



NATIONAL ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT CENTER

National Alternate Assessment Center

2009 Advisory Board Meeting

Year V

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

Agenda

- Review of recent findings in Technical Quality, Curriculum, & Assessment Design
- Discussion of emerging issues
- Advise technical assistance and dissemination activities for Year V through No Cost Extension and into the future
- What's next ?
 - Advice for Next Steps

Collaborative Partners

- **University of Kentucky**: Principal Investigator
- **National Center on Educational Outcomes**:
Technical Quality of Alternate Assessments and
Dissemination/Technical Assistance
- **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

1. Enhance the current research base on high quality, technically adequate alternate assessments (AA-AAS).
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 partner states.

Research Focus Areas 1 & 3

- Define technical quality for the four major types of alternate assessment as to the impact on student learning and access to grade-level content
- Identify and describe best practices for:
 - 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

A heuristic to help organize and focus the validity evaluation (Marion, Quenemoen, & Kearns, 2006)

OBSERVATION

INTERPRETATION

- Assessment System
- Test Development
- Administration
- Scoring

VALIDITY EVALUATION

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

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

COGNITION

- Student Population
- Academic Content
- Theory of Learning

Recent Findings

- Literature Review
- NCEO Survey
- LCI Reports from 7 States
 - Communication & AAC
 - Lack of Curriculum Progression across grade spans
- Use of Learner Characteristics
 - Attribute performance
 - Item analysis

Recent Findings

- Principal Survey
- Teacher Perception of Student Performance
 - Literature Review
 - Assignment of performance level
- Validity Evaluation
 - Embedded case study across Five States
 - Tools for student observation

From now through 2010

- Analyze NCEO Survey Data
- Multiple Case Study on Nominal Assessment Category
- Minimizing Errors in Portfolio Scoring : Study in 2 States
- Validating Achievement Standards: 1 State
- CIT Data: What Teachers are Telling Us

Continuing Issues

- Alternate Assessments on Grade-level Achievement Standards
- Continuing Language Barriers
You Said, I heard; Potatoe, PoTAtoe

Emerging Issues

- Growth Accountability models
- English Language Learners in the 1%
- Observation Instruments for Validity Evaluation
- Technical Assistance for External Evaluators
- Cross state analysis: Proficiency Descriptions
- Validating Achievement Standards

Research Focus Area 2

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



Two Phases of Goals

■ Phase One

- Develop and field test an methodology for alignment of AA-AAS

- Completed
- Current use in field

■ Phase Two

- Develop and evaluate professional development for teacher's alignment of instruction

- In progress

Phase 1 Complete

- Completed Phase I of Alignment studies (completed 6 studies with 5 different states using multiple formats (checklists, performance-based, and portfolio)
 - LAL reports were used by states for peer review evidence
- LAL replicated by another organization using 4 additional states
- LAL represented at the committee recommending industrial standards for standards for alignment studies (sponsored by WestEd)

Phase 2

- Develop and evaluate professional development for teacher's alignment of instruction
 - Curriculum summits (completed)
 - Professional development for instructional alignment (developed and tested)
 - ELA training (developed and pilot tested)
 - Go to scale in 5 states next year

Phase 2: Curriculum Summit

d2

- Conducted a Curriculum Summit
 - Created materials on curriculum in LA, math, and science and validated with experts in content and special education and with teachers
 - Used materials which received strong endorsement in validation to create teleconference
 - Held two teleconferences with help of NCEO and NAAC and curricular experts at UNCC
 - State Call
 - IHE Call

Slide 16

d2

When you get to this slide, hand out the conceptual model flyers and have others comment on how many were on calls; any feedback
dbrowder, 3/25/2009

Phase 2: Professional Development in Instructional Alignment

- Partnered with Project Mastery for Instructional Alignment to do pilot work with teachers in NC
 - Project Mastery focus is Math/ Science so UNCC NAAC Partner focus is Language Arts Alignment
 - Conducted Professional Development in Language Arts (Sept. 9th- 10 teacher participated)
 - Project Mastery did days on Math and Science
 - Followed up with classroom observations; submission of planning
 - Provided additional days of training
 - With general education teacher partner on UDL/ co-teaching
 - By teleconference on standards-based IEPs

Phase 2: What we did

- 1 day training on ELA with pilot teachers
 - Introduction to the grant
 - Overview of ELA
 - Activity on teaching to the standards in Language Arts
 - Story-based Lessons TA
 - Discussion with experts (ELA experts from UNCC)
 - Systematic Instruction and data collection
 - Embedding a standard in a SBL and Applying to a gen ed lesson
 - Individualizing instruction
 - Homework assignment (10 days of data, individualized Task Analysis)

Phase 2: What we found out

- Teachers reported that all activities and content were somewhat to very helpful
- There was growth from pre and post data in regard to self-evaluation of knowledge of activities/content
 - I feel that I am not proficient in this area;
 - I feel that I am somewhat proficient in this area;
 - I feel that I am proficient in this area;
 - I feel that I am very proficient in this area
- We did not get a strong return rate on homework (e.g., individualized TA's, 10 days of data, UDL forms)
- Teachers needed direct feedback after observations to improve fidelity

Phase 2: Planning from Pilot

- What we learned from pilot
 - Teachers need more practice on skills they will use in their classrooms
 - Focusing our training and outcome measures on specific quality indicators
 - Quality indicator checklist for professional development
 - Priorities when we have limited days for training versus inservice training
 - Have created our process agenda for future use

Phase 2: 2009-10 State Level Training in Instructional Alignment

- Implement Alignment Intervention Study using 5 states (WV, SD, SC, GA, & WY)
 - 2-3 states in fall 2009; 2-3 in summer/fall 2010
- Teachers will submit evidence of quality indicators
 - DVDs, lesson plans

Plans for Fall 2010

- Conduct feasibility study (survey state AA directors) for procedures, resources, and tools that result from Alignment Intervention Study
- Write manuscripts from studies
- Plan to disseminate resources generated
- Rest! ☺



Emerging Issues

- 1. Conceptual model flyers
 - Are they clear? Useful? How might you use them?
- 2. What advice do you have regarding professional development on alignment
 - What works? What doesn't work? What's needed?
- 3. Are you seeing any impact from our Phase 1 work in alignment of state's AA-AAS?
- 4. What resources that we have provided do you find useful? Which publications? Resources on our web site?
- 5. How do we get faculty in higher education more involved?
- 6. What tactics can we use to get a higher return rate from teachers at a national level?

Research Focus Area 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.

Recent Findings

- Awaiting results of NCEO Surveys
- Emerging Hybrid Models
 - Minimizing sources of error
 - Enhancing scoring consistency

UDL AA-AAS Evaluation Tool

- Created and tried out by NAAC team for the 3 AA types

- Portfolio
- Performance
- Checklist

- Goal:

- Could a tool be developed to evaluate AA-AAS of different types
- Could the tool be useful to development and revision of AA-AAS made by states

<p>1.1 Provide directions and stimuli that include sensory and perceptual options.</p>	<p>Tools: Visual: flexible fonts; image and text size; zoom; contrast; color; visual alerts; virtual manipulatives; captions for speech Audio: adjustable volume and rate Tactile: tactile cues/textured symbols representing concepts; physical manipulatives Multimedia: video; animation</p> <p>Strategies: Tactile system: size, shape, texture of objects; range of quality of touch (light touch to deep pressure); physical cueing (e.g. touch cues); tactile signing</p>	<p>TRv7 - p. 7 "Inappropriate (coded I). This code is used only in rare circumstances... item in question would be inappropriate based on the interaction between the sensory nature of the student's disability and the format of the item..." GASM - p. 6 Inappropriate (I)</p> <p>TRv7 - pp. 146-167 Extended Science Standard Administration Manual "Ensure there is plenty of space between the cards to avoid confusion between which card is being identified." (Repeated</p>	<p>There is limited expectation that directions and stimuli will include sensory and perceptual options.</p> <p>More possible sensory and perceptual options could be described that should first be considered prior to determining an item as "inappropriate." Consider listing an array of sensory and perceptual options that might be available to students before scoring an item as "inappropriate". (See 1.1 Tools and Strategies).</p> <p>Ensuring space between cards in order to avoid confusion offers an option for presentation. However, consider using additional multiple representations of content (See 1.1 Tools and Strategies).</p>
--	---	---	---

UDL AA-AAS Evaluation Tool Try Out - Reactions

Survey and interview reactions –
positive

- States believe tool will benefit
- Facilitate compliance with IDEA requirements, including evidence for application of Universal Design

UDL AA-AAS Evaluation Tool Feedback

- Model UDL within the Tool
 - Digital, TTS access, Font options,
- Capacity/option to share AA-AAS Evaluation Tool outcomes across states
 - Learn from the projects
 - Learn from other states
- Identified potential to use UDL AA-AAS Evaluation Tool in peer review process

UDL AA-AAS Evaluation Tool State Level Uses/Considerations

- Identified as systematic way to review items and assessments created in the state
- Share with peer review teams
- Make changes in materials and manuals
- Incorporate the Tool into their AA measure's technical manual.
- Use the Tools and Strategies sections as a resources for special and general educators, and administrators

Current and Next Steps

Modification of UDL AA-AAS Evaluation Tool Overview document

- ☑ – Construct relevance (find date approved)
- ☑ – Align guidelines more closely with CAST UDL guidelines
- Create a procedures document for dissemination with the tool (in development)

Align more closely with CAST UDL Guidelines

Multiple Means of Representation

Version 1

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

Version 2

- Guideline 1: Provide options for perception that enhance clarity and accessibility of directions (what is expected of students) and stimuli (assessment materials).
- Guideline 2: Provide directions and stimuli that include options for language and symbols.
- Guideline 3: Provide directions and stimuli that include options for comprehension (e.g., connecting, attacking, and collecting).

Align more closely with CAST UDL Guidelines

Multiple Means of Expression and Action

Version 1

Guideline 3: Reduce obstacles to interaction and expression by providing options that maximize students' opportunity to optimally interact with and respond to (e.g. navigate, act, respond, compose, construct meaning) directions and stimuli.

Guideline 4: Provide tools and options that allow for appropriate interaction and expression with the demands of an assessment item.

Version 2

Guideline 4: Provide options for physical action that maximize students' opportunity to optimally interact and respond (e.g. navigate, act, compose, and construct meaning).

Guideline 5: Provide options for expressive skills and fluency that maximize interaction and expression with the demands of an assessment item.

Guideline 6: Provide opportunities for student interaction and response for executive functions (e.g. planning, organization, and using working memory).

Align more closely with CAST UDL Guidelines

Multiple Means of Engagement

Version 1

Guideline 5: Reduce threats that inhibit engagement by providing options that reduce threatening contexts, levels of stimulation, and consequences.

Guideline 6: Promote and sustain engagement by providing tools to recruit interest, sustain effort and persistence, and increase self-regulation.

Version 2

Guideline 7: Provide options for recruiting interest for promoting and maintaining engagement.

Guideline 8: Provide options for sustaining attention, effort, and persistence.

*May not be applicable to all assessment situations

Guideline 9: Provide options for promoting and increasing self-regulation.

Summative Evaluation Questions

1. Tallies of dissemination: At what conferences (face-to-face, virtual, telephone) and to how many people were findings shared? What publications were produced and how were they distributed? What was web site traffic?
2. Was consensus developed for the research and practice findings in larger curriculum, measurement, and special education communities?

Plans for Summative Evaluation

- State visits planned for 4 partner states
 - Late summer 2009
- Telephone interviews for sample of partner states
 - Early fall 2009
- Telephone interviews with Advisory Board members

– Spring/Summer 2009

Summative Evaluation (cont.)

- Telephone interviews with Expert Panel members
 - Spring/Summer 2009
- Surveys to all partner states
 - Early fall 2009
- Surveys to all states/territories who have received assistance from NAAC
 - September 2009

Advice

- Other stakeholder groups
- Other types of information to collect
- Other ways to collect the information