – 2006. When all condition codes that were given to each objective across portfolios are scored as "0" and included in the analysis, as is done in operational Alt-MSA scoring, the inter-rater agreement across 2005-2006 ranges from 50% to 66% with an average of 58%. This is low by conventional standards, and is due to the large difference in the number of portfolios receiving condition codes by objective between 2005 - 2006 scoring.

Table L.3 Rater Agreement by Objective

Rater Agreement by Objective			
Within 2006 Sample (N=269)			
	Percent Agreement for Mastery Score		**Percent Agreement for All Scores with Condition Codes = "0"**
	Inter-rater Agreement for Mastery Only in 2006	**Inter-rater Agreement for Mastery Only across 2005 - 2006**	**Inter-rater agreement between 2005 and 2006**
Reading Obj 1	89%	86%	54%
Reading Obj 2	93%	91%	57%
Reading Obj 3	94%	93%	63%
Reading Obj 4	92%	97%	63%
Reading Obj 5	94%	87%	51%
Reading Obj 6	96%	90%	54%
Reading Obj 7	93%	82%	50%
Reading Obj 8	94%	93%	62%
Reading Obj 9	93%	90%	51%

Reading Obj 10	94%	92%	55%
Math Obj 1	89%	95%	57%
Math Obj 2	92%	92%	60%
Math Obj 3	94%	92%	67%
Math Obj 4	93%	92%	61%
Math Obj 5	93%	88%	55%
Math Obj 6	93%	93%	59%
Math Obj 7	96%	94%	62%
Math Obj 8	94%	93%	63%
Math Obj 9	92%	77%	58%
Math Obj 10	95%	86%	61%

The fourth analysis was conducted at the performance level for 2005 and 2006 scores within the research sample. The percent of portfolios at each performance level was calculated and compared across years. These results are presented in Tables L.4 and L.5. In each Table, values in cells on the diagonal are the frequency of like Mastery Percentiles across 2005 – 2006, that is, the number of portfolios that received the same overall Reading or Math score in both 2005 and 2006. Thirty-three of 269 portfolios fall into this category for Reading and 36 of 269 for Math. Values in green cells are the frequencies of portfolios that received higher overall scores in 2006 than 2005. Twenty portfolios are in this category for Reading and 24 for Math. Values in red cells are frequencies of portfolios that received lower overall scores in 2006 than 2005. For Reading, 141 of 269 portfolios have lower overall scores in 2006 than 2005. For Math, 123 of 269 portfolios have lower overall scores in 2006. The remainder of portfolios (i.e., n = 75 Reading, n = 86 Math) received scores in 2005 and all condition codes in 2006. Practically, this group of portfolios is calculated as "0%" Mastery in actual scoring. Finally, in the lower rows of each table, portfolios scored in the Advanced performance level in 2005 are fairly evenly distributed across the three performance levels based on 2006 scoring for both Reading and Math.

Table L.4 Agreement in Proficiency Level for Reading across 2005 – 2006

2005 Proficiency Level		2006 Proficiency Level												Total
			Basic						Proficient			Advanced		
		NonScor	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
Basic	0	11	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
	10	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	20	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	30	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
	40	1	5	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	10
	50	5	0	6	2	1	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	20
Proficient	60	9	1	5	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	1	0	31
	70	10	0	4	3	3	2	2	2	0	2	1	0	29
	80	11	1	5	3	1	2	2	3	2	4	0	0	34
Advanced	90	9	1	7	0	2	1	6	3	4	8	4	3	48
	100	16	0	6	5	2	1	2	4	5	5	4	9	59
	Total	75	17	40	19	15	13	18	17	13	20	10	12	269

Note. NonScor = Non-scorable and indicates students receiving condition codes on all 10 objectives in 2006.

Table L.5 Agreement in Proficiency Level for Math across 2005 – 2006

2005 Proficiency Level		2006 Proficiency Level												Total
			Basic						Proficient			Advanced		
		NonScor	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	
Basic	0	13	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
	10	4	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
	20	2	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
	30	5	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	40	9	1	2	2	1	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	21
	50	8	0	2	2	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	17
Proficient	60	4	1	2	4	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	18
	70	5	0	2	4	2	2	4	2	3	2	0	1	27
	80	8	0	5	5	4	2	3	2	5	4	2	1	41
Advanced	90	14	1	0	2	2	1	3	5	1	5	9	4	47
	100	14	1	1	4	2	0	3	1	6	5	5	7	49
	Total	86	13	23	25	18	9	19	13	17	17	16	13	269

Note. NonScor = Non-scorable and indicates students receiving condition codes on all 10 objectives in 2006.

The final analysis focuses on the frequency of condition code use by Mastery Objective across 2005 and 2006 for the research sample of portfolios. These frequencies are reported in Table L.6. The largest change across all Mastery Objectives is in the use of condition code "A" between 2005 and 2006. Condition code "A" was used in more portfolio scorings under 2006 rules than were all four condition codes combined under 2005 rules. This large effect, combined with the addition of two new condition codes (i.e., "E" and "F") resulted in a doubling of the percent of portfolios receiving condition codes in 2006 over 2005.

Table L.6 Frequency of Condition Code Usage by Objective

	2005 Condition Code Usage Percentages					2006 Condition Code Usage Percentages						
	Overall Condition Code Usage	A	B	C	D	Overall Condition Code Usage	A	B	C	D	E	F
Reading Obj 1	31%	3%	5%	8%	15%	62%	32%	6%	2%	17%	7%	1%
Reading Obj 2	31%	3%	6%	8%	15%	62%	34%	8%	1%	12%	7%	1%
Reading Obj 3	30%	3%	5%	8%	14%	61%	34%	3%	2%	16%	5%	2%
Reading Obj 4	30%	3%	5%	8%	14%	60%	31%	4%	2%	17%	7%	3%
Reading Obj 5	28%	2%	6%	9%	12%	57%	33%	4%	3%	12%	11%	3%

Reading Obj 6	29%	2%	6%	8%	13%	58%	33%	4%	2%	15%	11%	2%
Reading Obj 7	30%	3%	6%	9%	12%	60%	36%	7%	2%	14%	9%	2%
Reading Obj 8	29%	3%	6%	8%	12%	58%	33%	5%	2%	13%	10%	2%
Reading Obj 9	29%	2%	7%	8%	12%	58%	38%	5%	1%	16%	9%	3%
Reading Obj 10	27%	2%	7%	7%	10%	53%	35%	3%	2%	13%	12%	3%
Math Obj 1	25%	2%	5%	8%	10%	49%	36%	4%	3%	10%	7%	3%
Math Obj 2	26%	3%	5%	8%	11%	52%	31%	5%	4%	12%	4%	2%
Math Obj 3	32%	2%	6%	9%	15%	63%	32%	5%	2%	13%	6%	3%
Math Obj 4	31%	2%	6%	8%	15%	62%	33%	5%	3%	15%	7%	3%
Math Obj 5	30%	2%	6%	9%	12%	59%	34%	5%	3%	13%	7%	3%
Math Obj 6	26%	2%	6%	7%	11%	52%	35%	4%	3%	12%	5%	3%
Math Obj 7	36%	13%	5%	6%	12%	72%	44%	3%	3%	13%	4%	3%
Math Obj 8	35%	12%	5%	6%	12%	70%	41%	3%	3%	12%	6%	2%
Math Obj 9	35%	3%	7%	9%	17%	70%	41%	5%	2%	16%	5%	3%
Math Obj 10	32%	2%	6%	9%	15%	64%	35%	4%	2%	15%	4%	2%

Conclusions

Several related trends across 2005 and 2006 were identified for both Reading and Math content areas in this within-portfolio across year study of the Alt-MSA. Within year rater agreement was reasonably high and reasonably consistent for both 2005 and 2006. Across year rater agreement was reasonably consistent when only Mastery scores were analyzed, but was lower than conventionally acceptable when condition codes were included in the analysis. Percentages of portfolios within the Advanced and Proficient performance levels were much lower in 2006 than 2005. The underlying mechanism that causes the relationship between these findings is the much higher use of condition codes in 2006 than in 2005.

Raters were in agreement for what constituted both Mastery scores and condition code use *within* the confines of each year's scoring. Raters also agree what constitutes Mastery scores only, across years. However, when condition codes are considered in rater agreement across years, differences in the use of condition codes across years limits agreement across years for this sample of portfolios.

Because the scoring rules changed considerably regarding use of condition codes (e.g., became more demanding of evidence especially on data charts and prompt level) from

2005 to 2006, the number of students scoring at the proficient level is lower. Artifacts that were acceptable (scored a "1") in 2005, were unacceptable (scored a condition code) in 2006.

The differences in use of condition codes across 2005 – 2006 are due to the continuous improvement efforts of MSDE regarding the Alt-MSA program and lead to the number and % of students in each performance level changing dramatically between the 2005 and 2006 scoring for the sample of portfolios. For example, 75% are Proficient or Advanced with 2005 scoring; 37% are in these two categories combined using 2006 scoring. The higher use of condition codes in 2006 results in a large downward shift in reported performance.

In this research study (i.e., scoring 2005 portfolios using the 2006 scoring rubric) we are, in effect, holding test examiners accountable for details that were not evident, given or established in the 2004-05 handbook. It is natural to expect, because these test examiners did not follow the 2005-06 handbook when assembling the 2004-2005 portfolios and were therefore unaware of what would be expected in 2006, that the portfolios would receive somewhat different scores than they did in 2005. Particularly in relationship to condition code use and impact on overall mastery.

Overall, the results of this research study have shown the impact on scores and performance level attainment of increasing the stringency of scoring rules for the Alt-MSA. The changes in scoring rules between 2005 and 2006, as a part of the Alt-MSA continuous improvement program, will result in higher performance expectations for Maryland students. Further research focusing on score consistency and how changes in scoring rules affect student outcomes is recommended.

Appendix M

Examination of Data Collected During Scoring: Collect, Compile, and Review Data that is Generated during Scoring

Purpose

Training and working with the teachers and test examiners to develop portfolios that meet the state requirements is one of Maryland State Department of Education's (MSDE) priorities. To aid in the training, Pearson Educational Measurement (PEM) will analyze the general overall types of issues that are being seen by the scorers and provide MSDE with an overview of the areas in which teachers appear to be having difficulty. This information will allow MSDE to focus on any weaknesses that need to be addressed through teacher training. Because scorers come in contact with a wide variety of portfolios, their feedback can provide useful insight about test examiners' misconceptions and/or weaknesses in building portfolios.

Design

During the scoring of the 2006 Alternate Maryland School Assessment (Alt-MSA), Pearson's Performance Scoring Center (PSC) will collect all Alt-MSA Issues Forms that are generated during the normal course of scoring. This form is filled out by the scorer any time they find a portfolio that varies from the issues covered in the training sets. The portfolio and the form are then reviewed by the scoring supervisor. If the supervisor agrees that the portfolio shows an issue not already covered in training, the portfolio and the issue form are then reviewed by an MSDE representative. A scoring decision is made and scorers are trained on the new decision. At this point, the issues form will be photocopied and placed in a master file. At the end of each week, photocopies of all the forms will be forwarded to PEM Program Management who will key enter the information. This allows for the capture and summarization of all additional issues encountered throughout scoring.

To further facilitate analysis of the issues that suggest more focused teacher training is warranted, Scorers will keep a tally of comment categories that are commonly found with portfolios. PEM and MSDE agreed to track the six most frequently seen portfolio problems during scoring. Below are the six comment categories, the first four of which match condition codes used in scoring.

- Artifact not aligned with Mastery Objective
- Unacceptable artifact
- Data chart not done over time (do not have 3 non mastery)
- Data Charts (not observable/measurable)
- Test irregularities or evidence of questionable practices at the school level
- Numbering issue (objectives were inaccurately numbered by teacher)

Scorers will be trained that not every portfolio will be tallied on the form. Only occasionally will they encounter a portfolio that the form applies to. If they encounter an issue covered by the form during scoring, they will place one tally mark **for the whole portfolio.** There will not be a separate tally for **each piece** of the portfolio that the form applies to. The intent is to identify how many portfolios demonstrate each of the comment types. Therefore, the same portfolio may produce multiple tallies across categories, but not multiple tallies within a category. This will allow MSDE to focus future training on the types of errors that are seen most frequently.

At the end of each day, scorers will turn their tally forms into their scoring supervisor who will add up the total number of occurrences within their team for each comment type. Scoring supervisors will maintain a cumulative total which will be given to the Scoring Director at the end of the week. The Scoring Director will send the nine cumulative forms (one from each of nine teams) to PEM Program Management at the end of each week.

Analysis

Once scoring is complete the data collected from the Alt-MSA Issues Forms and the tally sheets will be compiled and summarized for presentation to the MSDE. Specifically, the number of issues overall and by category will be calculated for the Alt-MSA Issues Forms and the number and percentage of portfolios falling into each of the comment categories will be calculated for the tally form.

Based on this and other information obtained as part of the scoring process, the PSC will write up a brief discussion/interpretation of the results which will accompany the formal process documentation. In addition, the PSC will discuss how this information can be used to improve the teacher and scorer training process.

Please note that this study should be repeated each year as a routine process. The number of portfolios flagged and the types of flags should be analyzed over time as an evaluation of the effectiveness of training. The results (e.g., raw counts and percentages of the total numbers of portfolios, broken down by categories of a range of artifact types, a range of abilities, multiple grades and schools, and gender and ethnic groups) should be included each year in the technical report

Discussion/Interpretation of the Results

Introduction

Pearson Educational Measurement reviewed/synthesized the overall types of issues that were seen by the scorers during the 2006 Alt-MSA portfolio scoring season. This report provides an overview of the areas in which teachers appear to have some misconceptions. The report reviews scoring issues that were noted from two different sources. The first source was Alt-MSA Issues Forms that were generated during the course of scoring. These forms covered various issues that presented questions during scoring. They were completed if a scorer had a question about how to score an objective(s) in the portfolio they were scoring. The second source was a simple tally form used during a portion of the scoring window to capture the occurrence of common issues.

I. Alt-MSA Issues Forms

The Alt-MSA issue form was used to ask specific questions on how to score certain objectives that were not addressed in training. A scorer would fill out the Alt-MSA issues form when they experienced something new in a portfolio. The form would then be sent to MSDE for review. When MSDE made a final decision on how to score the portfolio, the form was sent back to the Scoring Director and scorers were trained on the decision. This process ensured that another form would not be filled out for the same issue. These forms were completed throughout scoring. The forms were then collected, reviewed, and categorized.

Table M-1. Results of the Alt-MSA Issues Forms

Alt-MSA Issue Forms	No. of instances	Percent
Concern about child	1	.5%
Names on documents don't match	3	1.2%
Issue about review documents	0	0%
Dates	4	2%
Incomplete portfolio	2	1%
Other scoring questions	19	10%
Alignment	5	2.5%
Data Chart Questions	4	17%
Scoring questions	32	16.5%
TD's missing	36	18.5%
No final TD	26	13%
Draft TD only	31	16%
Handwritten changes	25	13%
Unexpected documents	5	2.5%
Other	**# of instances**	**Percent**
Numbering	6	7%
Test Document Problems	36	42%
Hand-written changes to TD	9	10%
Missing Artifact	18	21%
Prompt question	6	7%
Wrong student	7	8%
Same objectives	2	2%
Use of plastic removal of artifacts or test documents	2	2%
Total	**86**	

In 2005-2006, the portfolio scoring occurred following two separate trainings. First, alignment was trained and scored. A group scorers and supervisors, experienced with the Alt-MSA, scored each portfolio for alignment and prompt level. The portfolios were

then scored by a group of general scorers who scored each objective for mastery. The Alt-MSA issues forms were used for both alignment scoring and general scoring.

On the Alt-MSA issues form, issues were divided into categories. The largest category was "Other," with 30 % of the whole accounting for most of the issues. This "other" category was categorized and examined separately. The limited sample size upon which these results are based lends itself best to a qualitative, descriptive evaluation with expert judgment used in the interpretation of the results. This was the approach used here.

"Other" Category: Test Document Problems

Results

In this category, the largest issue recorded (42% of "Other" category) was "test document problems." Examples of the type of problems scorers found were not including the original test documents and/or the final test documents and the order in which the test document and/or artifacts were put into the portfolios.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Training on the online process of submitting, printing, and completing test documents may be addressed. In 2006-2007, these issues should be reduced with improvements in the online process.

Missing Artifacts

Results

The second highest category (21%) was "missing artifacts." This category was utilized when the artifact for a particular mastery objective was completely missing or was misplaced in a different section of the portfolio. Both of these instances were alerted to MSDE for further investigation.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Training on the importance of including the artifact in the portfolio and placing it in the correct section may be helpful. If all artifacts are missing, MSDE is notified and further investigation occurs. Letting test examiners know that this occurs may highlight the importance of completing the portfolio.

Handwritten changes

Results

"Handwritten changes" were questioned by the scorer 10 % of the time. Sometimes these changes were minor (correcting the spelling) and sometimes they were major (changing the entire mastery objective.)

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Educate test examiners on what to do if an objective must be changed. Let them know that if is not acceptable to change the mastery objectives.

Wrong Student

Results

At times test documents or artifacts from one student were mixed in with test documents or artifacts of another student. This category (wrong student) accounted for 8 % of the accumulated data within the "other" category.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Training should stress the importance of making sure that all test documents and artifacts in a portfolio belong to one student and that is the student whose name is on the portfolio.

Numbering

Results

In conjunction with test document problems, incorrectly numbering the mastery objectives was also very common. Numbering issues accounted for 7 % of the data accumulated. This does not reflect the true number of times this occurred. Once this issue was initially identified, a separate "numbering team" was formed. Upon the creation of this "numbering team", numbering issues were immediately forwarded to this group whose soul responsibility was to carefully review the portfolio table of contents, mastery objective form and the objectives themselves and renumber them so that each objective was in the correct content standard. This occurred quite often, but after the "numbering team" was established numbering was no longer an issue and wasn't recorded.

Suggestions for test examiner/scorer training and the Alt-MSA Online

Keeping the numbers of the content standards in the correct order is essential for evaluation of training and the Alt-MSA Online system. For example, Algebra, Patterns and Functions must be Math objectives 1 and 2. Training and the online system should also show that substituting objectives for phonic and phonemic awareness must be numbered as Reading objectives 1 and 2 and not placed with the content standard chosen to substitute. In 2006-2007, this may not be an issue if the online entry process addresses these numbers on the Mastery Objectives.

Prompts

Results

"Prompts" are the support given to a student to assist in performing a task. The Alt-MSA defines the following categories of prompt levels: independent, gesture, verbal, model, partial physical and full physical. Questions scorers had about "prompts" involved the number or the type of prompt or terminology not seen in training. About 7 % of the issues forms under the category "other" were about "prompts."

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Training on prompt level may also help test examiners to understand the prompt level requirements. Specifically, training on the number and type of prompt used should be addressed and training on only using prompt level wording that is acceptable according to the MSDE handbook (independent, gesture, verbal, model, partial physical and full physical). Included in that training should be directives about using such verbiage as "or", "and/or", "visual cues", and other terms not acceptable for prompt level. Once again,

this may possibly be avoided in 2006-2007 because the online entry will address the only prompt levels acceptable.

Same Mastery Objective and Removal of Test Documents and/or Artifacts

Results

The two smallest categories in the accumulated data were both at 2 % of the 86 items. These were students with the "same mastery objective" and "removal of test documents and/or artifacts." The "same mastery objective" refers to a situation where the test examiner used the exact same mastery objective for two mastery objectives within the same content standard. "Removal of test documents" refers to a scorer asking permission to remove the test documents or artifacts from their plastic holders. Often test examiners stapled the test documents or artifacts together within a plastic sleeve. (Nothing is to be taken out of the portfolio; therefore scorers asked permission to take out test documents or artifacts in order to see them). Once this issue was addressed, scorers no longer asked permission.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Training that emphasizes that different mastery objectives must be used in each content standard may be helpful. There are no suggestions for removal of test documents, for this is a scorer training issue and was addressed with the scorers.

Categories Listed on the Alt-MSA Issues Forms

Test Documents Missing

Results

The rest of the issues gathered from the categories on the Alt-MSA issues form will be summarized separately**.** In this set of data the largest category was "test documents missing" at 18.5 %. As mentioned above this category was problematic throughout the portfolios.

Data Chart Questions

Results

The second most common category of accumulated data was "data chart questions" (17 %). The scorer may question whether the data was taken over time with at least three times of non-mastery. Data charts must show evidence that the student cannot meet the criteria written in the mastery objective on the first, second, or third attempt. In other words, this category indicated that the data charts did not show evidence of three times when the student had not met the criteria stated in their mastery objective.

The scorer may question the observable, measurable behavior on the data chart. Observable, measurable behavior tells exactly what the student is to do. The objective must contain a clear behavior that can be observed and measured. On data charts it is often unclear what behavior the student is performing. For example, a mastery objective may state that the student will write the meaning of vocabulary words. A data chart is presented but the vocabulary words are not listed; therefore, the observable, measurable is not clear.

Data chart questions are many and varied. Test examiners may use any type of data chart they choose. There are many examples of data charts shown during scorer training but often scorers come across a type of chart they have not seen. They may also encounter a data chart with unusual data in which they are uncertain how to interpret that data. These issues may be addressed through enhanced scorer training in 2007-2008.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Test Examiners should be trained that data charts are not primary types of evidence and therefore need to provide more than just mastery of the objective. Data charts must include at least three occurrences of non-mastery. Showing only one or two occurrences is not acceptable. Training may include data charts with examples of both acceptable and non-acceptable data charts. Emphasis should be placed on the number of non-mastery trials that is acceptable. Another suggestion is to have training on alternative solutions for the students who master the objective within the first three attempts.

Clear training on observable measurable behavior may include the specifics needed on a data chart. Again since data charts are not primary types of evidence, the specific behavior expected must be listed, not only in the mastery objective but on the data chart showing exactly what behavior occurs during each attempt. Test examiners should see examples of both acceptable and non-acceptable data charts highlighting observable, measurable behavior. Future training for the Test Examiners will emphasize these points in the Alt-MSA Handbook.

Scoring Questions

Results

The third most common category of accumulated data was "scoring questions" with 16.5 %. This category encompasses any question about scoring a particular objective(s) that the scorer had not seen in training.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Since the scoring questions that scorers ask are varied and individual, there are no suggestions for improvement.

Draft test documents only

Results

Often the final test documents were not included in the portfolio and only "draft" documents were found. These draft documents were not complete and were difficult to interpret. "Draft test documents only" accounted for 16 % of the 86 items of the accumulated data.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Training on the online process for submitting the mastery objectives would be helpful. During training stress the importance of submitting completed mastery objectives

No Final Test Documents

Results

Another category associated with test document problems was "no final test documents." 13 % of the accumulated data were questions in which portfolios had no final test documents. In some situation, this was not a problem because the original test documents met all Alt-MSA technical requirements when reviewed by contractor. In other cases the test documents did not meet criteria and the test examiner did not change the mastery objectives based on the contractor's feedback

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Again as stated under "draft documents only", training on the online process for submitting the mastery objectives would be helpful. During training, stress the importance of submitting completed mastery objectives

Handwritten Changes

Results

"Handwritten changes" accounted for 13 % of the accumulated data. As stated earlier in the "other" category, sometimes these changes were minor (correcting the spelling) and sometimes they were major (changing the entire mastery objective.)

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Again as stated in the "others" category, let test examiners know that they cannot make changes to the mastery objectives. Give clear directive on what to do if an objective must be changed.

Other Scoring Questions

Results

This category encompasses any question about scoring a particular objective(s) that the scorer had not seen in training.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Since the scoring questions that scorers ask are varied and individual, there are no suggestions for improvement.

Final Categories

Results

Since the remaining categories reported were quite small, they will be addressed together. "Alignment" and "unexpected test documents" accounted for 2.5 % each. The "alignment" has been addressed in the "others" category and "unexpected test documents" has been addressed as "draft" or "no final test documents."

Questions on "dates" occurred 2 % of the time. These questions may have been about dates outside the test window or using a date on an unusual artifact. The final four categories with one or less percent are the following: "names on documents don't match" at 1.2 % (addressed in "other" under "wrong students), "incomplete portfolio" at 1 %, (addressed in "other" section under "missing artifact"), "concern about child" at .5 % and "issue about review document" at 0 %.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

The above categories have all been addressed in other sections of this report.

II. Tally Forms

The tally form was used to collect information during scoring about a variety of issues. This form had the following categories:

- the artifact did not aligned with mastery objective
- an unacceptable artifact
- a data chart not done over time
- a data chart without observable, measurable behavior
- test irregularities or evidence of questionable practices at school level
- numbering issues (objectives were inaccurately numbered by the teacher).

The number of times the issue was observed was tallied on a form. If a portfolio had several of the same issues, it was only tallied once. If there were multiple issues in the same portfolio, each issue was tallied. This information was gathered from April 25 until the end of the scoring window. Only the first scorer used the tally forms so the information would not be reported twice. The tally forms were completed, collected, reviewed and interpreted. The results are presented in the following table.

Table M-2. Results of the tally forms

Comment Typed	Total	Percent
Artifact NOT aligned with Mastery Objective	422	21.6 %
Unacceptable artifact	203	10.4 %
Data Chart NOT done over time (do not have 3 non mastery)	783	40 %
Data Charts (not observable/measurable)	316	16 %
Test Irregularities or evidence of questionable practices at school level	15	.0007%
Numbering issue (objectives were inaccurately numbered by teacher)	215	11 %
Total	**1954**	

The tally forms are reported with the results and the interpretation and suggestions for each individual issue.

Data chart NOT done over time (do not have 3 instances of non mastery)

Results

Of the six types of issues recorded on the tally sheet, “data charts not done over time” seemed to be the area in which most misconceptions lie. Forty per cent of the portfolios scored during that time period contained at least one data chart that was not done over time. As stated in the Alt-MSA issue form section of this report, data charts must show evidence that the student cannot meet the criteria written in the mastery objective on the first, second, or third attempt. In other words, this category indicated that the data charts

did not show evidence of three times when the student had not met the criteria stated in their mastery objective.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

As stated in the Alt-MSA issue form section of this report, the same suggestions apply here and are worth restating. Test Examiners should be trained that data charts are not primary types of evidence and therefore need to provide more than just mastery of the objective. They must include not one or two occurrences of non-mastery but at least three. Training may include data charts with examples of both acceptable and non-acceptable data charts. Emphasis should be placed on the number of non-mastery trials that is acceptable. Another suggestion is to have training on alternative solutions for the student who does master the objective within the first three attempts.

Artifact not aligned with Mastery Objective

Results

The second highest issue in which misconceptions occurred, with 21.6 %, was "artifacts that did not align with the mastery objective." Included in this category were also portfolios with unacceptable prompt levels. Therefore, if the portfolio scored an "A" it could be because it did not align with the mastery objective or the prompt level was not acceptable (it may not have contained the type and/or number).

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

As stated in the Alt-MSA issue form section of this report, the same suggestions apply here and are worth restating. Training for test examiners on how to make sure the mastery objective aligns with the Maryland state content standard is indicated. For 2006-2007, test examiners should be encouraged to choose from the mastery objective bank that will be available to enter the mastery objective online in the fall.

Training on prompt level may also help test examiners to understand the prompt level requirements. Specifically, training on the number and type of prompt used should be addressed and training on only using prompt level terms that are acceptable in the MSDE handbook (independent, gesture, verbal, model, partial physical and full physical). Included in that training should be directives about using such verbiage as "or", "and/or", "visual cues", and other terms not acceptable for prompt level. This may possibly be avoided in 2006-2007 because the online entry will show only acceptable prompt level terms.

Data charts with no observable, measurable behavior

Results

Portfolios with "data charts without evidence of an observable and measurable behavior" were calculated to be 16 %. As stated in the Alt-MSA issue form section of this report, observable, measurable behavior states exactly what the student is to do. The objective must contain a clear behavior that can be observed and measured. On data charts it is often unclear what behavior the student is performing. For example, a mastery objective may state that the student will write the meaning of vocabulary words. A data chart is

presented but the vocabulary words are not listed; therefore, the observable, measurable is not clear.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

As stated in the Alt-MSA issue form section of this report, the same suggestions apply here and are worth restating. Clear training on observable measurable behavior may include the specifics needed on a data chart. Again since data charts are not primary types of evidence, the specific behavior expected must be listed, not only in the mastery objective but on the data chart showing exactly what behavior occurs during each attempt. Test examiners should see examples of both acceptable and non-acceptable data charts highlighting observable, measurable behavior.

Numbering issues

Results

During this tally procedure, scorers tallied 215 portfolio that had numbering issues, which accounted for 11% of issues tallied. These numbering issues were found during general scoring, not to be confused with the numbering issues in the "other" category on the Alt-MSA issues forms. These problems occurred when the artifact and test document did not match the correct numbers within the content standard.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Training on the importance of keeping the numbers of the content standards in the correct order would be helpful. For example, algebra, patterns and functions must be math objective 1 and 2. It should also be trained that if substituting objectives for phonic and phonemic awareness must be numbered as Reading objectives 1 and 2 and not placed with the content standard chosen to substitute. It should also be stressed that the artifact must have the corresponding number of each objective to the test document.

Unacceptable Artifacts

Results

The "unacceptable artifacts" category was calculated to be 10.4 %. An unacceptable artifact would be a checklist, a narrative description, a photograph of the student performing the task, or homework. .

The unacceptable artifact that was seen most often in 2005-2006 was a checklist. Checklists are merely a list of concepts with a checkmark next to each one completed; these are used for only one instance.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Training on acceptable and non-acceptable artifacts may be addressed. Training may also include examples of checklist and non-checklist, with an explanation of when each is acceptable

Test irregularities

Results

And finally the smallest category at .7 % was test irregularities or evidence of questionable practice at the school level. Test irregularities can be seen in portfolios when there are questionable practices. For example, one data chart is photocopied and used for all students in a class. This would be considered a test irregularity because data charts must be original and only for the student for which the data has been collected.

Suggestions for improvement for test examiner/scorer training

Training on the importance of only using "original" artifacts may be given. Test examiners should understand that data charts must be specific for each individual student and not photocopied. Training may also include the ramifications to test examiners who are involved in test irregularities.