



NATIONAL ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT CENTER

Advisory Board Year III

Part I: Overview, Activities, and Accomplishments

UKY, NCEO, UNC-Charlotte, CAST, NCIEA, UI-UC

Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, North Carolina, New Hampshire, New Mexico, South Carolina

Overview

- Project Overview
 - Goals
 - Top accomplishments
 - 3 + 2 review
- Focus Area Overview
 - Activities
 - Barriers
 - Accomplishments
 - Projected activities

Collaborative Partners

- University of Kentucky
 - Principal Investigator
- National Center on Educational Outcomes
 - Technical Quality of Alternate Assessments
- University of North Carolina at Charlotte
 - Alignment of alternate assessments to Content Domains
- CAST
 - Universal Design
- National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment
 - Technical Quality of Alternate Assessments
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
 - Evaluation

NAAC's Goals are to:

1. Enhance the current research base on high quality, technically adequate alternate assessments (AA-AAS and AA-GLAS).
2. Provide technical assistance to states as they endeavor to design or redesign their alternate assessments.
3. Demonstrate high quality design and administration of alternate assessments through our partnership states.

Top Ten NAAC Accomplishments

1. Convened and oriented an interdisciplinary team of technical, special education, and content experts.
2. Convened project advisory board to seek advice about priorities in years 3 – 5.
3. Identified and outlined the technical properties of the three major types of AA-AAS.
4. Developed and field tested the issues in alignment for AA-AAS.
5. Convened with NCEO/CAST a summit on Universal Design

Top Ten NAAC Accomplishments

6. Designed and implemented a 1.5 day workshop for 125 participants based on our foundational materials.
7. Participated in national technical assistance conference calls.
8. Operationalized a theoretical framework in demonstration activities with partner states.
9. Collaborated with nationally recognized organizations to identify teacher assessment competencies.
10. Developed key products on topics related to alternate assessments which are included in the OSEP Toolkit on Teaching and Assessing Students with Disabilities (2006).

3 + 2 Evaluation Results

- Overall score of 4.85 for the 15 questions receiving numeric ratings
 - Project Goals and Methodology 4.9/5.0
 - Project Management 4.86/5.0
 - Activities and Accomplishments 4.8/5.0
 - General Effectiveness 4.9/5.0
- Funding recommended to continue
- Yrs. 4 and 5 activities are logical

Written comments

- “Development of technical manual prototype very interesting”
- “Coordination across partners appears to be working well”
- “Resourcefulness of connecting with NH-EAG”
- “Excellent job of dissemination, in terms of scholarly products and presentations”

Recommendations

- ❑ Collaborate with National Organizations
 - ❑ NCCREST, NCLD, CCSSO-ASESS
- ❑ Increase dissemination efforts
 - ❑ User friendly, accessible dissemination to targeted audiences
- ❑ Clarify the role of research
 - ❑ Apparent confusion about the extent to which NAAC is a research entity

By 2009, we hope to:

- Bridge the gap between what we know about the student population, how these students learn, and effective measurement practices.
- Articulate a theory of learning for students who take alternate assessments within the content domains.
- Provide techniques and strategies for aligning alternate assessments with grade-level content.
- Identify and describe best practices in design and implementation of alternate assessments.
- Consider the implications of universal design as it applies to alternate assessments.
- Apply new guidelines and techniques in real-life contexts with our partner states.
- Provide technical quality guidance to states as they design or redesign their alternate assessments.
- Advance theory and practice in the design of alternate assessments.

Research Focus 1

- Define technical quality for the four major types of alternate assessment as to the impact on student learning and access to grade-level content:
 - portfolios,
 - performance events,
 - checklists, and
 - multiple choice tests
 - based on
 - a) alternate achievement standards and
 - b) grade-level achievement standards

Research Focus 1: Activities

- Develop technical manual prototype and apply to state alternate assessments through individual case studies
- Conduct Learning Characteristics Inventory
 - Articulate the assessment triangle for AA-GLAS and AA-AAS
 - Confirm the learner characteristics of students who take alternate assessments
- Conduct Technical Quality Rating Instrument and develop the Technical Considerations Report
- Conduct Teacher Perception Scale of Technical Quality
- Conduct Improved Technical Quality of Alternate Assessments Survey and work with states to develop a plan for improving the technical quality of their alternate assessments
- Engage state technical panels in validity evaluation discussion and feedback to the expert panel

The Assessment Triangle and Validity Evaluation

OBSERVATION ← → **INTERPRETATION**

VALIDITY EVALUATION

- Empirical Evidence
- Theory and Logic (argument)
- Consequential Features

- Assessment System
- Test Development
- Administration
- Scoring

- Reporting
- Alignment
- Item Analysis/DIF/Bias
- Measurement Error
- Scaling and Equating
- Standard Setting

COGNITION

- Student Population
- Academic Content
- Theory of Learning

Barriers:

- Overcoming the language differences among the disciplines.
- Identifying states which have AA-GLAS.
- Identifying a state with a checklist approach.
- Defining the population of students who participate in AA-AAS including students who are English language learners AND who also have significant cognitive disabilities.

Accomplishments to date:

- Convened the Expert Panel three times
- Developed Cognition white paper, Learner Characteristics Inventory (LCI) and reported LCI results in three states
- Developed Technical Considerations Report (Marion & Gong, 2006 and Marion & Pellegrino, 2006)
- Developed four Case Studies
 - Three major types of AA-AAS
- Developed a Table of Contents for developing a technical manual for AA-AAS
- Developed a “workbook” for documenting the Table of Contents
- Conducted two national alternate assessment seminars disseminating the technical quality workbooks
- Developed a tool for evaluating technical documentation

Projected Activities in Years 3-5

- Review of six additional technical quality case studies in Spring of 07 and four in the Fall of 07
- Conduct Learning Characteristics Inventory
 - Articulate the assessment triangle for AA-GLAS and AA-AAS
 - Confirm the learner characteristics of students who take alternate assessments and compare against student assessment results
- Conduct Technical Quality Rating Instrument and develop the Technical Considerations Report
- Conduct Teacher Perception Scale of Technical Quality
- Conduct Improved Technical Quality of Alternate Assessments Survey and work with states to develop a plan for improving the technical quality of their alternate assessments

We'd like your comments...

- How do we reach IHE's and teacher preparation programs to disseminate the findings of our research?

Research Focus 2:

- Identify grade-level content alignment methodologies and principles for alternate assessments based on grade-level achievement standards and alternate achievement standards.

Research Focus 2: What we know...

- Traditional alignment methodologies do not work well for AA-AAS
- States are grappling with how to establish alignment, including instructional alignment
- Alignment indices require close examination of idiosyncratic nature of state assessment systems

Research Focus 2: Activities

- Evaluate recommended alignment criteria using state case studies
- Develop guidelines for setting challenging learning standards
- Implement and evaluate alignment procedures
- Evaluate student access to the general curriculum
- Determine acceptability and feasibility of alignment procedures

Outcome

- Framework for alignment that is:
 - Developed by experts
 - Validated by teachers
 - Validated by states
- Development of model demonstration that can be used by teachers to create instructional alignment to content standards

Accomplishments to date...

Alignment Methodology

- **Links for Academic Learning**
- Created and validated alignment methodology composed of 8 alignment criteria
 - Browder, D. M., Wakeman, S. Y., Flowers, C., Rickelman, R., Pugalee, D., Karvonen, M. (in press). Creating access to the general curriculum with links to grade level content for students with significant cognitive disabilities: An explication of the concept. *Journal of Special Education*.

Alignment Methodology continued

- Flowers, C., Browder, D., Wakeman, S. & Karvonen, M. (2006). *Alternate assessment alignment pilot study: Report to State A Department of Education*. Charlotte, North Carolina: University of North Carolina at Charlotte, National Alternate Assessment Center. [REPORT](#)
- Flowers, C., Browder, D., Wakeman, S. & Karvonen, M. (2006). *Portfolio alternate assessment alignment study: Report to State A Department of Education*. Charlotte, North Carolina: University of North Carolina at Charlotte, National Alternate Assessment Center. [REPORT](#)
- Flowers, C., Browder, D., Wakeman, S. & Karvonen, M. (2006). *Alternate assessment alignment study: Report to State B Department of Education*. Charlotte, North Carolina: University of North Carolina at Charlotte, National Alternate Assessment Center. [REPORT](#)
- Flowers, C., Karvonen, M., Browder, D., & Wakeman, S. (2006). *Links for academic learning (LAL): A methodology for investigating alignment of alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Alignment Methodology continued

- Validation process:
 - Stakeholders
 - Measurement
 - Special Education
 - State
 - Review by NAAC partners for response to stakeholders in revisions

Criterion 1: Academic

- The content is academic and includes the major domains/strands of the content area as defined by state and national standards
 - History of functional curriculum
 - Does it have to be 100% academic?
 - Foundational skills
 - Content experts rate

Criterion 1: Academic Example

- Not Academic
 - Turn the page of a book
 - Hold head up to look at a book
 - Increasing attending behavior

Criterion 2: Grade Referenced

- The content is referenced to the student's assigned grade level (based on CA)
 - Are extended standards and AA referenced to the state's standards by grade or by grade band?
 - State's blueprint for % intended by strand of academic content by grade level

Criterion 3: Content and Performance Centrality

- The focus of achievement maintains fidelity with the content of the original grade level (content centrality) and when possible, with the specified performance in the original state standards (category of knowledge)
 - Content match is near, far, none for AA items and extended standards
 - Performance match is all, some, or none

Criterion 3: Content Examples

- Grade level standard
 - Read and write amounts of money using the dollar sign (\$) and decimal notation
- Extended standard
 - Identify the dollar amount in written form
- Near Link

Criterion 3: Content Examples

- Grade level standard
 - Apply strategies to read and write
- Extended standard
 - Communicate with peers
- No link (retrofitting/backmapping)

Criterion 3: Content Examples

- Grade level standard
 - Compute with rational numbers
- Extended standards
 - Change in one quantity relates to change in second quantity
- No link (mismatch)

Criterion 3: Content Examples

- Extended standard
 - Awareness of differences in ecosystems
- AA item
 - Identify deserts as dry and oceans as wet.
- No link (overstretch)

Criterion 3: Performance Examples

- Grade level standards
 - *Read and write* whole numbers
- Extended standards
 - *Identify* numerals up to 10
- Some of the same performance level

Criterion 4: Range, Balance, and DOK

- The content differs from grade level in range, balance, and depth of knowledge (DOK) but sets high expectations for students with significant cognitive disabilities (including full range of DOK)

Criterion 4: Range, Balance, and DOK

- Using items that:
 - are academic
 - have at least far content centrality, compute range, balance, and DOK
 - Does it match state's priorities?

Criterion 4: Range, Balance, and DOK

– Depth of Knowledge

- AA should match extended standards
- And be skewed lower than grade level expectation overall (alternate not grade level achievement)
- But have the full range of DOK

Criterion 5: Differentiation Across Grade Levels/ Bands

- There is some differentiation in CONTENT across grade levels or grade bands
 - When different AAs used for different grade levels or students (e.g., portfolios; different tests for different grade bands)
 - Content is not redundant across all grades
 - When one assessment used across grades
 - Includes items with increasing difficulty that link to upper grade standards as well as some linking to lower grades

Criterion 6: Alternate Achievement Standards

- The expected achievement is for the student to show learning of grade referenced academic content

Criterion 6: Degree of Inference About Student Learning

- **High Student Inference--Can** clearly infer student showed learning
 - High level of accuracy (If one response; response is correct. If multiple responses, above 90% correct)
- **No Student Inferences**
 - Does not have to get items correct to receive credit.

Criterion 7: Barriers to Responding

- The potential barriers to students demonstrating what they can do are minimized in the assessment
 - Can students with various sensory, physical, communication challenges show what they know?
 - Are modifications and supports specified?
 - Are there ways for students who use nonsymbolic communication or who have limited intentional communication to show what they know?

Criterion 8: Instructional Alignment

- The instructional program promotes learning in the general curriculum
 - Curriculum Indicator Survey: What are the teachers teaching?
 - What quality indicators are reflected in professional development materials?
 - Does professional development show teachers how to align instruction to state standards?

Accomplishments to date...

Alignment Manual

- Completed an alignment manual including
 - Conceptual framework
 - Measurement indices
 - Steps to conduct an alignment study
 - Sample forms and codes
 - Sample codebook

Measurement of the Criteria

- Use Webb's, Achieve, and the Survey of Enacted Curriculum
- Acceptable standard for alignment?
 - Gaps
 - Reason of lack of alignment when found

Steps to Conduct the LAL Alignment Study

- More complex than traditional alignment
- Understanding the system
- Include content and special education experts
- Capturing the rules
- Describing the link between extended standards (if applicable) and grade-level content standards
- Alignment of instruction & professional development

Alignment Manual

- Beginning to disseminate for state/testing contractor use
 - Potentially publish the manual
 - Disseminated information to Measured Progress, WestEd, and NCIEA

Accomplishments to date...

Validation of CIS

- Developed a short and long version of the CIS for ELA, math, and science
- Online versions
- Validation studies
 - Cognitive interviews
 - Long versus short forms
 - Criterion measures study

CIS

- Karvonen, M., Wakeman, S. Y., Flowers, C., & Browder, D. M. (in press). Measuring the enacted curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*.

Accomplishments to date... Presentations

- OSEP Project Director Conference 2006
Creating Access to the General Curriculum
with Links to Grade Level Content for
Students with Significant Cognitive
Disabilities
- ASES SCASS 2006- Links for Academic
Learning: The UNC Charlotte Alignment
Method for AA-AAS
- Student Profile Survey, CIS validation, and comparison of LAL across formats at NCME/AERA, 2007

Projected Activities in Years 3-5

- Implement alignment methodology with three more states (1 May, 1 July, 1 September)
- Present finalized papers at NCME/AERA (April, 2007)
- Submit manual for publication
- Hold a Curriculum Summit with states, experts in severe, and curriculum experts to build understanding and capacity
- Conduct randomized trials studies with teachers trained in alignment criteria for impact on instructional alignment

We'd like your comments...

- What topics would you see as important to discuss during the curriculum summit?
- What are the major issues that you see for teachers in trying to align instruction to content standards?
 - Using grade level standards?
 - Making the standards meaningful?
 - Taking skills to higher levels of DOK?
- What are your recommendations for targeting teachers for intervention studies (so as not to overburden them and get quality info)?

Research Focus 3:

- Identify and describe best practices for:
 - developing and designing AA-AAS and AA-GLAS using the principles of universal design as a guiding theory, and
 - administering AA-AAS and AA-GLAS considering effective practices in the development and administration of materials, teacher training/communication, and management of state-wide scoring of student assessment.

Research Focus 3: Activities

- Conduct an analysis of administration documents for alternate assessments and develop guidelines for the administration of alternate assessments.
- Conduct analysis of scoring procedures for alternate assessments and develop recommended practices for implementing scoring procedures.
- Conduct Alternate Assessment Impact Survey (AAIS) to measure instructional impact of the alternate assessment.
- Conduct Design and Administration Survey (DAS).
- Conduct Alternate Assessment Coordinator Survey (AACS).
- Conduct research related to UD as applied to AA-AAS and AA-GLAS and develop and administer training package on effective practices in design and implementation of alternate assessments as related to student access to the general curriculum.

Barriers:

- Reaching a wide array of teacher experiences for CIT cite.
- Conceptualizing UD as applied to AA-AAS.

Accomplishments:

- Conducted a review of the literature in AA-AAS.
- Conducted analysis of administration documents for AA-AAS using the AERA, APA, NCME Standards.
- Developed a Critical Incident Technique (CIT) website to document effective administration practices and teacher competencies.
- Developed concept paper on Universal Design for AA-AAS.
- Conducted a UDA Summit in conjunction with TA partners
- Drafted Alternate Assessment Impact Survey (AAIS) to conduct in participating states.
- Conducted AAIS in two states.
- Conducted an analysis of scoring procedures.

March 14, 2007

NAAC Advisory Board Year III

Projected Activities in Years 3-5

- Conduct an analysis of administration documents for alternate assessments and develop guidelines for the administration of alternate assessments.
- Conduct analysis of scoring procedures for alternate assessments and develop recommended practices for implementing scoring procedures.
- Conduct Alternate Assessment Impact Survey (AAIS) to measure instructional impact of the alternate assessment.
- Conduct Design and Administration Survey (DAS).
- Conduct Alternate Assessment Coordinator Survey (AACS).
- Conduct research related to UD as applied to AA-AAS and AA-GLAS and develop and administer training package on effective practices in design and implementation of alternate assessments as related to student access to the general curriculum.

UDL AA-AAS Evaluation Tool

- Universal Design for Learning Alternate Assessment Evaluation Tool
- Designed to support SEAs and test vendors in identifying potential AA-AAS limitations and suggest solutions vis-à-vis UDL
- Considers access, pedagogy, and cognition.

UDL AA-AAS Evaluation Tool Development Process

Create initial UDL Alternate Assessment Evaluation Tool	Sep-Dec 06
Review by NAAC expert panel or subset	Feb-Mar 07
Revise Evaluation Tool	Mar 07
Apply Tool to 3 states, present findings to states, and obtain feedback; provide results from states review to expert panel; revise Tool.	Apr-Jul 07
Apply revised Tool to all 11 states and prepare summary analysis. Revise Evaluation Tool.	Aug-Dec 07
Conduct in-depth evaluation of 3 states' AAs and provide feedback on how to make AAs more universally designed.	Jan-Mar 08
Design UDL Training Package for teachers, including survey instruments.	Apr-Oct 08

UDL AA-AAS Evaluation Tool Framework

■ UDL Principles

- I: Provide multiple means of representation
- II: Provide multiple means of interaction and expression
- III: Provide multiple means of engagement

I. Provide Multiple Means of Representation

- Guideline 1: Reduce access barriers to directions and stimuli by providing options that enhance clarity and accessibility of directions (what is expected of them) and stimuli (assessment materials).
- Guideline 2: Provide directions and stimuli that promote understanding by providing strategic supports for processing (connecting /attacking/collecting) directions and stimuli.

II. Provide Multiple Means of Interaction and Expression

- Guideline 3: Reduce obstacles to interaction and expression by providing options that maximize student's opportunity to optimally interact with and respond to (e.g. navigate, act, respond, compose, construct meaning) directions and stimuli.
- Guideline 4: Provide scaffolds that promote appropriate interaction and expression by facilitating student's application of construct-relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities while interacting with and responding to directions and stimuli.

III. Provide Multiple Means of Engagement

- Guideline 5: Reduce threats that inhibit engagement by providing options that reduce threatening contexts, levels of stimulation, and consequences.
- Guideline 6: Increase a perception of challenge to promote and sustain engagement.

Success Criterion Provided for Each Guideline

- Guideline 2: Provide directions and stimuli that promote understanding by providing strategic supports for processing (connecting / attacking / collecting) directions and stimuli.
 - 2.1: Provide directions and stimuli that prime background knowledge.
 - 2.2: Provide directions and stimuli that highlight critical features, ideas, and relationships.
 - 2.3: Provide directions and stimuli that are flexible and guide exploration and information processing.
 - 2.4: Provide directions and stimuli that facilitate memory and transfer.

We'd like your comments...

- We will be asking for your feedback related to the design and use of the UDA Evaluation Tool in the coming weeks.

NAAC Evaluation

- View evaluation as an integral, ongoing informative and reflective process.
 - Formative/Summative
 - Evaluation Meeting in Year II
 - Internal/External
 - Multiple Methods
 - Consumer Oriented
- Flexible to accommodate changing workscope of the project.

NAAC Evaluation

- Evaluation Foci
 - Integrity of Work Plan
 - Product Review
 - Stakeholder Perception and Impact

NAAC Evaluation

- Data Sources
 - Stakeholder Interviews
 - External Review
 - Survey
 - Document Review
 - Progress Monitoring

Evaluation Findings

- Expert panel convened in March 2005, August 2005, and February 2006 to review technical manual table of contents, discussions about documenting the technical quality of alternate assessments, discussion and presentation of state case studies
- Expert panel convened during August 2005 meeting to address adapting alignment methodologies to AA-AAS with grade-level content standards
- Pilot alignment study and first state completed, alignment studies currently planned for three more states
- Annotated Table of Contents completed and presented at first state's TAC meeting
- Workbook to guide development of technical manual presented and commented on at advisory board meeting

Project Effectiveness: Convene Expert Panel

■ Expert Panel

- Overall satisfaction with the meetings, but dramatic changes across the three meetings in terms of cross-disciplinary understanding. The following comment after 3rd meeting:

“measurement and special education experts were finally reaching common understandings about the population”

Project Effectiveness: Convene Advisory Board

- Advisory Board
 - Meeting satisfaction rated at 6.5–7.0
 - Participants were pleased with
 - the extent to which the meeting objectives were met.
 - meeting facilitation.
 - Indicated a need to review interim products and to invite peers from severe disabilities to participate.

Project Effectiveness: Technical Assistance and Dissemination

- **CCSS0 Pre-Session**
 - TA & D Network for Assessment

<u>Session Name</u>	<u>Mean (1-5)</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>N</u>
<u>Four Steps to Access</u>	<u>3.93</u>	<u>1.16</u>	<u>46</u>
<u>Measurement Perspectives for Alignment</u>	<u>3.72</u>	<u>1.07</u>	<u>46</u>
<u>Is it Reading, Is it Math?</u>	<u>3.83</u>	<u>1.09</u>	<u>47</u>
<u>Designing the Blueprint</u>	<u>3.61</u>	<u>1.08</u>	<u>44</u>
<u>Next Steps</u>	<u>3.79</u>	<u>.92</u>	<u>28</u>

Project Effectiveness: Conduct Research

- **Major Findings and Outcomes**
 - Case studies
 - Pilot alignment study
 - Learner Characteristics Inventory
 - Curriculum Indicator Survey
 - Level of Symbolic Communication Classification Survey
- **Evidence of Project Effectiveness**
 - Completed comprehensive review of literature on alignment
 - Created criteria for judging degree of alignment of AA to AAS
- **Evidence of Target Audience Satisfaction**
 - Pilot study follow-up interviews indicated satisfaction with the alignment process as a whole.
 - Follow-up for LCI planned for Fall 06
 - Satisfaction with Case Studies found in expert panel results.

Project Effectiveness: Conduct development and demonstration projects

■ Major Findings and Outcomes

- Pilot alignment study
- Alignment studies – continuing with second state in Fall, 2006
- Case Studies
- Technical Manual workbook

■ Evidence of Project Effectiveness

- Determined that alignment protocol is effective for use with states through pilot study
- Technical Panel Review of Case Studies
- Stakeholder Review of Technical Manual Workbook

■ Evidence of Target Audience Satisfaction

- Interviews with state personnel involved with the pilot alignment are pleased with the results and all would recommend the process to other states.
- Interviews with state assessment personnel indicate that they believe that AA is having a positive educational impact on students at the classroom level.
- Evaluation of Technical Panel Meetings
- Evaluation of Advisory Board Meetings

Project Effectiveness: Communication with OSEP

- Monthly Management Team calls include project officer
- Quarterly management team calls include other alternate assessment funded projects.
- Conducted presentation for 2005 OSEP Leadership Conference.
- Conducted presentation for 2005 OSEP Project Director's Meeting.
- Conducted presentation for 2006 OSEP Project Director's Meeting

Research Assistants

