References and Annotated Bibliographies for Part VII:
Measurement Perspectives for "Alignment"

Browder, D., Ahgrim-Delzel, L., Flowers, C., Karvonen, M., Spooner, F., & Algozzine, R. (2005). How states define alternate assessments. *Research and Policy in Developmental Disabilities, 15(4),* 209-220.

Browder, D., Flowers, C., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L. Karvonen, M., Spooner, F., & Algozzine, R. (2004). The alignment of alternate assessment content to academic and functional curricula. *Journal of Special Education, 37,* 211-224.

Browder, D., Spooner, F., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L. Flowers, C., Karvonen, M. & Algozzine, R. (2004). A content analysis of curricular philosophies in states' alternate assessment performance indicators. *Research and Practice in Severe Disabilities, 28,* 165-181.

Flowers, C., Browder, D., & Ahlgrim-Delzell, L (in press). An analysis of three states' alignment between language arts and mathematics standards and alternate assessments. *Exceptional Children.*

Council of Chief State School Officers (n.d.). *Alignment Models*. Retrieved April 29, 2005, from http://www.ccsso.org/Projects/alignment_analysis/models/418.cfm.

Porter, A. C., Smithson, J. L. (2001). *Defining, Developing and using curriculum Indicators.* (CPRE Research Report Series RR-048). University of Pennsylvania: Consortium for Policy Research and Education.

Webb, N. L. (1997). *Research Monograph No. 6: Criteria for alignment of expectations and assessments in mathematics and science education.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Ref. Type: Journal article

Notes: Journal article

Title: A content analysis of the curricular philosophies reflected in states' alternate assessment performance indicators.

Authors: Browder, D., Spooner, F., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Flowers, C., Algozzine, & Karvonen, M.

Pub. Date: 2004

Source: Research & Practice with Severe Disabilities

Vol, Issue: 28, 4

Publisher:

Page #: 165-181

Keywords: alternate assessment, performance indicators

Abstract:

Participants: Six selected states from a previous study that were identified as having strong, weak, or mixed links to reading and math were included in the study.

Test Design: The purpose of the study was to examine five curricular philosophies (*developmental, functional, social inclusion, self-determination, and academic*) that states use in their alternate assessment guidelines for students with severe disabilities, and to evaluate how these philosophies were reflected in the performance indicators of states selected from an earlier study on alignment. The content analysis used both qualitative and quantitative procedures. Using qualitative methods in an earlier study, states were identified as having strong, weak, or mixed links to reading and math. These states' performance indicators were classified by current philosophy and analyzed using non-parametric statistical procedures in the current study.

Findings: Results revealed that clear link states used predominantly academic tasks in their performance indicators for math and reading. Overall clear link states used more academic contexts than the weak link or the mixed link states.

Ref. Type: Journal

Notes: Journal article

Title: The alignment of alternate assessment content to academic and functional curricula

Authors: Browder, D., Flowers, C., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Karvonen, M., Spooner, F., & Algozzine, R.

Pub. Date: 2004

Source: The Journal of Special Education

Vol, Issue: 37, 4

Publisher:

Page #: 211-223

Keywords: alternate assessment, academic curricula

Abstract:

Participants: 31 states participated in the study.

Test Design: This study investigated the curricular focus of alternate assessments using performance indicators in math, language arts, and functional skills from 31 states. Professionals in math education, language arts and severe disabilities together with a group of stakeholders evaluated the performance indicators relative to their alignment to national standards and curricula. States that had alternate assessment performance indicators that were clearly aligned to math or language arts and those that did not were identified. The functionality of the indicators was also considered. Features of the performance indicators that exemplified alignment with general or functional curricula were identified through a series of discussions.

Findings: Results indicate that while some states have created lists of indicators that are accurate representatives of math and language arts, other states even within the most experienced states have missed the mark. Overall, the findings indicate that alternate assessments have a strong focus on academic skills, but they also reflect additive curricula approach which links academic and functional skills.

Ref. Type: Journal

Notes: Journal article

Title: How states define alternate assessments.
Authors: Browder, D., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Flowers, C., Karvonen, M., Spooner, F., & Algozzine, R.

Pub. Date: 2005

Source: Research and Policy in Developmental Disabilities,

Vol, Issue: 15, 4

Publisher:

Page #: 209-220

Keywords: alternate assessment, developmental disabilities
Abstract:

Participants: 42 states participated in this study.

Test Design: After IDEA 1997 mandated inclusion of students with disabilities in schools accountability systems, states began to develop alternate assessments to focus on students' performance on state standards. The purpose of this study was to examine how alternate assessments linked to state standards and how the assessments were scored. Researchers obtained and reviewed alternate assessment materials from 42 states. The information collection period ranged from June 2001 to November 2001. This information that consisted mainly of manuals and guidelines was examined to identify the skills and knowledge being measured by alternate assessments.

Findings: Findings from this study indicated that states employed a wide variety of implementation and scoring methods. Generally in most states, assessments were either linked back to state standards or standards were extended to alternate assessments. Most states measured academic domains; however, some states measured only functional skills. Regarding scoring, most states used some form of rubric to score the alternate assessments mainly measuring mastery, progress, or level of independence.

Ref. Type: Report

Notes: Technical Report

Title: Defining, Developing and using Curriculum Indicators
Authors: Porter, A. C., & Smithson, J. L.

Pub. Date: 2001

Source: CPRE Reports Series PR-048

Vol, Issue:

Publisher:

Page #:

Keywords: curriculum indicators, defining, developing
Abstract:

Participants:

Test Design:

Findings: The purpose of this report was to describe the progress made to develop valid and efficient measures of instructional content and its relationships to assessments and standards. The authors paid particular attention to mathematics and science. First they discussed the Reform Up Close Study, a Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) project. Then they highlighted the pertinent issues involved in defining and measuring curriculum indicators while taking note of how the approach has developed over the past ten years. In addition, they also provided information on using curriculum indicators in school improvement, program evaluation, and informing policy decisions. More focus was given to new methods for determining alignment among instruction, assessment, and standards. Suggestions for the next steps are also provided.

Ref. Type: Report

Notes: Monograph

Title: Criteria for alignment of Expectations and Assessments in Mathematics and Science Education. Research monograph no 6

Authors: Webb, N. L.

Pub. Date: 1997

Source: Research Monograph no. 6

Vol, Issue:

Publisher: Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers

Page #:

Keywords: Expectation, criteria, educational assessment, academic achievement, educational change, standards,

Abstract:

Participants:

Test Design:

Findings: The monograph presents criteria for judging the alignments between expectations of student achievement and assessment. Specifically, 12 criteria for judging alignment are discussed and grouped into five categories namely: 1) content focus; 2) articulation across grades and ages; 3) equity and fairness; 4) pedagogical implications; and 5) System applicability. Along with the criteria, examples and levels of agreement are also provided. An expert panel formed as a cooperative effort of the Council of Chief State School Officers and National Institute for Science Education developed the above criteria.