

Missouri Assessment Program- Alternate (MAP-A)

2011 Technical Report

DEVELOPED BY
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
University of Missouri/Assessment Resource Center
Measured Progress



Contents

Overview	1
Organization of the Report.....	1
Purpose of the MAP-A.....	2
Development of the MAP-A	2
MAP-A Chronology.....	5
Introduction to the MAP-A Process.....	7
Operational Assessment Administration	10
Eligible Students.....	10
MAP-A Participation Eligibility Criteria.....	10
Assessment Blueprint/Design.....	11
Assessment Blueprint for Mathematics.....	12
Assessment Blueprint for Communication Arts	12
Assessment Blueprint for Science	12
Mathematics and Communication Arts Data Collection and Submission Requirements	14
Science Data Collection and Submission Requirements.....	14
Steps for MAP-A Administration	15
A Twelve-Step Procedure for Completing MAP-A.....	15
Administrator Training	17
Implementation Schedule	19
Participation.....	19
Scoring and Reporting	20
Scoring Rubric.....	20
MAP-A Rubric.....	21
Scoring Rules	22
Scorer Selection	24
Scorer Training.....	24
Scoring Procedures.....	24
Reporting.....	25
Reports.....	25
Reporting Decision Rules	26
Student Performance.....	27
Reliability and Validity	33
Reliability.....	33
Agreement among Scorers.....	41
Validity.....	42
Test Content.....	43
Consequences of MAP-A Testing	44
Teachers' Role	45
MAP-A Information Security	47
Enrollment.....	47
Scoring.....	47
Data Storage.....	47

Contents (contd.)

Future Plans 48

References 49

APPENDICES

A. Mathematics and Communication Arts Assessment Development Process..... 50

B. Science Pilot Assessment Development Process..... 63

C. Science Standard-Setting Report 114

D. Forms 224

E. Achievement Level Descriptors and Cut Scores 242

F. Administration Training Materials..... 252

G. MAP-A Scoring Criteria 264

H. Scorer Training Materials..... 270

I. Sample Reports..... 285

Overview

The purpose of this report is to document the technical aspects of the 2010-2011 Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate (MAP-A) assessment. This was the sixth year of the MAP-A program in its current design. In the spring of 2011 students in grades 3 through 8, 10, and 11 participated in the MAP-A as follows:

- Grades 3 & 4: Mathematics and communication arts;
- Grade 5: Mathematics, communication arts, and science;
- Grades 6 & 7: Mathematics and communication arts;
- Grade 8: Mathematics, communication arts, and science;
- Grade 10: Mathematics only;
- Grade 11: Communication arts and science.

Mathematics and communication arts MAP-A assessments have been operational since 2006. The science assessment for MAP-A was developed and piloted in 2007 and became operational in 2008. This report provides information about the technical quality of the mathematics, communication arts and science assessments, including a description of the processes used to develop, administer, and score the MAP-A, and how the scores are reported and analyzed.

Organization of the Report

The organization of this report is based on the conceptual flow of an assessment's life span. It begins with an overview of the initial test specifications and addresses all the intermediate steps that lead to final score reporting. The second section addresses the general design of the MAP-A, the ongoing development process, the specific designs of the communication arts, mathematics, and science assessments, the MAP-A format, and the administration of the assessment. The third section addresses scoring and reporting of MAP-A results. The fourth section addresses the reliability and validity of the MAP-A. The fifth section addresses security of MAP-A information. The report also includes a description of the state's future plans for the assessment, along with references and appendices as appropriate.

This report describes several technical aspects of the 2011 MAP-A in an effort to contribute to the accumulation of validity evidence to support MAP-A score interpretations. Because it is the interpretations of scores that are evaluated for validity, not the assessment itself, this report presents documentation to substantiate intended interpretations (AERA, 1999). In the case of the MAP-A, however, construct validity is a major factor in score interpretation. The information in this report contributes important information to the validity assertion by addressing the following aspects of the MAP-A:

- Design and alignment with Missouri's standards;
- Administration;
- Scoring;
- Reporting;
- Achievement levels.

Purpose of the MAP-A

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be included in each state's system of accountability and that students with disabilities have access to the general curriculum. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) also speaks to the inclusion of all children in a state's accountability system by requiring states to report student achievement for all students as well as for groups of students on a disaggregated basis. These federal laws reflect an ongoing concern about equity. All students should be academically challenged and taught to high standards; all students should be involved in the educational accountability system.

To ensure the participation of all students in the state's accountability system, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has developed the MAP-A. Only IDEA-eligible students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are expected to participate in the MAP-A. Students with moderate disabilities participate in the standard MAP Grade-Level and End-of-Course assessments, with appropriate accommodations.

The MAP-A is a portfolio-based assessment that measures student performance based on alternate achievement standards. The MAP-A is aligned with Missouri's Show-Me Standards, Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) and Alternate Grade Level Expectations (AGLEs) in communication arts, mathematics, and science. Missouri educators worked with DESE and its contractor, Measured Progress, to develop and review the AGLEs and to design the assessment blueprint for alternate assessment of eligible Missouri students.

MAP-A results are intended to inform stakeholders about student achievement on Missouri's communication arts, mathematics, and science standards and AGLEs. The results should be used for program and instructional improvement and as a component of school accountability.

The MAP-A assesses student performance on two Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs) in each of two content-area strands in communication arts and two content-area strands in mathematics. It also assesses performance on four APIs in science, which are selected from two process strands and six content strands. Teachers observe and assess a student's performance and collect evidence in each strand during two distinct collection periods. The assessment effectively links standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment and is scored using three criteria: 1) level of accuracy, 2) level of independence, and 3) connection to the standards. The collected evidence provides documentation of a connection between the Show-Me Standards and instruction.

Development of the MAP-A

Considering the needs of Missouri's assessment programs at the time, among them efforts to ensure participation of all students in the state's accountability system, alignment of assessments with Missouri's Show-Me Standards and GLEs, and continued improvement to the state's assessment program, DESE called for a redesign of the MAP-A in 2004. The redesigned assessment was intended to meet the needs of students and teachers while complying with the requirements of the federal government.

A general description of the assessment development and standard-setting processes for MAP-A mathematics, communication arts, and science assessments follows. For more detailed information about the assessment development, please refer to Appendix A, Mathematics and

Communication Arts Assessment Development Process, and Appendix B, Science Pilot Assessment Development Process.

Mathematics and Communication Arts

The MAP-A was developed as a collaborative project by Measured Progress, the Assessment Resource Center (ARC) and DESE divisions of Curriculum and Assessment and Special Education. Mathematics and communication arts development began in the 2004-2005 academic school year with the discussions of the MAP-A Advisory Committee, made up of stakeholders that included parents, teachers, and school administrators. In addition to this committee, the contractor and DESE called together groups of Missouri educators several times to participate in the development and review process. Special education and general education teachers made up the review groups that developed the AGLs, in cooperation with DESE and Measured Progress assessment and content specialists. They used the Missouri Show-Me Standards and the Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) to draft and revise AGLs, which were in turn the basis for the APIs used for assessment with the MAP-A. Prior to their adoption, the AGLs and APIs were presented to district personnel for review and comment.

After considering concerns expressed by the MAP-A Advisory Committee, chief among which was the paperwork burden on teachers, DESE and Measured Progress drafted an assessment blueprint and piloted mathematics and communication arts assessments. Missouri's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the blueprint prior to administration of the pilot.

In February 2005, the teachers recruited to pilot mathematics and communication arts were required to attend one of four training sessions delivered at various locations around the state. A total of 164 pilot assessments were administered March-April 2005. Pilot teachers provided feedback to the developers through direct contact and responses to a survey administered to each. The pilot assessments were scored in May 2005 at ARC. Measured Progress led table leader training. Sessions were attended by ARC staff and DESE staff. Scorers were asked to provide feedback through a survey administered following the training and scoring.

DESE considered the feedback and suggestions provided by pilot teachers and scorers, along with the input of its advisory groups to make refinements to the MAP-A prior to its initial operational assessment year, 2005-2006. Clarifications were made to training materials and the development of additional samples for teachers was planned. The most significant change, however, was made to the blueprint. In response to serious concerns from teachers about the workload and ability to assess the nine strands in each content area, the number of strands required for assessment at each grade span was decreased from nine to four.

Following the initial operational administration, Measured Progress conducted a standard-setting meeting in Columbia in June 2006 to set cut scores that would be used to determine achievement levels for mathematics and communication arts. Eighty-three panelists, divided into six grade-span and content-area groups, participated in the three-day meeting. Measured Progress employed the modified Body of Work Method, in which panelists are presented with a set of actual student work and are asked to determine which performance level best matches the skills and abilities evidenced in the student work sample.

Individual participants were recruited by Measured Progress and ARC with the goal of empanelling a demographically diverse group that represented a mix of parents, special education teachers, communication arts and mathematics content teachers, and school

administrators. DESE exercised final approval over panelist selection. At the beginning of the meeting, all panelists attended a large-group training containing an overview of the MAP-A, participation criteria, administration information, scoring procedures, overview of the standard-setting process and related issues, and finally specific training about the tasks required of panelists. Following this training, the large group broke into grade-level panels which were led through their tasks over the three-day meeting by a trained facilitator from Measured Progress.

The standard-setting process included three rounds of panelist review. The first consisted of achievement level descriptors review and discussion, review of assessment submissions, and individual cut-point recommendation. The second and third rounds consisted of individual cut-point recommendation after extensive group discussion. Within each round, the panelists first made the middle (Basic-Proficient) cut, then sorted the below Proficient group into Below Basic and Basic, and finally sorted the second group by determining an upper (Proficient-Advanced) cut. Following the second round, the percentage distribution of achievement level impact data was presented to the groups by Measured Progress's psychometrician, to assist them in their round 3 discussions. After the final round, panelists again turned their attention to the achievement level descriptors, and made recommendations for clarifications to the language.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the changes and cut scores recommended by the panelists were reviewed by Measured Progress and DESE. Measured Progress applied smoothing methods and recommended achievement level descriptors and cut-score tables to DESE for consideration by the Missouri State Board of Education. The achievement level descriptors and cut scores were approved by the board and used to generate reports and accountability information for the 2005-2006 school year.

Detailed information about the standard-setting process may be found in the MAP-A Revised Standard Setting Report at the DESE website, <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/tech/index.html>.

Science

The development of the science assessment began in the 2006-2007 school year. In addition to the MAP-A Advisory Committee, a Science Assessment Development and Review Committee, also made up of stakeholders that included parents, teachers, and school administrators, provided input to the development process. The AGLE/API development process followed much the same format as that used for the mathematics and communication arts AGLEs and APIs, as did the rest of the development process, including review and comment from groups of Missouri educators, the MAP-A Advisory Committee, and the TAC.

The MAP-A science blueprint differs from that of mathematics and communication arts. It requires only two entries, but each must contain an activity that addresses two APIs from two different strands. In this way, the science assessment entries pair standards from grade-level-specific science content strands and all-grade-level science process strands. In all, MAP-A science requires the assessment of four strands.

Pilot teacher training for 135 volunteer teachers was conducted in December 2006 at four locations in Missouri. The science pilot was administered to 92 students during the January-March 2007 window, and scored in Columbia in June 2007. As with the other two subjects, surveys were administered to pilot participants, both teachers and scorers, and their responses

were considered, along with any face-to-face feedback they provided. The two ideas that emerged involved the provision of information to teachers about administering MAP-A science for two primary reasons: 1) differences in assessment requirements, and 2) teachers' concerns about their own expertise with science content. DESE and Measured Progress made plans to address these concerns, adding additional information to training materials, providing pathways to science content specialists and planning the expansion of science samples.

Measured Progress, as it did for mathematics and communication arts, used the modified Body of Work method in the standard-setting process for science. The standard-setting meeting took place over two days in the late spring of 2008, following the first operational administration of MAP-A science assessments and followed much the same format as the June 2006 standard-setting meeting. One difference of note in the outcome of the science standard-setting is the establishment of a uniform set of cut scores across all three grade levels in science.

The MAP-A science achievement level descriptors and cut scores were approved by the Missouri State Board of Education and used to generate score reports and accountability data for the 2007-2008 school year. More information about the standard-setting process, and the science standard-setting meeting itself, may be found in Appendix C.

MAP-A Chronology

Major milestones in the MAP-A development process and subsequent administration of the MAP-A are listed in the chronology below.

1999 – 2000

- MAP-A mathematics and communication arts assessments are administered as voluntary assessments.

2000 – 2003

- MAP-A mathematics and communication arts assessments are required and administered to eligible students at ages 9, 13, and 17.

2004 – 2005

- MAP-A mathematics and communication arts assessments are administered to eligible students in grades 4, 8, and 11.
- DESE contracts with Measured Progress for development of a redesigned MAP-A to assess mathematics and communication arts.
- Development involves multiple groups of stakeholders and advisors.
- Mathematics and communication arts assessments are piloted.

2005 – 2006

- Revisions based on stakeholder feedback are made to MAP-A design.
- Operational assessment in mathematics and communication arts commences.
- MAP-A mathematics assessments are administered to eligible students in grades 3 through 8 and 10; communications arts assessments are administered in grades 3 through 8 and 11.
- Standard setting for mathematics and communication arts is conducted and the resulting cut scores are approved by the Missouri State Board of Education.
- DESE contracts with Measured Progress for development of MAP-A science assessment. Development involves multiple groups of stakeholders and advisors.

2006 – 2007

- Revisions in response to stakeholder feedback are made to MAP-A.
- Mathematics and communication arts are administered to eligible students in grades 3-8 and one grade in high school for the second year.
- The MAP-A science component is developed and piloted; Measured Progress documented the science development process. This documentation may be found in Appendix B.

2007 – 2008

- Revisions in response to stakeholder feedback are made to MAP-A.
- Mathematics and communication arts are assessed with MAP-A for the third year.
- The MAP-A science component becomes operational and is assessed at grades 5, 8, and 11.
- Measured Progress conducts standard-setting meeting for the science assessment and the resulting cut scores are approved by the Missouri State Board of Education.

2008 – 2009

- Updates and revisions in response to stakeholder feedback are made to MAP-A training materials and resources.
- Mathematics and communication arts are assessed with MAP-A for the fourth year; science is assessed with the MAP-A for the second year.
- DESE offers MAP-A scoring training to teachers administering the MAP-A as professional development.

2009 – 2010

- Updates and revisions in response to stakeholder feedback are made to MAP-A training materials and resources.
- Mathematics and communication arts are assessed with MAP-A for the fifth year; science is assessed with the MAP-A for the third year.
- Supplemental professional development is offered through Regional Professional Development Centers to teachers in the form of MAP-A scoring training.


2010-2011

- Updates and revisions in response to stakeholder feedback are made to MAP-A training materials and resources.
- Mathematics and communication arts are assessed with MAP-A for the sixth year; science is assessed with the MAP-A for the fourth year.
- Science AGLE revision is conducted by DESE.

Introduction to the MAP-A Process


The MAP-A calls for information about the performance of students with significant cognitive disabilities on assessment activities designed and implemented by their teachers. The assessment activities are designed to provide evidence of student knowledge and ability in mathematics, communication arts, and science. The MAP-A assesses accuracy, independence, and connection to the standards on four APIs in each subject.

Figure 1. MAP-A Assessment Design




Teachers design activities to assess these APIs; they are trained to build their activities to align with the standards to assess and the student's highest academic functioning level. Activity descriptions for each API are submitted in Student Work Record forms in the student's binder. Teachers record data for an API three times during each of two collection periods, altogether producing six data points and two Student Work Records for that entry. These data points are averaged together on an Entry Data Summary Sheet to create that entry's Accuracy and Independence percentages.

Figure 2. MAP-A Entry



Each complete MAP-A mathematics and communication arts submission contains four entries (one for each API), and complete science submissions contain two entries with two APIs assessed in each one.

Figure 3. MAP-A Submission



All submissions for a student's MAP-A are combined in that student's binder along with a Table of Contents Checklist and Validation Form. Completed binders are returned to the Assessment Resource Center for processing and scoring.

Scorers review submitted binders and assign rubric scores to each entry. These scores correspond to student Level of Accuracy and Level of Independence averages provided by teachers. A Connection to the Standards rubric score is determined by considering whether the assessment activity connects to the API and if the activity demonstrates application of the skill in the API. When scoring irregularities occur (e.g., no connection to the API, missing documentation), scorers record the appropriate comment codes as well as the rubric score. Final entry rubric scores are added together to create the raw score for each content area. DESE-approved cut scores are

used to assign achievement levels for each assessment.

Table 1. Condensed MAP-A Rubric

Rubric	Score-Point				
	4	3	2	1	No Score
Level of Accuracy	76-100%	51-75%	26-50%	0-25%	Entry contains insufficient evidence to score.
Level of Independence	76-100%	51-75%	26-50%	0-25%	Entry contains insufficient evidence to score.
Connection to the Standards		Entry contains evidence of applying the API in two standards-based activities, one per collection period.	Entry contains evidence of applying the API in one standards-based activity, one out of two collection periods.	Entry contains some evidence of a connection to the API.	Entry contains insufficient evidence of connection to the API.

Teachers and individuals familiar with MAP-A administration and evaluation routinely use many acronyms and terms that may be unfamiliar to all readers. Several common terms are outlined below.

Table 2. Common MAP-A Terms

Term	Definition
Acquisition	Activities that demonstrate acquisition focus on practicing skills rather than applying them for a purpose.
AGLE	Alternate Grade Level Expectations
API	Alternate Performance Indicators
Application	Activities that demonstrate application require the student to apply skills for purposes other than practicing.
CTS	Connection to the Standards
Entry	A student binder component that includes an Entry/Data Summary Sheet, two Student Work Records, and optional Student Work samples.
IEP	Individualized Education Program
Validation Form	A student binder component that includes the student's mode of communication, the names of individuals who reviewed and/or contributed to the development or administration of the student's MAP-A, and the signature of the administrator who approved the binder for final submission.
Work Record	An entry component that contains the Task/Activity, Level of Accuracy, and Level of Independence descriptions.

Operational Assessment Administration

The MAP-A was administered in the spring of 2011 to students meeting the Missouri's alternate assessment eligibility criteria. Mathematics assessments were administered to students in grades 3 through 8 and 10. Communication arts assessments were administered to students in grades 3 through 8 and 11. Science assessments were administered to students in grades 5, 8, and 11. Students from 433 districts participated in the MAP-A; 6,202 students participated in mathematics, 6,152 students participated in communication arts, and 2,496 students participated in science.

Eligible Students

All students are required to participate in the Missouri Assessment Program in one of four ways: 1) MAP Grade-Level assessments, 2) MAP End-of-Course assessments, 3) MAP Grade-Level or End-of-Course assessments with accommodations, or 4) the MAP-A.

The decision as to how a student with disabilities will participate in the state's accountability system is made by the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) team using DESE-established criteria. If the IEP team for a student with a disability answers "yes" to all five of the following eligibility questions, then the student is eligible for MAP-A participation.

MAP-A Participation Eligibility Criteria

Yes No

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. The student has a demonstrated significant <u>cognitive</u> disability and adaptive behavioral skills. Therefore, the student has difficulty acquiring new skills, and skills must be taught in very small steps. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. The student does not keep pace with peers, even with the majority of students in special education, with respect to the total number of skills acquired. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. The student's educational program centers on the <u>application of essential skills</u> to the Missouri Show-Me Standards. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. The IEP team, as documented in the IEP, does not recommend participation in the MAP assessments (Grade-Level or End-of-Course) or taking the MAP with accommodations. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. The student's inability to participate in the MAP Grade-Level or End-of-Course assessments is not primarily the result of excessive absences; visual or auditory disabilities; or social, cultural, language, or economic differences. |

In an attempt to provide more information for educators charged with making the MAP-A eligibility decision, DESE provided statements as a supplement to criterion #3. These statements may be used by IEP teams in identifying students whose educational programs center on the **application of essential skills** to the Missouri Show-Me Standards:

1. The student's reading ability is limited and, as such, the student acquires information primarily through other methods.
2. The student's ability to demonstrate knowledge by writing or speaking is limited; thus, the student must often use other methods to express ideas and share information.

3. The student requires significant supports to access the general education curriculum while demonstrating modest progress in that curriculum.
4. The student typically has difficulty solving novel problems or using newly acquired skills in differing situations.
5. The student's educational priorities primarily address essential skills that will be used in adult daily living.
6. The student's post-secondary outcomes will likely require supported or assisted living.
7. The student requires instruction in small groups or on a one-to-one basis, with frequent prompts and guidance from adults.

The grade-level MAP and End-of-Course assessments provide access to the vast majority of students. Therefore, approximately 1% of Missouri students assessed are expected to participate in the MAP-A. In accordance with NCLB regulation 34 CFR 200.13 Adequate Yearly Progress in General, if necessary Missouri would apply a 1% cap to the number of proficient and advanced scores based on the MAP-A that may be included in AYP calculations at both the state and district levels.

District test coordinators were required to enroll MAP-A eligible students in the MAP-A through ARC in fall 2010. This triggered delivery of a set of student-specific materials to the districts for each student enrolled in the MAP-A and an expectation that a MAP-A would be submitted for scoring for that student in spring 2011.

Assessment Blueprint/Design

The MAP-A is a performance-based assessment that promotes enhanced capacities and integrated life opportunities for students with severe disabilities. One key purpose is to capture evidence of student learning. Another key purpose, in accord with high-quality assessment practices, is to provide information upon which to base ongoing development of curricula and instruction that are responsive to individual student needs. Students with significant cognitive disabilities are valued and contributing members of their school and community. Missouri implements and continues to improve the MAP-A to meet the needs of students and teachers as well as to comply with the requirements of the federal government.

The MAP-A consists of a portfolio of data and supporting evidence collected by an instructional team. It provides information on a student's knowledge and skills in communication arts, mathematics, and science. The MAP-A assesses accuracy, independence, and connection to the standards on two APIs in each of two strands in communication arts and mathematics; the MAP-A also assesses four APIs in two process and six content strands in science. Tables 3, 4, and 5 contain the assessment blueprints for the three subjects.

Table 3. Assessment Blueprint for Mathematics

Content Area	Grade Focus	Title of Strand
Mathematics	Required for Grades 3-8 and 10	Numbers and Operations (NO)
	Required for Elementary Grades 3, 4, and 5	Algebraic Relationships (AR) <i>and/or</i> Geometric and Spatial Relationships (GS)
	Required for Middle School Grades 6, 7, and 8	Data and Probability (DP)
	Required for High School Grade 10	Measurement (ME)

Table 4. Assessment Blueprint for Communication Arts

Content Area	Grade Focus	Title of Strand
Communication Arts	Required for Grades 3-8 and 11	Reading: Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process (RD and/or RP)
	Required for Elementary Grades 3, 4, and 5	Writing: Compose well-developed text using standard English conventions (WC)
	Required for Middle School and High School Grades 6, 7, 8, and 11	Writing: Apply a writing process in composing text or write effectively in various forms and types of writing (WP)

Table 5. Assessment Blueprint for Science

Content Area	Grade Focus	Title of Strand
Science	PROCESS STRANDS	
	Required for Grades 5, 8, and 11	Scientific Inquiry (IN)
	Required for Grades 5, 8, and 11	Impact of Science, Technology and Human Activity (ST)
	CONTENT STRANDS	
	Required for Elementary Grade 5	Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms (LO)
	Required for Elementary Grade 5	Changes in the Ecosystems and Interaction of Organisms with their Environments (EC)
	Required for Middle School Grade 8	Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy (ME)
	Required for Middle School Grade 8	Properties and Principles of Force and Motion (FM)
	Required for High School Grade 11	Process and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere) (ES)
	Required for High School Grade 11	Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It (UN)

In science, which is assessed at grades 5, 8, and 11, four APIs are assessed. Two strands, Scientific Inquiry (IN), and The Impact of Science, Technology and Human Activity (ST), are required at all three grades. An API from each is paired with an API from one of two grade-specific required strands.

Mathematics and communication arts are assessed at grades 3 through 8. Mathematics is also assessed at grade 10. Communication arts is also assessed at grade 11. Both mathematics and communication arts require assessment of four different APIs. APIs for MAP-A entries must be selected from particular strands within each content area, depending upon the student's grade level.

For example, the mathematics Measurement strand (ME) includes 55 APIs, from which two must be selected for a 10th-grade student's MAP-A mathematics assessment, along with two APIs from the Numbers and Operations strand (NO). The following is a sample of nine APIs from the Measurement strand.

Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs)

Justify and use the appropriate unit of measure (linear, time, weight).

ME1.1. Recognize, compare, and order attributes such as length and weight.

- a. Compare and communicate the length of 2 objects directly, using words such as "bigger," "smaller," "longer," "shorter," and "taller."
- b. Compare and communicate the weight of 2 objects directly, using words such as "heavier," and "lighter."
- c. Engage in experiences to connect number with length, using both conventional rulers and manipulative units that are standard units, such as centimeter cubes.
- d. Engage in experiences to connect number with weight, using balance and spring scales.
- e. Select and identify the appropriate tool for the attribute being measured.
- f. Show understanding of unit iteration for length measurement (e.g., placing units end to end in some manner, with no gaps).
- g. Use repetition of a single unit to measure something larger than the unit (e.g., measuring the length of the room with a single meter stick).
- h. Use appropriate unit for the attribute being measured.

Complete API lists may be found in the *Instructor's Guide and Implementation Manual* and/or at DESE's MAP-A web page.¹

Once the APIs are selected, the MAP-A requires that data for each API be collected over two collection periods to form a MAP-A entry. For each entry, three data points per collection period must be recorded on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet. One of these three data points per collection period must be further described and documented on a Student Work Record. Actual student work, appropriate for inclusion in the portfolio, is submitted with the student work record.

A **complete MAP-A entry** is defined, at a minimum, as one Entry/Data Summary Sheet and two Student Work records documenting six data points for each API. Because there are four APIs, and four entries required, a student's mathematics submission will contain documentation for 24 data points, at a minimum. The same is true for communication arts, for a total of 48

¹<http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/mapa.html>

MAP-A data points per student participating in both mathematics and communication arts assessments. Table 6 below outlines the requirements.

Table 6. Mathematics and Communication Arts Data Collection and Submission Requirements

Strand	API	Collection Period	Data Collection Required	Forms Required	
Strand 1	API 1	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records
		2	3 data points		
	API 2	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records
		2	3 data points		
Strand 2	API 1	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records
		2	3 data points		
	API 2	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records
		2	3 data points		

Science is assessed at grades 5, 8, and 11; it requires assessment of four different APIs, but unlike mathematics or communication arts requires two APIs in each entry, for a total of two science entries. Each entry must incorporate one API from one of the two process strands in combination with one API from a grade-appropriate content strand (Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms (**LO**) at grade 5, for example). Collection periods and data collection for science are identical to those of mathematics and communication arts. Table 7 outlines the requirements.

Table 7. Science Data Collection and Submission Requirements

Strand	API	Collection Period	Data Collection Required	Forms Required	
Process Strand 7 and Content Strand	Process API 1 and Content API 1	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records
		2	3 data points		
Process Strand 8 and Content Strand	Process API 2 and Content API 2	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records
		2	3 data points		

Steps for MAP-A Administration

The administration process follows twelve steps that take the teacher from determining student eligibility to the point of submitting the assessment. These steps are outlined in the *Instructor's Guide and Implementation Manual* provided to teachers. That manual provides detailed information on what evidence to collect and how to do so for each student and also provides many samples for teachers to refer to during the process. The twelve steps are as follows:

A Twelve-Step Procedure for Completing the MAP-A

1. Verify student eligibility for participation in the MAP-A. Refer to the student's IEP.

For information about eligibility see the Participation Eligibility Criteria established by DESE.

2. Determine the composition of the instructional team that will assess the student and fully inform all participants about the MAP-A.

The instructional team may include teachers, administrators, physical therapists, speech therapists, occupational therapists, paraprofessionals, job coaches, parents or guardians, and the student, when appropriate. **The student's case manager/teacher is responsible for the coordination of the assessment.** The case manager/teacher should fully inform all participants on the instructional team about the alternate assessment. Other professionals responsible for assisting the case manager/teacher in collecting information about the student should be aware of the MAP-A requirements and their roles in administering the MAP-A. Members of the instructional team are listed on the MAP-A validation form. The instructional team may have members in common with the IEP team, but they are NOT the same group.

3. Identify the mandatory strands in each content area.

The instructional team should refer to the Assessment Blueprint prior to beginning collection of evidence for the MAP-A.

4. Select Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs) for each required content-area strand.

The instructional team should refer to the Alternate Performance Indicators for a list of appropriate grade-level APIs for each strand.

- For mathematics and communication arts, **two APIs per strand** are required.
- For science, **one API per grade-appropriate strand** is required.

5. Review the requirements for documentation for the MAP-A.

The following forms are required to complete documentation for each API:

- **Form 1: Entry/Data Summary Sheet**

This form is used to determine student scores for the rubric dimensions *Level of Accuracy* and *Level of Independence*. The following are included on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet:

- Student identification
- Content area and strand identification
- API identification and description
- Summary data chart

- **Form 2: Student Work Record**

This form is used to determine the student's score for the rubric dimension *Connection to the Standards*. In order to obtain full credit for this rubric

dimension, the Student Work Record must show *application* of the API in standards-based activities. The following are included on the Student Work Record:

- Student identification
- Content area and strand identification
- API identification and description
- Activity description
- Description and evaluation of student performance

6. Determine the data collection system for documentation of student performance.

The instructional team selects the APIs and determines how student performance will be documented. The team should ask the following questions when planning for data collection:

- How was the activity designed?
- What type of data will be collected?
 - Discrete trials
 - Task analyses
 - Time intervals
 - Accuracy rates
- How will the data be collected and organized?
- Who will collect the data?
- When will the data be collected?
- How will data be converted into percentage scores?

7. Collect and record data throughout the assessment period.

There are two required collection periods for the recording of data on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet. Only data collected during the identified collection periods should be included on the data sheets. There must be three data points per collection period, one of which is linked to a Student Work Record.

8. Select a Student Work Record to include in the MAP-A for each collection period.

The data from the Student Work Records submitted must be documented on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet. Make sure the activity shows evidence of application of the API.

9. Complete the Student Work Record.

10. Complete the Entry/Data Summary Sheet for each assessed API.

There are two steps to completing the Entry/Data Summary Sheet prior to submission of the MAP-A:

- Determine API percentage averages.
 - a. Average the two scores for *Level of Accuracy*.
 - b. Average the two scores for *Level of Independence*.
- Indicate the Student Work Record included for each collection period of the API.

11. Assemble the MAP-A documentation.

Once all of the required documentation has been completed, the teacher should assemble the MAP-A as directed in the Table of Contents Checklist.

12. Submit completed MAP-A.

Submit completed MAP-A to your district test coordinator on or before the MAP-A return deadline.

Administrator Training

Through DESE Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) contracts, Improvement Consultants (ICs) hold primary responsibility for training Missouri teachers about MAP-A. On September 9, 2010, ARC staff delivered administration training to ICs employed by the state's RPDCs, staff from the Missouri Schools for the Severely Disabled, and staff from the DESE Assessment Section and Division of Special Education. The intent of the training was to provide ICs and others with the information necessary to train teachers in the MAP-A administration process. The 29 participants represented all nine regions of the state. Participants were provided with a copy of the 2010-2011 *MAP-A Instructor's Guide and Implementation Manual* and supporting materials that included sample agendas, blank activity sheets with attached step-by-step instructions, electronic copies of the presentation slides and other training materials.

The training included updates in the assessment program for 2011, participation criteria, a step-by-step process for the administration of the MAP-A, an overview of the components and forms used in the MAP-A, the scoring rubric and rules, data collection processes, the assessment AGLEs and APIs, and several student samples. Participants were led through the step-by-step process from start to finish using student vignettes supplied to them. They were led through a process that involved making decisions about which APIs may be appropriate for an individual student's assessment, up to the point of deciding what kind of data and student work would be submitted for the student. Participants were also given a script for this activity to use in the future as they trained teachers.

Other hands-on activities showed prospective trainers how to use the actual student samples provided in the manual for training purposes. A variety of student samples were included in the manual to show a range of students, grades, and content areas. Other samples were specifically created to train teachers on the differences between acquisition and application of skills and also how to write up student observations so that all the information on evaluating the student and his/her performance on a chosen API was present.

Participants were also provided with information regarding common difficulties and errors encountered in the 2010 MAP-A submissions. These included

- difficulty with science APIs,
- confusion over application and acquisition,
- attempts to show progress,
- inappropriate or incomplete descriptions of student accuracy or independence, and
- selection of APIs out of the grade-span allowable strands.

To respond to requests from trainers and teachers across the state for additional sources of consistent MAP-A administration training information, DESE and ARC divided the MAP-A administration information into three segments, 1) general administration training, 2) new information for the current school year, and 3) sample activities and MAP-A entries. To pilot the new training materials, DESE and ARC staff held webinars to deliver each of the three segments to ICs and other key MAP-A liaisons across the state and asked for questions and feedback. The resulting segments were converted to PowerPoint presentations and distributed to ICs for their use in training teachers. The training material and edited webinar discussions were posted to the DESE website as a resource for all teachers administering the MAP-A.

The ICs provided trainings in their respective regions to school personnel, using the tools and resources developed by DESE and ARC. Based on feedback from teachers across the state, most

RPDCs offered a training session for teachers new to MAP-A and a training session specifically designed for returning MAP-A teachers.

ICs delivered the content provided to them by ARC and DESE, using the MAP-A administration training presentation and other materials developed and approved by DESE. Teachers received not only the detailed information regarding MAP-A administration, hands-on exercises, and group discussion opportunities described above, but also received additional individual attention and feedback from the IC in their region. In addition, ICs in many regions offered drop-in days. On these days, hosted and moderated by the RPDCs, teachers worked with RPDC staff and with their peers to refine MAP-A assessments-in-development. See Appendix F for MAP-A administration training presentations.

Table 8 indicates the total number of MAP-A training workshops offered by each region and the number of participants at those trainings.

Table 8. 2011 MAP-A Administration Training by Region

Region	Number of Workshops Offered	Number of Participants Attending
Southeast	7	235
Heart of Missouri	6	110
Kansas City	10	338
Northeast	9	214
Northwest	5	128
South Central	16	316
Southwest	9	206
St. Louis	15	290
Central	10	225
Total	87	2062

DESE made the 2011 *Instructor's Guide and Implementation Manual* available to every teacher administering the MAP-A. Teachers attending training conducted by the ICs were provided with a copy; teachers could also obtain copies of the manual through the RPDC in their region or from the Assessment Resource Center. The manual was also available for download at the DESE website.

Implementation Schedule

The schedule for the MAP-A began with the September 9, 2010, administration training and continued with trainings conducted by RPDC staff beginning in September 2010. Assessment materials were shipped to districts December 2010 through early January 2011, and two distinct data collection periods spanned January through mid-March 2011. MAP-A submissions were returned to ARC in March 2011 for scoring. Table 9 outlines this timeline.

Table 9. 2011 MAP-A Timeline

Event	Dates
Enrollment Window	September 13 – November 5, 2010
Transfer Administration Date	January 7, 2011
Collection Period 1	January 10 – February 4, 2011
Collection Period 2	February 7 – March 4, 2011
Submit Completed MAP-A within District	March 6 – March 9, 2011
Return Deadline	March 11, 2011

Participation

MAP-A participation totaled 6,202 students in mathematics, 6,152 in communication arts, and 2,496 in science. A summary of Missouri student participation in the 2011 MAP-A assessment is provided in Table 10. See the Scoring and Reporting section for additional information regarding student participation and performance.

Table 10. 2011 MAP-A Participation

Content Area	Grade Span/Level	Students Participating
Mathematics	3-5	2,821
	6-8	2,624
	10	757
Communication Arts	3-5	2,821
	6-8	2,624
	11	707
Science	5	975
	8	814
	11	707

Scoring and Reporting

MAP-A scoring was conducted at the Assessment Resource Center (ARC). Scoring took place over several weeks beginning in March and continuing through May 2011.

Scoring Rubric

The scoring rubric is the basis for determining the student scores on the MAP-A. Three dimensions are scored:

1. Level of accuracy. This dimension reflects how well the student understands the concept(s) being assessed.
2. Level of independence. This dimension reflects the extent to which the student is able to perform without assistance from the examiner.
3. Connection to the standards. This dimension reflects whether the assessment is clearly linked to the Show-Me Standards.

Scorers review the entries submitted and assign rubric scores for each of the three dimensions. Level of accuracy and level of independence are scored using a four-point rubric. Connection to the standards is scored using a three-point rubric. The total entry score is a simple sum of these three, and ranges from 0 to 11 points. A sum of the entry scores for the four entries required for mathematics and for communication arts and the two entries that are required for science makes up the total raw score for that subject area. The total raw score ranges from 0 to 44 points for mathematics and communication arts and 0 to 22 points for science.

Table 11 shows the rubric dimensions.

Table 11. MAP-A Rubric

Rubric	Score Points				
	4	3	2	1	No Score
Level of Accuracy	Student performance of skills “based on Alternate Performance Indicators” demonstrates a high level of understanding of concepts. 76–100% Accuracy	Student performance of skills “based on Alternate Performance Indicators” demonstrates some understanding of concepts. 51–75% Accuracy	Student performance of skills “based on Alternate Performance Indicators” demonstrates a limited understanding of concepts. 26–50% Accuracy	Student performance of skills “based on Alternate Performance Indicators” demonstrates a minimal understanding of concepts. 0–25% Accuracy	Entry contains insufficient information to determine a score.
Level of Independence	Student requires minimal verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 76–100% Independence	Student requires some verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 51–75% Independence	Student requires frequent verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 26–50% Independence	Student requires extensive verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 0–25% Independence	Entry contains insufficient information to determine a score.
Connection to the Standards	--	There is evidence of applying the Alternate Performance Indicator in two standards-based activities, one per collection period.	There is evidence of applying the Alternate Performance Indicator in at least one standards-based activity, one out of two collection periods .	There is some evidence of a connection to the Alternate Performance Indicator.	There is insufficient evidence of a connection to the Alternate Performance Indicator.

MAP-A data submissions are not always complete and may not follow submission guidelines. Table 12 shows potential data irregularities, the rules used to address them, and the frequencies at which these irregularities appeared in the MAP-A entries for 2011.

Table 12. Scoring Rules

Code	Data Irregularity	Scoring Rule	# of Appearances in Scored 2011 Entries	% of Total Scored 2011 Entries
01	No dates given on Entry/Data Summary Sheet and on Student Work Records.	Entry is assigned a “No Score” for each dimension of the rubric.	7	0.01
02	Missing Entry/Data Summary Sheet.	Entry is assigned a “No Score” for each dimension of the rubric.	27	0.05
03	A collection period does not have a minimum of three data points.	Entry is assigned a “No Score” for each dimension of the rubric.	288	0.53
04	An entry does not include at least one Student Work Record per Collection Period.	Entry is assigned a “No Score” for each dimension of the rubric.	146	0.27
05	A submitted Student Work Record for an entry does not connect to the API/s.	Entry is assigned a “No Score” for each dimension of the rubric.	3448	6.34
06	One out of two collection periods is incomplete.	Entry is assigned a “No Score” for each dimension on the rubric.	33	0.06
07	No API/s identified on a Student Work Record or Entry Data/Summary Sheet.	The collection period is considered incomplete. Entry is assigned a “No Score” for each dimension on the rubric.	0	0.00
08	The API/s is/are not grade-span appropriate.	The collection period is considered incomplete. Entry is assigned a “No Score” for each dimension on the rubric.	39	0.07
09	A single API is used in more than one entry.	The first instance is scored. In the second instance, the entry is assigned “0 Data Points” in both collection periods and “No Score” for each dimension of the rubric.	8	0.01

Table 12. Scoring Rules (contd.)

Code	Data Irregularity	Scoring Rule	# of Appearances in Scored 2011 Entries	% of Total Scored 2011 Entries
10	A single science content strand is used in more than one entry.	The first instance is scored. In the second instance, the entry is assigned "0 Data Points" in both collection periods and "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric.	16	0.03
11	Missing entry.	Entry is assigned "0 Data Points" in both collection periods and "No Score" for each dimension on the rubric.	853	1.57
12	API/s is/are not consistent across the 2 collection periods.	Entry is assigned a "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric.	5	0.01
13	Dates on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet and Student Work Records are not within the timeframes of the collection periods.	Any data from dates outside of the timeframes is not used for scoring.	0	0.00
14	One or more Student Work Records shows acquisition rather than application of the API/s.	The activity in these collection periods cannot be considered application.	7000	12.87
15	Student work sample or piece of tangible student work submitted without a Student Work Record attached.	The activity in this collection period cannot be considered application.	0	0.00
16	Student Work Record missing task/activity description.	The activity in this collection period cannot be considered application.	11	0.02
17	Submitted percentages are miscalculated.	Scorer corrects percentages.	1336	2.46
18	Percentage calculations for Accuracy or Independence cannot be verified for a Student Work Record.	Percentage for Accuracy or Independence for the Student Work Record is replaced with zero and entry average is recalculated to determine rubric score.	1891	3.48

More information regarding scoring criteria may be found in Appendix G.

Scorer Selection

ARC has many years' experience hiring and training scorers to read, evaluate, and score open-ended assessments (fill-in-the-blank, short answer, short or long essay, and portfolio) for students at the primary, secondary, and post-secondary educational levels in subject areas including reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Emphasis is placed on the maintenance of security and confidentiality of tests at all times. Scorers consult with scoring facilitators about scoring questionable responses to determine how to score them and attend regularly scheduled meetings in order to identify and provide input for solving problems or potential problems. Facilitators exercise functional supervision over reader/scorers and/or other staff as necessary.

ARC recruited scorers and facilitators specifically for the MAP-A program. Minimum qualifications for MAP-A scorers include a baccalaureate degree, strong communication skills, and demonstrated ability to critically review printed material. In addition, MAP-A scoring facilitators have prior scoring experience, strong facilitation skills, and the ability to instruct scorers regarding the meaning and application of scoring rubrics. Preferred qualifications for MAP-A scorers include previous experience scoring open-ended assessments, teaching, editing, and/or participating in structured analysis.

Twenty-two scorers and four scoring facilitators scored the 2010-2011 MAP-A submissions from March through May 2011. Scorers and scoring facilitators were required to sign nondisclosure agreements and agreed to maintain the security of MAP-A materials at all times.

Scorer Training

Scorer candidates participated in training sessions led by MAP-A experts that involved paper-and-pencil scoring training. Scorer training focused on the MAP-A rubric and scoring rules. Scorers were given examples of typical student work illustrating various rubric scores and scoring decisions. Examples of "difficult" submissions presenting a variety of scoring challenges were included. Scorer training also included an emphasis on applying the rubric and decision rules as trained, guarding against bias. Following training, scorer candidates were given qualifying tests. If they passed these tests, candidates were certified to score the MAP-A. After they qualified, scorers participated in further hands-on training that consisted of additional MAP-A scoring exercises and the review of MAP-A submissions scored the previous year. See Appendix H for resources used in MAP-A scorer training.

Individuals who served as scoring facilitators began their MAP-A training earlier than the remaining scorer candidates. Their participation in intensive training sessions and successful completion of qualifying tests were initial activities in the MAP-A scoring window. In addition to these tasks, they also assisted with screening scorer candidates.

Scoring Procedures

The facilitators functioned as day-to-day monitors of MAP-A scoring, and conducted retraining using materials approved by the ARC MAP-A program staff. Facilitators met with ARC MAP-A program staff on a regular basis to discuss scoring congruence and MAP-A submission irregularities. A blind second read was conducted on a randomly selected set of portfolios, 35%

of the 2011 MAP-A submissions.² The facilitators conducted resolution reads on portfolios that contained rubric score disagreements between scorers. In these cases, the facilitator's score prevailed as score of record. In addition, highly qualified senior scoring or program staff audited approximately 3% of MAP-A submissions at each grade span and circulated pre-scored submissions during the scoring window. In cases of disagreement with the initial score, the resolution or audit-read score replaced the initial score as the score of record. Facilitators had access to a variety of quality control information, monitored several MAP-A scoring agreement reports throughout each scoring day, and used this information to assist, recalibrate, or retrain scorers as necessary. Scorers were required to maintain acceptable agreement rates (an average of 80% across the three rubric dimensions).

To organize the flow of work during a typical day, MAP-A facilitators outlined the basic tasks and order of work in a simple-to-follow set of instructions.

Steps for Scorers

1. Take one MAP-A binder from the "In Box."
2. Apply numbered sticker to MAP-A binder spine.
3. Verify that the student name and grade level on the MAP-A binder match the information in the MAP-A scoring interface.
4. Score according to directions.
5. Place completed MAP-A binder in the "Second Read Box," "Resolution Read Box," or "Completed Binder Box."
6. Repeat process as needed.

Steps for Scoring Facilitators

1. Stock the "In Box" with unscored MAP-A binders.
2. Conduct resolution read on MAP-A binders from the "Resolution Read Box."
3. Place validated MAP-A binders in the "Completed Binder Box."
4. Repeat process as needed.

To promote scoring consistency, MAP-A submissions were sorted and scored by grade span to allow scorers and facilitators to focus on one set of APIs for a prolonged period of time. The content strands and APIs assessed with the MAP-A change from grade span to grade span. Following completion of an entire grade span, the facilitators conducted training to calibrate scorers to the next set of APIs.

Reporting

Paper reports were created at the individual student level and at the district level. Two separate student-level reports were created, one for parents/guardians and one for teachers. Paper reports were printed at ARC or at the University of Missouri Printing Services, located in ARC's building. The score data did not leave ARC and the electronic prepress files were returned with the paper products. Paper reports were sent to both the district of residence and the district of attendance for each student as appropriate. A description of the paper reports follows and report samples may be found in Appendix I.

² This was a change from the original scoring design which called for a read-behind strategy in which the original score is verified and when necessary, corrected by an expert rater. Historically, the MAP-A read-behind rates ranged from 20% to 100%.

Reports

Individual Student Report–Parent/Guardian and Teacher

This report contained overall achievement level for a single content area, achievement level descriptors, raw rubric scores, and APIs assessed for each of the required entries. The only difference between the student-level reports was that teacher reports included comments related to any submission irregularities in a student’s MAP-A so that teachers could learn to make correct submissions in the future.

API History Report

The Individual Student API History Report listed APIs assessed in 2010-2011 and, if information is available, those assessed in previous years. APIs that were assessed with the MAP-A in more than one year are noted. This report is provided for informational purposes and is meant to assist administrators, teachers, and parents in tracking the breadth and depth of content assessed with the MAP-A from year to year across a student’s educational span.

Student Record Label

The label contained assessment year and achievement level information.

District Report

This report summarized data based on student district of residence, and compared district performance by content area, grade span, and achievement level to overall state performance.

State Schools Building Report

This report was similar to the District Report but compared student data from one Missouri Schools for the Severely Disabled (MSSD) building by content area, grade span, and achievement level to overall MSSD performance.

State Schools Report

This report was similar to the District Report but compared student data from one MSSD building by content area, grade span, and achievement level to overall state performance.

State Schools District Report

This report was similar to the District Report but contained a summary of data of students who attend all MSSD buildings and compared overall MSSD performance by content area, grade span, and achievement level to overall state performance.

Report packages sent to districts included the mathematics, communication arts, and science reports for students who were enrolled or assessed in the district.

Reporting Decision Rules

Reports included achievement levels based upon the application of cut scores that may be found in Appendix E. Table 13 outlines the decision rules used for reporting of MAP-A scores.

Table 13. 2011 MAP-A Score Reporting Rules

Achievement Level	
Below Basic	Cut scores applied. <i>At least one data point recorded in content area submissions.</i>
Basic	Cut scores applied.
Proficient	Cut scores applied.
Advanced	Cut scores applied.
Level Not Determined	No assessment data points are provided in content-area-required entries.
Participation	
Participating	Enrolled students for whom MAP-A binders are returned for scoring with evidence of at least a partial attempt to collect data.
Non-participating	Enrolled students for whom empty or no MAP-A binders are returned for scoring.
Accountability	
Accountable	All enrolled students, less those who meet health waiver or enrollment exemptions.
Reportable	All accountable students less Level Not Determined and Non-participating students.
Health Waiver	Approved on an individual basis by DESE committee composed of representatives from Special Education; Assessment; and Accountability, Data and Accreditation.
Enrollment Exemptions	Students who moved in or out of the district after January 7, 2011.

Student Performance

The following tables present information regarding 2011 MAP-A student performance and participation.

Table 14. 2011 Students Tested Using MAP-A by Grade Level

Grade Level	MAP-A Students	Total MO Students	% MAP-A
3	904	67,717	1.34
4	942	68,375	1.38
5	975	67,498	1.44
6	917	68,262	1.34
7	893	66,811	1.34
8	814	67,648	1.26
10	757	69,711	1.09
11	707	66,732	1.06
Total	6909	542,754	1.27

Table 15. 2011 MAP-A Achievement Level Distribution

Grade Span	Achievement Level	Mathematics		Communication Arts		Science	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All Grades	Level Not Determined	90	1.45	79	1.28	55	2.20
	Below Basic	147	2.37	128	2.08	395	15.83
	Basic	337	5.43	543	8.83	487	19.51
	Proficient	1783	28.75	1586	25.78	369	14.78
	Advanced	3845	62.00	3816	62.03	1190	47.68
	Prof & Adv	5628	90.74	5402	87.81	1559	62.46
Grades 3, 4, 5	Level Not Determined & Below Basic*	56	1.99	48	1.70	144	14.77
	Basic	133	4.71	99	3.51	200	20.51
	Proficient	716	25.38	703	24.92	127	13.03
	Advanced	1916	67.92	1971	69.87	504	51.69
	Prof & Adv	2632	93.30	2674	94.79	631	64.72
Grades 6, 7, 8	Level Not Determined	32	1.22	31	1.18	23	2.83
	Below Basic	106	4.04	76	2.90	139	17.08
	Basic	134	5.11	305	11.62	150	18.43
	Proficient	837	31.90	750	28.58	147	18.06
	Advanced	1515	57.74	1462	55.72	355	43.61
	Prof & Adv	2352	89.63	2212	84.30	502	61.67
Grades 10, 11	Level Not Determined	31	4.10	21	2.97	23	3.25
	Below Basic	12	1.59	31	4.38	121	17.11
	Basic	70	9.25	139	19.66	137	19.38
	Proficient	230	30.38	133	18.81	95	13.44
	Advanced	414	54.69	383	54.17	331	46.82
	Prof & Adv	644	85.07	516	72.98	426	60.25

* Level Not Determined and Below Basic data combined due to small sample size.

Table 16. 2011 MAP-A Mathematics Achievement Level Distribution by Grade Level

Grade Span	Total Students	Level Not Determined & Below Basic *		Basic		Proficient		Advanced		Prof & Adv	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
3, 4, and 5	2821	56	1.99	133	4.71	716	25.38	1916	67.92	2632	93.30
6, 7, and 8	2624	138	5.26	134	5.11	837	31.90	1515	57.74	2352	89.63
10	757	43	5.68	70	9.25	230	30.38	414	54.69	644	85.07
Total	6202	237	3.82	337	5.43	1783	28.75	3845	62.00	5628	90.74

* Level Not Determined and Below Basic data combined due to small sample size.

Table 17. 2011 MAP-A Communication Arts Achievement Level Distribution by Grade Level

Grade Span	Total Students	Level Not Determined & Below Basic *		Basic		Proficient		Advanced		Prof & Adv	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
3, 4, and 5	2821	48	1.70	99	3.51	703	24.92	1971	69.87	2674	94.79
6, 7, and 8	2624	107	4.08	305	11.62	750	28.58	1462	55.72	2212	84.30
11	707	52	7.36	139	19.66	133	18.81	383	54.17	516	72.98
Total	6152	207	3.36	543	8.83	1586	25.78	3816	62.03	5402	87.81

* Level Not Determined and Below Basic data combined due to small sample size.

Table 18. 2011 MAP-A Science Achievement Level Distribution by Grade Level

Grade	Total Students	Level Not Determined & Below Basic *		Basic		Proficient		Advanced		Prof & Adv	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
5	975	144	14.77	200	20.51	127	13.03	504	51.69	631	64.72
8	814	162	19.90	150	18.43	147	18.06	355	43.61	502	61.67
11	707	144	20.37	137	19.38	95	13.44	331	46.82	426	60.25
Total	2496	450	18.03	487	19.51	369	14.78	1190	47.68	1559	62.46

* Level Not Determined and Below Basic data combined due to small sample size.

Table 19. 2011 MAP-A Mathematics Achievement level Distribution by Gender, Ethnicity, Primary Disability, Student Status, ELL Status, and Classroom Instruction

	Level Not Determined		Below Basic		Basic		Proficient		Advanced		Prof & Adv	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Gender												
Male	60	1.5	100	2.5	213	5.3	1147	28.7	2476	62.0	3623	90.7
Female	30	1.4	47	2.1	124	5.6	636	28.8	1369	62.1	2005	90.9
Ethnicity												
Black, not Hispanic	24	1.8	48	3.6	81	6.1	402	30.2	775	58.3	1177	88.5
White, not Hispanic	62	1.4	91	2.0	239	5.3	1272	28.2	2844	63.1	4116	91.3
Not Reported: Native American or Alaska Native; Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic groups*												
Primary Disability												
MR	48	1.6	58	1.9	148	4.9	861	28.2	1934	63.4	2795	91.7
Autism	14	1.1	31	2.5	56	4.5	385	31.0	757	60.9	1142	91.9
Multiple Disabilities	14	2.2	32	5.1	66	10.6	214	34.3	298	47.8	512	82.1
Not Reported: Specific LD, ED, Traumatic Brain Injury, Speech, Hearing, Language, Visual, Orthopedic, and Other Health impairments*												
Student Status												
SES	26	2.4	33	3.0	70	6.5	296	27.4	657	60.7	953	88.1
IEP	89	1.4	147	2.4	337	5.5	1776	28.7	3833	62.0	5609	90.7
In building less than a year	13	2.0	12	1.9	25	3.9	179	28.0	410	64.2	589	92.2
Not Reported: Gifted, H.S. Career Education, IAP, In district less than a year, Migrant, Title 1, and Voluntary Transfer Student designations*												
ELL Status												
Not Reported: Receiving ELL Services, ELL Monitoring, and Title III*												
Classroom Instruction												
From 21% to 60% of school day	22	1.2	32	1.7	67	3.7	526	28.8	1182	64.6	1708	93.4
More than 60% of school day	46	1.4	74	2.3	155	4.8	863	26.9	2066	64.5	2929	91.4
Separate School	16	1.7	34	3.5	100	10.4	332	34.4	484	50.1	816	84.5
Not Reported: Classroom Instruction Less than 21% of school day *												

* In compliance with confidentiality requirements, data from these subgroups are not reported due to small sample size ($n < 10$ in any one cell).

Table 20. 2011 MAP-A Communication Arts Achievement level Distribution by Gender, Ethnicity, Primary Disability, Student Status, ELL Status, and Classroom Instruction

	Level Not Determined		Below Basic		Basic		Proficient		Advanced		Prof & Adv	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Gender												
Male	51	1.3	88	2.2	357	9.0	997	25.1	2476	62.4	3473	87.5
Female	28	1.3	40	1.8	186	8.5	589	27.0	1340	61.4	1929	88.4
Ethnicity												
Black, not Hispanic	23	1.7	39	2.9	149	11.1	347	25.8	787	58.5	1134	84.3
White, not Hispanic	49	1.1	87	2.0	363	8.2	1135	25.5	2817	63.3	3952	88.8
Not Reported: Native American or Alaska Native; Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic groups*												
Primary Disability												
MR	42	1.4	53	1.7	249	8.2	758	25.0	1933	63.7	2691	88.7
Multiple Disabilities	14	2.3	29	4.8	86	14.2	189	31.2	288	47.5	477	78.7
Not Reported: Specific LD, ED, Traumatic Brain Injury, Speech, Hearing, Language, Visual, Orthopedic, Autism, and Other Health impairments*												
Student Status												
SES	27	2.4	33	3.0	142	12.9	280	25.3	623	56.4	903	81.7
IEP	78	1.3	128	2.1	542	8.8	1582	25.8	3802	62.0	5384	87.8
In building less than a year	11	1.8	11	1.8	53	8.7	150	24.7	383	63.0	533	87.7
Not Reported: Gifted, H.S. Career Education, IAP, In district less than a year, Migrant, Title 1, and Voluntary Transfer Student designations*												
ELL Status												
Not Reported: Receiving ELL Services, ELL Monitoring, and Title III*												
Classroom Instruction												
From 21% to 60% of school day	13	.7	24	1.3	91	5.1	431	24.1	1227	68.7	1658	92.8
More than 60% of school day	43	1.4	64	2.0	266	8.4	797	25.2	1987	62.9	2784	88.2
Separate School	18	1.8	35	3.5	165	16.5	301	30.0	484	48.3	785	78.3
Not Reported: Classroom Instruction Less than 21% of school day *												

* In compliance with confidentiality requirements, data from these subgroups are not reported due to small sample size ($n < 10$ in any one cell).

Table 21. 2011 MAP-A Science Achievement level Distribution by Gender, Ethnicity, Primary Disability, Student Status, ELL Status, and Classroom Instruction

	Level Not Determined		Below Basic		Basic		Proficient		Advanced		Prof & Adv	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Gender												
Male	41	2.5	262	16.0	323	19.7	226	13.8	785	48.0	1011	61.8
Female	14	1.6	133	15.5	164	19.1	143	16.6	405	47.1	548	63.8
Ethnicity												
Black, not Hispanic	22	3.9	112	19.7	90	15.8	83	14.6	261	46.0	344	60.6
White, not Hispanic	30	1.7	256	14.3	365	20.4	267	14.9	875	48.8	1142	63.7
Not Reported: Native American or Alaska Native; Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic groups*												
Primary Disability												
MR	32	2.5	203	15.7	236	18.3	184	14.2	637	49.3	821	63.5
Not Reported: Specific LD, Multiple Disabilities, ED, Autism, Traumatic Brain Injury, Speech, Hearing, Language, Visual, Orthopedic, and Other Health impairments*												
Student Status												
SES	16	3.4	89	19.1	102	21.9	71	15.2	188	40.3	259	55.6
IEP	55	2.2	393	15.8	485	19.5	367	14.8	1186	47.7	1553	62.5
Not Reported: Gifted, H.S. Career Education, IAP, In district less than a year, In building less than a year, Migrant, Title 1, and Voluntary Transfer Student designations*												
ELL Status												
Not Reported: Receiving ELL Services, ELL Monitoring, and Title III*												
Classroom Instruction												
More than 60% of school day	33	2.5	203	15.3	245	18.4	204	15.3	644	48.5	848	63.8
Separate School	14	2.9	106	22.0	98	20.3	70	14.5	194	40.2	264	54.8
Not Reported: Classroom Instruction Less than 21% of school day and From 21% to 60% of school day*												

* In compliance with confidentiality requirements, data from these subgroups are not reported due to small sample size ($n < 10$ in any one cell).

Reliability and Validity

Validity refers to how well a test does the job it was employed to do. Reliability refers to the consistency of results from an assessment, or the extent to which an assessment provides the same results over repeated administrations and the extent to which various items within a test tend to provide the same results (AERA, 1999). The validity of any assessment is limited by its reliability. That is, if a test does not consistently yield the same results at each administration, it is probably not valid.

Reliability

Typically the reliability of assessments is determined by correlations among test-retest administrations, parallel forms, and items within the test (e.g., item discrimination, Cronbach's alpha). Neither parallel forms, test-retest reliability, nor consistency of an individual student's performance over time can be computed for the MAP-A as it is currently designed, administered, and scored. Recall that on each student's Entry/Data Summary Sheet there are six data points, three data points collected during each of two collection periods. These are averaged for a single entry score.

Internal consistency or homogeneity of the MAP-A can be computed as an estimate of reliability, with caution. Recall that two entries are completed for each of two strands within the mathematics or communication arts domains. Each entry assesses a single API. Thus, each student has four entry scores recorded for each of these two domains. For the science domain there are only two entry scores. Each science entry assesses two APIs representing two different strands. One measure of internal consistency, split-half reliability, is typically computed by dividing the test in half (e.g., odd vs. even items) and correlating scores on half the test items with scores on the other half. This approach could be used to estimate the reliability of the MAP-A in two ways:

1. Treat the two entries as two halves of a test and correlate the two scores. For mathematics and communication arts this would provide an estimate of internal reliability for each of the two strands. For science this is the only estimate of reliability that is possible because there are only two entries.
2. Treat all four entries in mathematics or communication arts as items of a test of the same domain and compute Cronbach's coefficient alpha.

Each API is supposed to represent the same strand, and each strand is supposed to represent the same domain. Thus, correlations between them provide an estimate of how generalizable each entry score is to the strand or to the larger domain. However, there are three concerns regarding the interpretation of these estimates:

1. This method depends upon variation among scores. The MAP-A has restricted variation. Teachers can select APIs and design assessment activities on which they are fairly certain the student will be successful. Thus, there is a negative skew on entry average scores, with roughly 40-50% of the scores at ceiling. The distribution of rubric scores is more restricted, with 45-80% scoring at ceiling and 10-40% scoring at floor, or "0."
2. This is a very short test. On the MAP-A, the split-half reliability would be based on only two or four items. The Spearman-Brown formula could be applied to estimate the reliability of the whole test if the test were twice as long (i.e., four or eight items), but even doubled it would be a short test. Reliability is a problem on a short test.

- This method is best applied to similar items measuring a single concept. Ideally, the two halves of a test should have similar content and difficulty level. Items measuring each behavior/skill should be on each half of the test. On the MAP-A, the halves are not likely to be equivalent because there is only one item on each half and because teachers are free to choose any two APIs from a field of dozens. For example, a 5th grader might be given the following two performance indicators: “Recognize a small collection of 1 or 2 items” (NO1.1a) and “Develop fluency with basic number relationships of addition and subtraction for sums up to 10” (NO9.4). Both of these APIs are designed to measure understanding of numbers and operations. However, they have different content and levels of difficulty.

Tables 22-24 show the domain of available APIs by content area and strand.

Table 22. 2011 Domain of Available and Assessed APIs in Grades 3-5

Content Area	Strand	Total APIs Available	# of APIs Assessed
MA	Numbers and Operations (NO)	86	86
	Algebraic Relationships (AR)	21	21
	Geometric and Spatial Relationships (GS)	32	32
CA	Reading: Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process (RD <i>and/or</i> RP)	69	66
	Writing: Compose well-developed text using standard English conventions (WC)	22	22
SC	Scientific Inquiry (IN)	18	18
	Impact of Science, Technology and Human Activity (ST)	5	5
	Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms (LO)	32	24
	Changes in the Ecosystems and Interaction of Organisms with their Environments (EC)	32	28

Table 23. 2011 Domain of Available and Assessed APIs in Grades 6-8

Content Area	Strand	Total APIs Available	# of APIs Assessed
MA	Numbers and Operations (NO)	142	132
	Data and Probability (DP)	32	32
CA	Reading: Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process (RD <i>and/or</i> RP)	87	85
	Writing: Apply a writing process in composing text or write effectively in various forms and types of writing (WP)	40	40
SC	Scientific Inquiry (IN)	25	24
	Impact of Science, Technology and Human Activity (ST)	16	15
	Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy (ME)	135	78
	Properties and Principles of Force and Motion (FM)	62	55

Table 24. 2011 Domain of Available and Assessed APIs in Grades 10-11

Content Area	Strand	Total APIs Available	# of APIs Assessed
MA	Numbers and Operations (NO)	147	119
	Measurement (ME)	55	53
CA	Reading: Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process (RD and/or RP)	94	79
	Writing: Apply a writing process in composing text or write effectively in various forms and types of writing (WP)	43	42
SC	Scientific Inquiry (IN)	39	32
	Impact of Science, Technology and Human Activity (ST)	27	21
	Process and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere) (ES)	144	68
	Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It (UN)	69	38

Tables 25-27 show the APIs that were assessed most often in each content area.

Table 25. 2011 API Usage in Mathematics

Grade Span	APIs Most Often Assessed	# of Times Assessed	% of Total Entries
Grades 3-5	AR2.1.A	514	4.61
	AR3.1.B	503	4.51
	AR1.1.E	388	3.48
	AR7.1.B	382	3.43
	NO4.2	343	3.08
	AR3.1.A	320	2.87
	NO1.0	285	2.56
	AR3.1.C	276	2.48
	NO1.6	243	2.18
GS3.1.A	226	2.03	
Grades 6-8	DP2.1.B	541	5.23
	DP2.1.A	525	5.07
	DP4.1.C	349	3.37
	DP3.1.D	302	2.92
	DP3.2.B	289	2.79
	DP1.2	283	2.74
	DP1.1.B	265	2.56
	DP1.2.A	246	2.38
	DP3.1.C	243	2.35
NO1.6	219	2.12	
Grade 10	ME3.4.A	243	8.37
	ME2.1.F	90	3.10
	NO12.2	89	3.06
	ME2.1.B	86	2.96
	ME2.1.A	75	2.58
	ME2.1.E	69	2.38
	ME3.3.G	58	2.00
	ME2.2.E	58	2.00
	NO1.6	55	1.89
ME3.1.D	55	1.89	

Table 26. 2011 API Usage in Communication Arts

Grade Span	APIs Most Often Assessed	# of Times Assessed	% of Total Entries
Grades 3-5	WC4.1	539	4.84
	WC2.2	514	4.61
	WC1.5	484	4.34
	WC1.1	483	4.33
	WC1.4	408	3.66
	WC2.4	383	3.44
	WC2.6	354	3.17
	WC5.1	352	3.16
	WC3.3	327	2.93
	RD4.1	326	2.92
Grades 6-8	WP1.3	437	4.22
	WP1.8	366	3.53
	WP3.1	320	3.09
	WP2.3	311	3.00
	WP3.4	279	2.69
	WP1.1	271	2.61
	WP3.2	269	2.60
	WP1.7	265	2.56
	WP5.4	214	2.06
	RD1.10	211	2.04
Grade 11	WP2.3	132	4.81
	WP1.3	127	4.63
	WP3.4	121	4.41
	WP5.3	110	4.01
	WP1.8	98	3.57
	WP5.4	84	3.06
	WP3.1	84	3.06
	RD4.2	77	2.81
	WP3.2	66	2.41
	RD1.4	64	2.33

Table 27. 2011 API Usage in Science

Grade	APIs Most Often Assessed	# of Times Assessed	% of Total Entries
Grade 5	ST1.2	550	14.31
	ST1.1	342	8.90
	EC1.5	333	8.66
	IN5.1	253	6.58
	EC1.4.A	216	5.62
	LO1.5	183	4.76
	LO1.3	151	3.93
	LO1.1	150	3.90
	IN2.1	142	3.69
LO1.4	107	2.78	
Grade 8	ST1.2	335	10.63
	ST1.1	165	5.24
	IN2.1	151	4.79
	ST1.4	136	4.32
	IN1.2.B	100	3.17
	ME1.1.B	97	3.08
	ST1.3	75	2.38
	FM1.1	69	2.19
	IN1.2	67	2.13
IN1.2.A	64	2.03	
Grade 11	UN6.3	207	7.58
	ST1.2	161	5.89
	ST1.3	155	5.67
	ST1.1	135	4.94
	IN5.1	131	4.80
	UN2.1	111	4.06
	UN2.3	92	3.37
	ES4.4	71	2.60
	IN1.1.C	65	2.38
	ES9.2	65	2.38

Noting these limitations to the interpretation of split-half reliability coefficients as applied to the MAP-A, Tables 28-32 report reliability estimates. In the mathematics and communication arts domains, the split-half reliabilities for Strands 1 and 2 can be thought of as replications of each other. Reliabilities for the rubric scores may be lower because the range is truncated.

Table 28. Reliability Estimates for the MAP-A, All Grades

	Mathematics			Communication Arts		
	Strand 1	Strand 2	Alpha	Strand 1	Strand 2	Alpha
Entry Average						
Accuracy (0 – 100)	.78	.74	.85	.71	.73	.82
Independence (0 – 100)	.84	.79	.89	.77	.83	.86
Rubric Score						
Level of Accuracy (0 – 4)	.55	.42	.62	.49	.59	.68
Level of Independence (0 – 4)	.61	.48	.67	.54	.66	.72
Connections to Standards (0 – 3)	.57	.47	.65	.55	.57	.68

Note. Numbers in the Strand 1 and Strand 2 columns present the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficients for the two APIs within that strand. Alpha refers to Cronbach’s alpha for the 4 API scores within each domain. Although the total sample was 6,909, due to missing data entry average reliabilities are based on 5,090 – 5,635 cases. Rubric score reliabilities are based on 6,152 – 6,202 cases. If there are scoring irregularities, the entry averages get no score and are treated as missing data in the reliability estimates. However, they are recorded as a “0” in the rubric scores. This results in fewer missing cases for reliability estimates of rubric scores.

Table 29. Reliability Estimates for the MAP-A, Grades 3 – 5

	Mathematics			Communication Arts		
	Strand 1	Strand 2	Alpha	Strand 1	Strand 2	Alpha
Entry Average						
Accuracy (0 – 100)	.76	.73	.83	.68	.72	.79
Independence (0 – 100)	.82	.82	.89	.78	.86	.87
Rubric Score						
Level of Accuracy (0 – 4)	.51	.38	.56	.44	.65	.67
Level of Independence (0 – 4)	.60	.45	.63	.51	.74	.74
Connections to Standards (0 – 3)	.52	.43	.60	.53	.61	.67

Note. Numbers in the Strand 1 and Strand 2 columns present the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficients for the two APIs within that strand. Alpha refers to Cronbach’s alpha for the 4 API scores within each domain. Although the total sample for these grades was 2,821, due to missing cases, entry average reliabilities are based on 2,302 – 2,684 cases. Rubric score reliabilities are based on the full 2,821 cases.

Table 30. Reliability Estimates for the MAP-A, Grades 6 – 8

	Mathematics			Communication Arts		
	Strand 1	Strand 2	Alpha	Strand 1	Strand 2	Alpha
Entry Average						
Accuracy (0 – 100)	.80	.74	.86	.72	.73	.83
Independence (0 – 100)	.84	.74	.88	.75	.77	.84
Rubric Score						
Level of Accuracy (0 – 4)	.54	.40	.62	.53	.51	.67
Level of Independence (0 – 4)	.58	.46	.67	.56	.57	.70
Connections to Standards (0 – 3)	.57	.46	.65	.57	.50	.68

Note. Numbers in the Strand 1 and Strand 2 columns present the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficients for the two APIs within that strand. Alpha refers to Cronbach's alpha for the 4 API scores within each domain. Although the total sample for these grades was 2,624, due to missing data, entry average reliabilities are based on 2,133 – 2327 cases. Rubric score reliabilities are based on the full 2,624 cases.

Table 31. Reliability Estimates for the MAP-A, Grades 10 – 11

	Mathematics			Communication Arts		
	Strand 1	Strand 2	Alpha	Strand 1	Strand 2	Alpha
Entry Average						
Accuracy (0 – 100)	.83	.76	.86	.75	.76	.87
Independence (0 – 100)	.88	.83	.92	.78	.79	.87
Rubric Score						
Level of Accuracy (0 – 4)	.64	.65	.75	.46	.67	.72
Level of Independence (0 – 4)	.66	.67	.77	.49	.68	.74
Connections to Standards (0 – 3)	.64	.59	.73	.50	.60	.67

Note. Numbers in the Strand 1 and Strand 2 columns present the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficients for the two APIs within that strand. Alpha refers to Cronbach's alpha for the 4 API scores within each domain. Although the total sample for these grades was 757 (10th-grade mathematics) and 707 (11th-grade communication arts), due to missing data entry average reliabilities are based on 576 – 655 cases. Rubric score reliabilities are based on the full 757 and 707 cases.

Table 32. Reliability Estimates for the MAP-A Science

	Grade			
	All Grades	5 th Grade	8 th Grade	11 th Grade
Entry Average				
Accuracy (0 – 100)	.73	.79	.76	.63
Independence (0 – 100)	.84	.87	.87	.75
Rubric Score				
Level of Accuracy (0 – 4)	.43	.34	.47	.47
Level of Independence (0 – 4)	.47	.41	.50	.51
Connections to Standards (0 – 3)	.48	.37	.51	.56

Note. These numbers are the Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficients for the two science entry scores. Although the total sample for these grades was 975 (5th grade), 814 (8th grade) and 707 (11th grade), due to missing data entry average reliabilities are based on 441 – 653 cases at each grade. Rubric score reliabilities are based on the full 707 – 975 cases.

Three steps have been taken to increase the reliability of the MAP-A. First, three data points are collected at each of two collection periods for a total of six data points for each entry. The average for these six data points is taken as the student's score for that entry. Multiple data points result in a more stable score because the effects of "outlier" data points are minimized, and the average score is closer to what may be the student's "true" score. Increasing the number of data points should result in higher reliability.

Second, two standard forms, the "Entry/Data Summary Sheet" and the "Student Work Record," along with actual student work, if appropriate, are used to report data. Test administrators are carefully trained to provide data on these standardized forms. The degree of accuracy and of independence that is required to earn each point on the rating scales is clearly specified, and models are used in training. Data collection, documentation, and submission requirements are prescribed in order to reduce the degree of variance in judgment that is somewhat inevitable in portfolio assessments. This standardized format contributes to reliability, although it has to be balanced with the need to design individualized assessments appropriate to each eligible student.

Third, scorers are carefully trained and monitored to assure inter-rater agreement. This is important because a test cannot have reliability that is higher than the reliability of the scoring. Inter-rater agreement is discussed in detail next.

Agreement Among Scorers

The extent to which two scorers assign the same score to an assessment when using the same rubric is referred to as inter-rater agreement. As part of ARC's quality control program for scoring MAP-A, inter-rater agreement reports are generated regularly. During scoring, 35% of submissions were given a blind second read. Thus, 2,418 of the 2011 MAP-A portfolios were checked for inter-rater agreement.

As a scorer completes a first read of a binder, his/her scores for each entry in the binder are entered into the MAP-A score database. As a scorer completes a second read of a binder, his/her scores for each entry in the binder are entered into the MAP-A score database and compared to the first set of scores. If there is a rubric score discrepancy on any of the entries within the portfolio, a facilitator then conducts a blind resolution read on the entry or entries in question. The facilitator's score then becomes the score of record.

Facilitators review discrepancy logs and agreement reports comparing inter-rater agreement percentages among scorers as well as agreement percentages with the facilitators' resolution reads. Early in the scoring season, agreement reports are reviewed several times a day with MAP-A program staff. As the season progresses and agreement rates stabilize, reports are reviewed by facilitators daily and with program staff several times a week.

Facilitators and program directors use inter-rater agreement and resolution reports to identify scorers in need of retraining and calibration and to identify any areas in which the entire scoring panel might have needed recalibration. With this information, retraining can be targeted and delivered quickly. Facilitators determine what retraining is necessary for scorers individually and as a group.

Tables 33, 34, and 35 summarize agreement reports for the MAP-A entries scored during the 2011 scoring season. Thirty-five percent of 24,808 mathematics, 23,608 communication arts, and 4,992 science entries received second reads. Inter-rater agreement percentages for each subject

may be found in the tables below. Level of accuracy and level of independence dimensions are scored using a four-point rubric. Connection to the standards is scored using a three-point rubric. The rubric for each scoring dimension calls for multiple decisions prior to assigning a rubric score. The maximum possible score per MAP-A entry is 11 points. The MAP-A scoring rules call for scorers to make decisions about whether an entry is scorable or unscorable. In cases of disagreement on such decisions, the resulting rubric scores differ by more than one point. This being the case, higher non-adjacent rates are expected in MAP-A scoring than in scoring using other holistic or analytic rubrics. It should be noted that scoring of the science entries has the added complexity of requiring two APIs per entry. The result is that more decisions are incorporated into the assignment of a single rubric score. As a result, lower perfect agreement rates in science are anticipated.

Table 33. Mathematics Agreement Rates*

	Perfect	Perfect Plus Adjacent	Non-adjacent
Level of Accuracy	91.31	92.56	7.44
Level of Independence	90.77	92.73	7.27
Connection to the Standards	83.66	85.95	14.05

Table 34. Communication Arts Agreement Rates*

	Perfect	Perfect Plus Adjacent	Non-adjacent
Level of Accuracy	92.93	94.30	5.70
Level of Independence	91.77	94.37	5.63
Connection to the Standards	84.53	87.24	12.76

Table 35. Science Agreement Rates*

	Perfect	Perfect Plus Adjacent	Non-adjacent
Level of Accuracy	84.50	85.50	14.50
Level of Independence	83.96	86.09	13.91
Connection to the Standards	77.69	81.63	18.17

**Note.* As described in the Scoring Procedures section, the methodology for monitoring scorer agreement changed in 2011 from a read-behind to a blind read. With this switch in scoring procedures, slightly lower agreement rates than in previous years were observed.

Validity

Validity refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of inferences made from test scores. It is the extent to which an assessment measures what it is intended to measure for a

particular purpose. The purposes of the MAP-A are to (1) document student learning according to state academic standards, and (2) inform instruction. Some of the evidence to support the validity of the MAP-A for these purposes has already been discussed in earlier sections of the report that address test administration, test scoring, and test reliability. Another important piece of evidence to support validity of the MAP-A for these purposes is test content, which is discussed next.

Test Content

Lissitz & Samuelson (2007) argue that the test construction process is at the heart of validity. They state, “*content validity, or internal validity, should be acknowledged as the critical initial characteristic to consider when evaluating the quality of a test*” (p. 446). While there is controversy regarding whether test content is the most important aspect of validity (Embretson 2007), content validity is widely considered the minimal requirement for a valid test, but not a guarantee that a test is valid.

This aspect of validity refers to whether the content of the assessment corresponds with what content should be covered by the assessment, that is, whether test content is relevant and representative of the construct. It is based on judgment and is not quantifiable. We discuss three aspects of the MAP-A content that support its validity for the purposes discussed above:

1. The alignment of strands with standards;
2. The alignment of APIs with strands;
3. The range of content in portfolios.

First, during development of the MAP-A, a blueprint was used to outline the curriculum and standards for each subject and grade level. This process assured strong alignment of MAP-A strands with Missouri’s Show-Me Standards, GLEs, and AGLEs. A summary of the assessment development process may be found in the Overview section of this report; refer to the *2006 MAP-A Technical Manual* for a detailed description of the mathematics and communication arts development process and to Appendix B for details regarding the science development process. The assessment blueprint may be found in the Operational Assessment Administration section.

Second, two steps have been taken to maximize alignment of APIs with strands. First, MAP-A administrators are carefully trained so that administration procedures are standardized. This process is described in the Operational Assessment Administration chapter. Second, each MAP-A portfolio is rated on its “connection to standards.” This process is described in the Scoring and Reporting chapter. However, MAP-A administrators can choose what APIs to use to represent each strand with each student. Their choices influence the content validity of the MAP-A. In fact, the validity of each student’s portfolio is potentially unique, depending on the APIs selected by the administrator.

Third, effort has been made to broaden the range of content assessed by the MAP-A. Typically, tests merely sample a portion of the universe of items that could be used to assess a content domain. The larger the sample, the more valid the test. Because lengthy assessments are onerous, particularly for the MAP-A student, a balance must be achieved between the number of actual APIs selected and the universe of possible APIs. A 2006 study of communication arts and mathematics MAP-A submissions was conducted by Dr. Norman Webb, University of Wisconsin, at DESE’s request, to address this issue.

Dr. Webb led an alignment study team using the Webb Alignment Tool (WAT), which has been used to analyze curriculum standards and assessments in over 16 states preparing to meet Title I compliance as required by the U.S. Department of Education. Overall, the findings from this study indicated need for improvement in the alignment between the collection of portfolios and the Missouri communication arts and mathematics alternate standards. Specifically, the MAP-A had limited range. Teachers were required to assess only two APIs for each of two strands in both communication arts and mathematics, yet there are a large number of APIs.

Although the state determined that the Webb model did not lend itself well to assessing the alignment of an alternate assessment of MAP-A's nature, DESE in 2008 took the following actions to improve alignment.

Teachers were provided with specific guidance in addition to the assessment blueprint, requiring them to select APIs not only from different strands, but also from different goals within the strands. To help teachers implement these new requirements, DESE provided additional training for teachers focusing on the following:

1. selection of APIs and design of activities at appropriate depth-of-knowledge levels, and
2. creation of assessment activities that closely tie to the content in the given APIs.

DESE provided for the development of additional sample entries and scoring information to be made available to teachers to assist them in their efforts to improve alignment.

Other states have used a variety of approaches to evaluating the alignment of alternate assessments, many based on modifications of the Webb model. DESE conducted a re-review of the mathematics and communication arts in conjunction with the NCLB-required alignment study of the science MAP-A, in 2009. This alignment study, conducted in collaboration with Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), used the Links for Academic Learning methodology, a significantly different approach designed specifically for alternate portfolio assessments. The technical reports for the alignment reviews of all MAP-A content areas can be found at <http://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/tech/>.

Consequences of MAP-A Testing

The *intended* consequence of the MAP-A is to enhance education outcomes for children with disabilities. To this end reports are provided to parents, teachers, schools, districts, and DESE, as described in the Scoring and Reporting chapter. Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) provide users with clear reference points for mastery at each grade level, so that scores can be readily interpreted and used to inform curriculum and IEP development. However, different APIs are used from year to year, so annual growth for individual children for specific APIs cannot be tracked.

Assessments can also have both positive and negative *unintended* consequences. Researchers disagree about whether assessment of consequences is an aspect of validity of a test or not, but there is widespread agreement that test designers and users should explore and fully disclose identified consequences of a test's use, including negative consequences, whenever possible (Linn 1997; Popham 1997; Shepard 1997).

Therefore, DESE commissioned a study to evaluate the consequences of its state assessment program. Part of that study addressed the consequences of MAP-A. Focus group discussions and

surveys were used to collect information from several stakeholder groups, among them teachers, parents, students, school board members, superintendents, principals, and personnel from DESE, and its Regional Professional Development Centers. Through this study and other contact with MAP-A stakeholders, a number of findings have emerged, both positive and negative.

1. MAP-A design lends itself to incorporation into IEP goals.
2. Requirements to administer the assessments led to better interventions for some MAP-A students.
3. MAP-A documentation and time requirements are onerous.
4. It is difficult to select appropriate APIs for the most severely disabled students.
5. Teachers' knowledge or lack of knowledge about how to administer the assessment and about the content standards affects student scores.

These findings suggest that stakeholders perceive the MAP-A as valid for the purpose of informing instruction. The findings also suggest that the assessment is challenging for teachers. Findings from multiple perspectives were presented in a symposium at the American Educational Research Association's annual meeting in April 2009.

Teachers' Role

Teachers have a significant role in administering, reporting, and using the information provided by the MAP-A. Thus, teachers influence the validity of the test. DESE provides training and on-going guidance to help teachers administer and report the assessment validly. Nevertheless, teachers introduce construct-irrelevant variance that may compromise the validity of the MAP-A. There are three ways that administration error can reduce a student's score.

1. If a teacher fails to provide evidence of evaluation on a student work record, the student would get a "0" on the accuracy and independence scores for that data point. This "0" would be averaged with the other two data points for that collection period. (If the teacher miscalculates, the entry is simply re-calculated, which could lead to a lower or higher score.) Thus, a student who may be fully capable of an API, but whose teacher fails to adequately document this on the student work record, would get a score of "67" $[(100 + 100 + 0)/3]$ instead of a score of "100." This would result in a lower rubric score, and may or may not result in a lower overall achievement level.
2. If a teacher gives the student an *acquisition* rather than *application* task, the student would get a lower "connections to standards" score, which would reduce the rubric score to 9-10 instead of 11. This may or may not result in a lower overall achievement level.
3. If a teacher (a) chooses an API not in the grade span, (b) describes an activity that doesn't connect with the API, or (c) assesses the student outside the specified time period, the student would receive a "no score" for that API, which becomes a "0" for the rubric score. For example, the API that "Cody" was assessed on was "*Write simple directions for doing something, considering a given audience*" (WP5.4). Cody wrote a grocery list for a recipe to be prepared by his life skills class. Cody showed accuracy and independence, but received a rubric score of "0" because his teacher simply reported that Cody found the ingredients, but did not discuss his writing, nor what kind of prompt was needed. Cody's score of "0" suggests inability to complete this API, when in fact he could write a shopping list. A rubric score of "0" would reduce his overall score by 11 points, out of a possible 44. This is likely to place him in a lower overall achievement level.

Teacher error in administration of the MAP-A could result in artificially low scores for students, whereas a correct administration could have permitted the students to display their competence. Thus, the meaning of a particular student's rubric score is not entirely clear, and may or may not be valid for determining the student's overall achievement level.

In summary, we cannot know all aspects of validity and reliability of the MAP-A because of the nature of this assessment. We cannot compare scores from one student to another. We cannot know how their performance pertains to same-age peers who are completing standardized assessments. However, strong efforts have been made to ensure that the assessment is as valid and reliable as possible for an individualized performance assessment. The evidence described above suggests that the MAP-A's psychometric properties contribute to its intended consequence, that is, to make inferences about student achievement on the Show-Me Standards for communication arts, mathematics, and science and to improve instructional programs.

MAP-A Information Security

Although the MAP-A submissions do not contain secure test items, they do contain confidential student information. The security of this information is maintained throughout the MAP-A cycle, from enrollment to receipt and check-in of submissions and through scoring, reporting, and archiving.

Enrollment

Electronic enrollment is handled by an ASP.NET website with a back-end Oracle database located behind a firewall. The website is protected by 128-bit SSL encryption, and the webserver is protected with IP filters for minimal exposure. The website requires users to login with a username and password assigned by ARC. District test coordinators can elect to create accounts within the system that can be used by their designees to enroll students. Enrollment is limited to students within a district and edit/delete can only be done by the district test coordinator.

Scoring

MAP-A binders returned to ARC for scoring are shipped to and stored in a secure warehouse adjacent to the rooms where scoring takes place. Access to the warehouse is limited to employees of ARC. Binders are staged for scoring in a secure manner. All ARC staff, including scoring personnel, sign a confidentiality agreement that is legally binding in which they agree not to discuss any aspect of the scoring process or confidential student information. The scoring process and confidential student information are defined to include, but not be limited to, any aspect of scoring, student responses, districts or teachers administering the MAP-A outside the scoring room. In addition, all ARC staff wear security identification name badges at all times during the workday. No cell phones, cameras, or other recording devices are allowed in scoring areas. All materials necessary for scoring, including training materials, rubrics, and MAP-A binders, remain in designated scoring areas. When scoring is concluded, discarded paper and scoring materials are securely shredded.

Data Storage

The enrollment data and score data are stored on University of Missouri servers which are behind firewalls. Additional network-level protection is provided by IP filters that block access to unauthorized subnets and protocols, regardless of their presence inside the intranet. Data are stored in a combination of Oracle database and flat text file formats. File-level access control lists prevent unauthorized staff from accessing MAP-A data on the network.

Future Plans

NCLB requires technical documentation for all components of Missouri's statewide assessment system, including MAP-A, to be submitted to the United States Department of Education's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education for Peer Review. Following review of a report completed by Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) of the alignment of the MAP-A Science assessment to Missouri's Show-Me Standards and the Science AGLEs, the Peer Review committee assigned to Missouri requested that the state submit a plan and timeline to address the recommendations from the report. One of these recommendations was for the state to review the Science AGLEs for grade appropriateness and accessibility.

DESE brought together a committee of statewide Missouri practitioners composed of administrators of special education, general education science teachers, and special education teachers representing a wide range of grade spans and certification status. The committee spent seven days during the months of March and April 2011, reviewing the Science AGLEs for grade appropriateness and accessibility. At the conclusion of its work, the committee submitted a revised version of the Science AGLEs. After DESE review, the AGLEs were approved and will be implemented for the upcoming 2011-2012 MAP-A testing window administration beginning January 9, 2012. The Alternate Performance Indicators have been updated to reflect the approved 2011 Science AGLEs. DESE has released an RFP calling for proposals to conduct a standard-setting study following the 2012 MAP-A science administration and to conduct an alignment study on the MAP-A science assessment in the fall of 2012.

Other changes to the MAP-A assessment program planned for the 2011-2012 assessment year include general refinement and updating of the resources prepared for teachers. The administration training in all subjects will be updated, based on stakeholder feedback from the 2011 assessment year.

The MAP-A *Instructor's Guide and Implementation Manual*, which is an important resource for teachers who administer the MAP-A, will be updated, as it is annually. The administration training which employs this manual as a guide will also be updated. The mathematics, communication arts, and science sample entries and their accompanying explanations used in all MAP-A training and reference materials will be reviewed and updated as necessary.

Scorer training materials will be refined as appropriate to include samples of any trends in assessment activities and /or student responses.

As in the previous year, DESE plans to continue its efforts to guide teachers in the selection of APIs. Through training materials and resources available at the DESE website, teachers will be encouraged to select APIs at the most advanced level appropriate for the student and representing as broad a range as possible, given the student's IEP and the content standards required for assessment by the MAP-A blueprint. To assist teachers in this process, APIs on which a student has been assessed with the MAP-A and the year or years in which they were assessed will continue to be provided with the student-specific assessment materials sent to districts each fall. Instructional teams that include content-area experts will continue to assist each student's primary teacher in his or her efforts to develop appropriate MAP-A assessment activities.

References

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

Bergin, D. A., Bryant, R. A., McFarling, P. L., Murphy, B. E., Parshall, T., Sireno, L., Su, I. (2009). Motivational Aspects of NCLB-Mandated Testing. Presentation at the American Educational Research Association, April 2009, San Diego, Symposium: Intended and Unintended Consequences of NCLB-Mandated Testing.

Bryant, R. A., Murphy, B. E., Bergin, D. A., McFarling, P. L., Parshall, T., Sireno, L., Wang, Z. (2009). Perceptions of Responsibility and Accountability for Student Learning in the Context of NCLB-Mandated Testing. Presentation at the American Educational Research Association, April 2009, San Diego, Symposium: Intended and Unintended Consequences of NCLB-Mandated Testing.

Embretson, S. E. (2007). Construct validity: A universal validity system or just another test evaluation procedure? *Educational Researcher* 36(8), 449–455.

Linn, R. L. (1997). Evaluating the validity of assessments: The consequences of use. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 16(2), 14–16.

Lissitz, R. W., & Samuelson, K. (2007). A suggested change in terminology and emphasis regarding validity and education. *Educational Researcher* 36(8), 437–448.

McFarling, P. L., Bryant, R. A., Parshall, T., Sireno, L. (2009). Overview of the Missouri Assessment Program and Missouri Schools Study. Presentation at the American Educational Research Association, April 2009, San Diego, Symposium: Intended and Unintended Consequences of NCLB-Mandated Testing.

Popham, W. J. (1997). Consequential validity: Right concern - wrong concept. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 16(2), 9–13.

Shepard, L. A. (1997). The centrality of test use and consequences for test validity. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 16(2), 5–24.

Appendix A: Communication Arts and Mathematics Assessment Development Process

Alternate Grade Level Expectation (AGLE) Expansion

Process

The MAP-A was developed as a collaborative project between Measured Progress, the Assessment Resource Center (ARC) and the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education divisions of Curriculum and Assessment and Special Education.

Stakeholder involvement

An advisory committee, representing perspectives of parents, teachers, and administrators, provided input during the development of this assessment. In addition, teacher work groups were formed at several points in the development and revision process. Mathematics and communication arts AGLE review work groups, composed of general and special education teachers, were formed. These teachers reviewed the AGLE documents that are the basis of the skills evidenced for this assessment. A third group of special education teachers participated in the pilot testing and scoring of this assessment, providing valuable feedback about the test design.

Development of the Communication Arts and Mathematics AGLEs

The AGLEs were developed for students with significant cognitive disabilities not working at the same level as their age level counterparts. The AGLEs were developed using Missouri's Show-Me Standards and GLEs for communication arts and mathematics. Measured Progress curriculum and special education specialists developed a draft of the AGLEs. The review committee participants and DESE staff provided input and recommendations for changes to the original draft. Using these recommendations Measured Progress revised the AGLEs. This document was used to develop the assessment performance indicators. Table 1 that follows shows how the document is organized and gives an example for each content area. The Missouri Show-Me Standards and AGLEs are not included in this manual because of the length of each document. They are located on the DESE web site at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/mapa.html>.

Table 1: Missouri – Alternate Standards and AGLEs

Terminology		
Term/Description	Examples	
Content Area	Mathematics	Communication Arts
Standard/Strand Learning outcome expected for all students throughout all Grades.	“Data and Probability”	“Reading”
Big Idea A statement of the standard separating the essential components.	“Formulate questions that can be addressed with data and collect, organize and display relevant data to answer them.”	“Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process.”
Concept Expectation for typical students described for each grade level.	“Pose questions and gather data about themselves and their surroundings.”	“Demonstrate basic concepts of print .”
Alternate Performance Indicator (API) Skill or concept expanded from the typical GLE to a basic level.	“DP1.1 Formulate questions that can be addressed with data collection. a. Identify what information is interesting to know (e.g., favorite TV show, ice cream; number of pets, teeth lost). b. Formulate and pose question to answer/find information (e.g., “How many pets do you have?”).”	“RD1.1. Attend to literacy-based materials. RD1.2. Understand print tells story by attending to and/or reading story. RD1.3. Match objects to like objects.”

MAP-A AGLE Development Process Overview

An overview of the AGLE development process for the MAP-A program follows in Table 2, showing the development process from its initial stages to the completed documents that have been circulated to school and district personnel.

Table 2: AGLE Development Process Overview

Development Step	Procedure of the Step
Initial expansion of GLEs completed in Missouri Summer of 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work completed in Missouri by DESE and Missouri educators.
Initial Measured Progress review and Recommendations Fall of 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measured Progress curriculum and special education specialists commented on and made recommendations on the GLE expansion work done in Missouri.• Recommendations were shared with the MO Alternate Assessment Advisory in November 2004.• DESE convened a set of teachers to go over the recommendations from Measured Progress and decided on which recommendations to take.
Measured Progress draft expansion was presented for review February 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measured Progress curriculum and special education specialists expanded the GLE document to create AGLEs.• Review groups in mathematics and communication arts were convened to review the AGLE documents and make further suggestions.
AGLEs were Finalized April 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measured Progress made revisions based on review committee recommendations.• DESE gave final approval for the documents.• Documents were published on the DESE website.

The Pilot

Blueprint and Design of the Pilot Assessment

Measured Progress presented an initial proposal for the assessment blueprint and design to the Alternate Advisory Committee in November 2004. Committee members were quite concerned with the amount of paperwork that the re-design might require for teachers to compile. The Advisory Committee suggested less evidence be collected than the original proposal. They also made recommendations for some changes to the blueprint. DESE listened to the recommendations of their Advisory Committee and requested that changes be made to the assessment blueprint and design. Measured Progress presented this assessment blueprint and design to the Technical Advisory Committee in February 2005 seeking their recommendations and approval. The blueprint that was presented consisted of a consistent content strand across all grade levels and a second content strand that alternated by grade span (3-5, 6-8 and HS) for each content area being assessed. The TAC was not comfortable with this blueprint and recommended that all content strands in each content area be assessed at all grade levels. This change was incorporated for the pilot, requiring teachers to assess students on five math strands and 4 communication arts strands. Table 3 on the following page outlines the assessment blueprint that was recommended by the TAC and utilized for the pilot.

Table 3: Pilot Assessment Blueprint

Content Area	Title of Strand	Grade Focus
Mathematics Pilot	Numbers and Operations (NO)	Required at all grade levels
	Algebraic Relationships (AR)	
	Geometric and Spatial Relationships (GS)	
	Data and Probability (DP)	
	Measurement (ME)	
Communication Arts Pilot	Reading: Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process, A-H (RD)	Required at all grade levels
	Reading: Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process, F-I (RP)	
	Writing: Compose well-developed text using standard English conventions (WC)	
	Writing: Apply a writing process in composing text or write effectively in various forms and types of writing (WP)	

The TAC made recommendations on the assessment design as well. The Advisory group that had made initial recommendations to the design proposed by Measured Progress was concerned about the amount of paperwork required by teachers and wanted the collection of evidence to be limited to a data sheet and one piece of student work for each API. The TAC felt that this was insufficient evidence upon which to make assessment judgments and recommended that, in addition to a data sheet, at least three pieces of student work be collected per API. Tables 4 and 5 show the design utilized for the pilot.

Table 4: Mathematics Pilot Assessment Design

Mathematics														
Strand 1 (NO)			Strand 2 (AR)			Strand 3 (GS)			Strand 4 (DP)			Strand 5 (ME)		
API 1			API 1			API 1			API 1			API 1		
Data Sheet			Data Sheet			Data Sheet			Data Sheet			Data Sheet		
CP1 WS	CP2 WS	CP3 WS	CP1 WS	CP2 WS	CP3 WS	CP1 WS	CP2 WS	CP3 WS	CP1 WS	CP2 WS	CP3 WS	CP1 WS	CP2 WS	CP3 WS

Table 5: Communication Arts Pilot Assessment Design

Communication Arts											
Strand 1 (RD)			Strand 2 (RP)			Strand 3 (WC)			Strand 4 (WP)		
API 1			API 1			API 1			API 1		
Data Sheet			Data Sheet			Data Sheet			Data Sheet		
CP1 WS	CP2 WS	CP3 WS	CP1 WS	CP2 WS	CP3 WS	CP1 WS	CP2 WS	CP3 WS	CP1 WS	CP2 WS	CP3 WS

API= Alternate Performance Indicator CP= Collection Period WS= Work Sample

Pilot Training

The pilot included a recruitment effort of up to 200 teachers, with each teacher limited to piloting the MAP-A with one or two students. The pilot was designed to accommodate up to 100 students per grade in grades 5, 7, 10 and 11. All teachers in the pilot were required to attend a one-day training session that was offered at four locations throughout the state. The dates and locations were as follows.

Table 6: 2004-2005 Pilot Teacher One-Day Trainings

Location	Date	Total Number of Participants
St. Louis	Tuesday, February 22	34
Columbia	Wednesday, February 23	40
Springfield	Thursday, February 24	26
Kansas City	Friday, February 25	29
TOTAL		129

All pilot teachers were provided a MAP- Alternate Examiner's Manual and the training required to administer the pilot. Teachers were further supplied with a CD version of ProFile, a software tool that could be used by teachers to record their data and evidence on the computer and then print out at the end of the collection.

The implementation window for the pilot was from March 1 to April 29, 2005. Teachers were provided information on how and when to return portfolios to the Assessment Resource Center (ARC). Teachers were further asked to complete a survey related to the pilot process and to return it with their pilot portfolios in early May 2005. (See survey responses in Appendix B.)

While the recruitment had specifically targeted students in grades 5, 7, 10 and 11 there were teachers who were interested in piloting the new MAP-A that did not have students currently in those grades so the recruitment expanded to allow student in grades 3- 8, 10 and 11. Table 7 below indicates the actual number of portfolios that were turned in for the pilot, and the grades and content areas covered.

Table 7: 2004-2005 MAP-A Pilot Participation

Grade Level	Number of Students	
	Mathematics	Communication Arts
3	4	4
4	7	7
5	13	13
6	6	6
7	27	27
8	3	3
10	23	6
11	4	11
All Grades	87	77

Pilot Scoring

The pilot portfolios were returned to ARC in early May. The portfolios were logged in and prepared for scoring. The scoring institute took place over three days in June 2005. There were four table leaders and twenty-four scorers. The table leaders and scorers were recruited from individuals involved in either the pilot development process or the piloting process itself.

Table leaders were trained in advance and required to qualify to score. Scorers were involved in a half day training and were also required to qualify to score. DESE staff were on site and available to make any policy decisions that arose and to address any scoring rules that needed to be agreed upon during the scoring process. Scoring took a day and a half. All portfolios were scored by two scorers in a double blind fashion. Any rubric dimensions that were not exact matches between scorer 1 and scorer 2 were scored by the table leader, whose score became the score of record. The inter-rater consistency for the pilot scoring is shown in Table 8 below.

Table 8: Pilot Scoring Inter-rater Consistency

Subject	Percent of 1st Scores that Matched 2nd Scores	Kappa Coefficient
Math	80.50	0.703
Communication Arts	80.40	0.689

Pilot Survey Results

Both pilot teachers and pilot scorers were asked to complete extensive surveys about the processes they had been involved in. Pilot teachers were asked questions that ranged from the usefulness of the training and materials provided to the assessment design itself and how well teachers felt it worked for their students. Pilot scorers were asked about the training they received, their understanding of the scoring process and the amount of time it took to score. Both the pilot teacher survey and pilot scorer survey results are provided in Appendix B. In addition to the scorer survey the state was able to facilitate a focused feedback session at the end of the scoring institute with the scorers.

Revisions from the Pilot

Feedback from the surveys and state led focused feedback session were used to make

changes to the assessment training, materials and design for the 2005-2006 implementation year. Some areas for further clarification and training included providing more examples of writing up evaluations of the student and understanding application of skills and how to evidence that. Further highlighted was a need to clarify some of the language on the forms being used to evidence student work. Suggestions were also made to improve the software tool ProFile for ease of use by teachers. All of these types of changes were incorporated into the materials provided to teachers in the form of the manual, teacher training and ProFile.

The most extensive change that came as a direct response from the feedback of the pilot teachers and scorers was the idea that nine strands for assessment was too much to evidence in the timeframe of the assessment and too disjointed for students. DESE listened carefully to this feedback and sought advice from Measured Progress and from the federal government about this change. Ultimately the feedback they received on all fronts led to a change in the assessment blueprint and design so that teachers were assessing students on two strands at each grade level per content area, evidencing two APIs from each strand. The final assessment blueprint and design are shown in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9: Final Assessment Blueprint

Content Area	Title of Strand	Grade Focus
Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numbers and Operations (NO) 	Required at all grade levels
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Algebraic Relationships (AR) <u>AND/OR</u> Geometric and Spatial Relationships (GS) 	Required for elementary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data and Probability (DP) 	Required for middle school
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurement (ME) 	Required for high school
Communication Arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reading: Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process (RD and/or RP) 	Required at all grade levels
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing: Compose well-developed text using standard English conventions (WC) 	Required for elementary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writing: Apply a writing process in composing text or write effectively in various forms and types of writing (WP) 	Required for middle school and high school

Table 10: Final Assessment Design

Mathematics											
Strand 1 (NO)						Strand 2 (by grade span)					
API 1			API 2			API 1			API 2		
Data Sheet			Data Sheet			Data Sheet			Data Sheet		
CP 1	CP 2	CP 3	CP 1	CP 2	CP 3	CP 1	CP 2	CP 3	CP 1	CP 2	CP 3
WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS

Communication Arts											
Strand 1 (RD or RP)						Strand 2 (by grade span)					
API 1			API 2			API 1			API 2		
Data Sheet			Data Sheet			Data Sheet			Data Sheet		
CP 1	CP 2	CP 3	CP 1	CP 2	CP 3	CP 1	CP 2	CP 3	CP 1	CP 2	CP 3
WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS	WS

MAP-A Components

Required Documentation

The assessment requirements for the MAP-A include the following documentation:

Table of Contents Checklist acts as a guide for organization of the MAP-A.

Validation Form (found in Appendix B) provides documentation of the individuals who have reviewed and/or contributed to the MAP-A. Obtain the principal verification signature prior to submission of the MAP-A.

Entry/Data Summary Sheet (found in Appendix A) must be used for each API documented within the assessed content area strands. The Data Summary Sheet is used to record student performance on each API assessed. The student’s score for Level of Accuracy and Level of Independence for each API will be determined based on the percentages recorded on the Entry/ Data Summary Sheet.

Student Work Samples must be submitted for each collection period of each assessed API. Each student work sample should demonstrate the **application** of the API in a standards-based activity. Two different options have been provided for the submission of the student work samples:

- Option 1: Tangible Student Work Product
 - Actual product completed by student
 - Worksheets
 - Drawings or writings
 - Journal entries
 - Projects
 - Complete and submit Tangible Work Product Label (Attached to actual student work)
- Option 2: Written Teacher Observation and Anecdotal Record
 - Used when there is no tangible work product to submit
 - Complete and submit Anecdotal Record Form as a student work sample

Samples of the above forms are on the pages that follow.

Student: _____

School Year: _____

Grade: 3 4 5

Table of Contents Checklist

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner)

- Validation Form

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD, RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 3 Student Work Sample

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD, RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 3 Student Work Sample

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 3 Student Work Sample

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 3 Student Work Sample

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 3 Student Work Sample

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 3 Student Work Sample

Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 3 Student Work Sample

Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Sample
- Collection Period 3 Student Work Sample

Validation Form

Student: _____

School Year: _____

This form provides documentation of the individuals who have reviewed and/or contributed to this MAP-A.

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Please obtain administrator's (principal, assistant principal, or special education director) signature prior to submission.

Signature

Date

Student: _____

Grade: 3 4 5 6 7 8 11

Entry/Data Summary Sheet					Communication Arts					Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)					
API #		API Description													
Task/Activity Description:															
	Collection Period 1 January 3-January 27					Collection Period 2 January 30-February 17					Collection Period 3 February 20-March 17				
Date															
Data Type															
Accuracy %															
Independence%															
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy:					Accuracy:					Accuracy:				
	Independence:					Independence:					Independence:				

Data Type Key:
 WS= Student Work Sample (Tangible Student Work Product OR Teacher Observation/Anecdotal Record Form)
 DC= Data Collection System

	API Entry Average
Level of Accuracy	
Level of Independence	

Revision 03-07

17

MAP-A Tangible Work Product Label

(Attach to actual student work product)

Student Name:		Date:
Content Area (Circle One): Mathematics Communication Arts		Strand (Circle One): 1 or 2
API:	Description:	
Task/Activity Description: (Write a brief description of the task/activity that resulted in the attached work product.)		
Evaluation of Student's Performance: (Describe the student's actual performance. Include information on how the percentages were determined for both Accuracy and Independence.)		
Level of Accuracy _____ %		Level of Independence _____ %

Revision 03-07

18

MAP-A Teacher Observation & Anecdotal Record Form

(Student Work Sample)

Student Name:		Date:
Content Area (Circle One): Mathematics Communication Arts		Strand (Circle One): 1 or 2
API:	Description:	
Student's Interaction in Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity. Be sure to include information on how the student participated in the activity.)		
Evaluation of Student's Performance: (Describe the student's actual performance. Include information on how the percentages were determined for both Accuracy and Independence.)		
Level of Accuracy _____ %		Level of Independence _____ %

Appendix B: Science Pilot Assessment Development Process

Alternate Grade Level Expectation (AGLE) Expansion

Process

The MAP-A Science Pilot was developed as a collaborative project between Measured Progress, the Assessment Resource Center (ARC) and the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education divisions of Curriculum and Assessment and Special Education.

Stakeholder involvement

The Science Assessment Development and Review Committee, representing perspectives of parents, teachers, and administrators, provided input during the development of this assessment. In addition, teacher work groups were formed at several points in the development and revision process. Science review work groups, composed of general and special education teachers, were formed for each grade level. These teachers reviewed the AGLE documents that are the basis of the skills evidenced for this assessment. A third group of special education teachers participated in the pilot testing and scoring of this assessment, providing valuable feedback about the test design. (See Attachment 1 for stakeholder lists.)

Development of the Science AGLEs

The AGLEs were developed for students with significant cognitive disabilities not working at the same level as their age level counterparts. The AGLEs were developed using Missouri's Show-Me Standards and GLEs for science. Measured Progress curriculum and special education specialists developed a draft of the AGLEs. The review committee participants and DESE staff provided input and recommendations for changes to the original draft. Using these recommendations Measured Progress revised the AGLEs. This document was used to develop the assessment performance indicators. Table 1 that follows shows how the document is organized and gives an example. The Missouri Show-Me Standards and AGLEs are not included in this manual because of the length of each document. They are located on the DESE web site at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/mapa.html>.

Table 1: Missouri – Alternate Standards and AGLEs

Terminology	
Term/Description	Examples
Content Area	Science
Strand Learning outcome expected for all students throughout all grades.	“Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy”
Big Idea A statement of the standard separating the essential components.	“Changes in properties and states of matter provide evidence of the atomic theory of matter.”
Concept Expectation for typical students described for each grade level.	“Objects, and the materials they are made of, have properties that can be used to describe and classify them.”
Alternate Performance Indicator (API) Skill or concept expanded from the typical GLE to a basic level.	<p>“ME1.1 Explore physical properties of objects.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. Recognize that objects have specific properties (i.e., size, shape, color, mass, smell, texture, and/or temperature).</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Using one or more of the five senses, explore the physical properties of different objects (e.g., identify one physical property of an object- the ball is round; it is red; the box is big; the ice cube is cold; the surface is rough; the feather is light).”</p>

MAP-A AGLE Development Process Overview

An overview of the AGLE development process for the MAP-A Science Pilot follows in Table 2, showing the development process from its initial stages to the completed documents that have been circulated to school and district personnel. (See Attachment 2 for survey results from the July and August review meetings.)

Table 2: Science AGLE Development Process Overview

Development Step	Procedure of the Step
Science Assessment Development and Review Committee Meeting Spring 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measured Progress presented the proposed design for the science MAP-A.• Participants reviewed the GLEs and made recommendations to DESE on what science GLEs to expand.
Measured Progress draft expansion was presented for review July and August 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measured Progress curriculum and special education specialists expanded the GLE document to create AGLEs.• Review groups in science were convened to review the AGLE documents and make further suggestions.
AGLEs were finalized September 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Measured Progress made revisions based on review committee recommendations.• DESE gave final approval for the documents.• Documents were published on the DESE website.

The Pilot

Blueprint and Design of the Pilot Assessment

Measured Progress presented an initial proposal for the assessment blueprint and design to the Science Assessment Development and Review Committee. The science strands in Missouri consist of 2 process strands and 6 content strands. Discussion was had about how to tie these strands together for assessment. It was decided that the science assessment would consist of assessing four strands at each grade level, but that this would be done within two entries. Teachers would be assigned the four required strands at each grade level, but would have a choice in how to pair the strands so that each entry would be comprised of one process strand API and one content strand API. The Science Assessment Development and Review Committee did not make any changes to the proposed design.

The Missouri TAC was presented with Science design in August of 2006. The blueprint and design follow in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Pilot Assessment Blueprint

Content Area	Title of Strand	Grade Focus
Science Pilot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms (LO) 	Required for Elementary Grade 5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environments (EC) 	Required for Elementary Grade 5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy (PP) 	Required for Middle School Grade 8
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Properties and Principles of Force and Motion (FM) 	Required for Middle School Grade 8
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere) (ES) 	Required for High School Grade 11
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It (UM) 	Required for High School Grade 11
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific Inquiry (SI) 	Required at all Grade Levels
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity (IS) 	Required at all Grade Levels

Table 4: Pilot Assessment Design

Science			
Strand 1 (SI and by grade span)		Strand 2 (IS and by grade span)	
Process API 1/Content API 2		Process API 1/Content API 2	
Data Sheet		Data Sheet	
CP 1 WS	CP 2 WS	CP 1 WS	CP 2 WS

API= Alternate Performance Indicator CP= Collection Period WS= Work Sample
 SI= Scientific Inquiry IS=Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity

Pilot Training

The pilot included a recruitment effort of up to 200 teachers, with each teacher limited to piloting the MAP-A with one or two students. The pilot was designed to accommodate up to 100 students per grade in grades 5, 8 and 11. All teachers in the pilot were required to attend a one-day training session that was offered at four locations throughout the state. The dates, number of participants, and locations were as follows:

Table 5: 2006-2007 Pilot Teacher One-Day Trainings

Location	Date	Number of Participants
Kansas City	Tuesday, December 11	38
Springfield	Wednesday, December 12	39
Columbia	Thursday, December 13	32
St. Louis	Friday, December 14	26
	TOTAL	135

All pilot teachers were provided a MAP- Alternate Examiner’s Manual and the training required to administer the pilot. Teachers were further supplied with a CD version of Measured Progress ProFile, a software tool that could be used by teachers to record their data and evidence on the computer and then print out at the end of the collection.

The implementation window for the pilot was from January 8 to March 2, 2007. Teachers were provided information on how and when to return portfolios to the Assessment Resource Center (ARC). Teachers were further asked to complete a survey related to the pilot process and to return it with their pilot portfolios by March 19, 2007. (See survey responses in Attachment 2).

While the recruitment had specifically targeted students in grades 5, 8 and 11 there were teachers who were interested in piloting the new MAP-A Science Pilot that did not have students currently in those grades so the recruitment expanded to allow student in grades 3-8, 10, and 11. Table 6 indicates the actual number of portfolios that were turned in for the pilot, and the grades covered.

Table 6: 2004-2005 MAP-A Pilot Participation

Grade Level	Number of Students
3, 4, 5	28
6, 7, 8	50
9, 10, 11	15
All Grades	92

Pilot Scoring

The pilot portfolios were returned to ARC in mid March. The portfolios were logged in and prepared for scoring. The scoring institute took place over three days in June 2007. There were five table leaders and twenty-five scorers. The table leaders and scorers were recruited from individuals involved in either the pilot development process or the piloting process itself.

Table leaders were trained in advance and required to qualify to score. Scorers were involved in a half day training and were also required to qualify to score. Qualifying to score required individuals to score at least 80% agreement with a set of two entries that had been prepared and scored in advance of qualification. DESE staff were on site and available to make any policy decisions that arose and to address any scoring rules that needed to be agreed upon during the scoring process. Scoring took a day and a half. All portfolios were scored by two scorers in a double blind fashion. Any rubric dimensions that were not exact matches between scorer 1 and scorer 2 were scored by the table leader, whose score became the score of record. The inter-rater consistency for the pilot scoring is shown in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Pilot Scoring Inter-rater Consistency

Subject	Percent of 1st Scores that Matched 2nd Scores	Kappa Coefficient
Science	80.20	0.772

Pilot Survey Results

Both pilot teachers and pilot scorers were asked to complete extensive surveys about the processes they had been involved in. Pilot teachers were asked questions that ranged from the usefulness of the training and materials provided to the assessment design itself and how well teachers felt it worked for their students. Pilot scorers were asked about the training they received, their understanding of the scoring process and the amount of time it took to score. Both the pilot teacher survey and pilot scorer survey results are provided in Attachment 2. In addition to the scorer survey the state was able to facilitate a focused feedback session at the end of the scoring institute with the scorers.

Two main themes were voiced in the pilot teacher and pilot scorer survey results. Teachers clearly wanted to be provided more examples and samples of science entries, especially focusing on how to connect the process and content APIs within the same entry. The second theme was that teachers felt it would be very important to provide enough training that teachers would feel comfortable completing the science portion of the MAP-A.

MAP-A Components

Required Documentation

The assessment requirements for the MAP-A include the following documentation:

Table of Contents Checklist acts as a guide for organization of the MAP-A.

Validation Form provides documentation of the individuals who have reviewed and/or contributed to the MAP-A. Teachers obtain the principal verification signature prior to submission of the MAP-A.

Entry/Data Summary Sheet must be used for each API documented within the assessed content area strands. The Data Summary Sheet is used to record student performance on each API assessed. The student's score for Level of Accuracy and Level of Independence for each API is determined based on the percentages recorded on the Entry/ Data Summary Sheet. Student Work Samples must be submitted for each collection period of each assessed API. Each student work sample should demonstrate the **application** of the API in a standards-based activity. Two different options are provided for the submission of the student work samples:

- Option 1: Tangible Student Work Product
 - Actual product completed by student
 - Worksheets
 - Drawings or writings
 - Journal entries
 - Projects
 - Complete and submit Tangible Work Product Label (Attached to actual student work)

- Option 2: Written Teacher Observation and Anecdotal Record
 - Used when there is no tangible work product to submit
 - Teachers complete and submit an Anecdotal Record Form as a student work sample.

Samples of the above forms are on the pages that follow.

Table of Contents Checklist

Elementary

Student: _____	School Year: _____	Grade: 5
----------------	--------------------	----------

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner)

- Table of Contents Checklist
- Validation Form

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Science Strand 7: Scientific Inquiry (IN) and Strand 3 (LO) or 4 (EC)

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Science Strand 8: Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity (ST) and Strand 3 (LO) or 4 (EC)

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

MAP-A

Page # _____

Validation Form

Student: _____

Grade: _____

District & School of Attendance: _____

This form provides documentation of the individuals who have reviewed and/or contributed to this MAP -A.

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: Person Responsible for the MAP-A Administration

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

OPTIONAL - Use this space to provide information regarding the student's mode of communication.

Please obtain administrator's (principal, assistant principal, or special education director) signature prior to submission.

Signature Date

Print Name

MAP-A

Page # _____

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Science

Student Name:				Grade:		
Content Area:				Process Strand:		
				Content Strand:		
Process API:	Process API Description:					
Content API:	Content API Description:					
	Collection Period 1 January 14 – February 8			Collection Period 2 February 11 – March 7		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.			Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.		
Date						
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %						
Independence %						
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy:			Accuracy:		
	Independence:			Independence:		

	API Entry Average
Level of Accuracy	
Level of Independence	

Student Work Record
Science

Attach student work sample if appropriate

Student Name:		Grade:	Date:
Content Area:		Process Strand:	
		Content Strand:	
Process API:	Process API Description:		
Content API:	Content API Description:		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to both APIs, and how it demonstrates application.)			
Evaluation of Student's Performance:			
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy .		Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence .	
Level of Accuracy: _____%		Level of Independence: _____%	

MAP-A

Page # _____

Attachment 1

Stakeholder Lists

- Design and Review Committee
- AGLE Review Committee
- Pilot Scorers

Design and Review Committee

Name	Role
Cheryl McCutcheon	Special Education Administrator
Katie Cook	RTAC
Bev Woodhurst	SAEP Member
Karen Allan	Special Education Director
Lynn Fain	Curriculum Coordinator
Lisa Buschart	Special Education Teacher
Barbara Stevens	Interim Superintendent
Robin Krick	Curriculum Coach
Susie Register	Special Education Teacher
Eric Hadley	Science Teacher
Charlotte Spencer	RTAC
Catherine McCormack	
John Palmer	Special Education Administrator
David Fager	Special Education Teacher
Kathie Wolff	Special Education Administrator
Janice Putman	RTAC
Eric Remelius	MO Parent Involvement Coordinator
Shirley Woods	Parent
Karen Willits-McCormack	Science
Tammy Boyt	

AGLE Review Committee

Name	Role
Katie Cook	RTAC
Karen Allan	Special Education Director
Lynn Fain	Curriculum Coordinator
Lisa Buschart	Special Education Teacher
Robin Krick	SLPS
Susie Register	Special Education Teacher
Charlotte Spencer	RTAC
John Palmer	Special Education Administrator
Kelly Fortune	SSD
Janice Putman	RTAC
Karen Willits-McCormack	Science/
Tammy Boyt	Science Teacher (Middle School)
Karen Wells	SSSH
Jackie Snow	Curriculum Specialist, Secondary Science 7-12
Karen Leigh-Kral	
Pam Mills	Earth Science Teacher (8th Grade)
Tracy Brown Hager	Science Teacher (Elementary)
Cay Miller	Science Curriculum Director
Jamie Edwards	SPED Teacher, 3-7

Pilot Scorers

Name	School District
Christine Baker	St. Louis Public
Anna Berkbuegler	Fredericktown R-I
Suzanne Bodkins	Dixon R-I
Katherine Bradley	Iberia
Terri Bradley	Archie R-V
Mindy Brown	Meadow Heights R-II
Linda Cook	Miller R-II
Tracy Cooper	State School
Glenn Dalton	Ste Genevieve R-II
Tanya Deering	Lincoln County R-III
David Fager	East Buchanan
Lynn Fain	Columbia Public
Kelly Fortune	Spec. Sch Dst
Shannon Grubb	Grain Valley R-5
Judith Hallmark	Seymour
Jane Harrington	Park Hill
Jennifer Johnson	Junction Hill C-12
Robin Krick	St. Louis Public
Sally LaVigne	Camdenton R-III
Thelma Livesay	Louisiana R-II
Nicole Martinez	North Kansas City
Marsha Meeker	Shelby County R-II
Julie Moore	Cassville R-IV
Linda Newman	Hillsboro R-III
Jennifer Siem	Spec. Sch Dst
Lisa Stevenson	Shelby County R-IV
Lori Wallace	Knox County R-I
Lynn Wapelhorst	Columbia Public
Jaime Edwards	Columbia Public

Attachment 2

Survey Results:

- Science AGLE Review Committee Survey Results: July
- Science AGLE Review Committee Survey Results: August
- Pilot Training Survey Results
- Pilot Teacher Survey Results
- Pilot Scorer Survey Results
- Train-the-Trainer Survey Results

MAP-A
Science AGLE Review Committee Evaluation
July 11 and 12, 2006
17 Respondents

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	
Overall the AGLE review worked well.	1	2	3	4 6	5 11	4.65
The overview on the first day with the whole group was helpful.	1	2	3 2	4 6	5 9	4.41
Once in the small groups the task at hand was clearly defined.	1	2	3	4 4	5 13	4.76
The facilitation of my small group went well.	1	2	3 1	4 3	5 13	4.71
The materials provided were helpful in the process.	1	2 1	3	4 4	5 12	4.59
The facility worked well for this meeting.	1	2	3	4 4	5 13	4.76
The food was great.	1	2 2	3 1	4 7	5 7	4.12
Three things I liked best about this experience...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great learning experience (3) • Gaining more insight and knowledge of the subject • New perspective • Overall , an enlightening and enjoyable experience • Small group work (2) • Working with the science teachers (2) • High level of professionalism of participants (3) • Being with other professionals- blend of roles and experience (4) 					

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent facilitation- whole and small group, very patient (4) • Skilled leadership provided by MP and ARC • Having definitions for the teacher • Organization • Flow of sessions • Timeline for meeting was followed • Discussion • Facility (5) 	
Three things I would change about this experience...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish vocabulary first (5) • Would like to see the Division of Special Education of DESE represented • Clear assignments for facilitator and recorder • Establish norms • Bring in those not familiar with MAP-A early, more info for those unfamiliar (3) • Full copy of GLEs for everyone (2) • Break into smaller groups- get work done faster 	
Other comments...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover use of i.e. and e.g. at training for teachers • Meeting well designed and planned • Facility was great and pleasant • Have stakeholder present and at the table (not in hall or leaving early) • APIs for science may be the same as APIs in math and Com Arts- how will this be addressed when individual teacher chooses APIs in each area? • Room temperature (2) • More bottled water 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone’s opinion was valued and we were comfortable sharing ideas. • Small group work – organization of materials with color coding – obvious expertise of group/team leaders. • 1. The people we worked with – leaders & teachers; 2. the 2nd location was great! 3. Working in small groups then reporting to large group format. • Food & cleanliness & friendliness were wonderful.
Three things that I would change about this experience...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have coffee, sodas, & bottled water in each breakout room. Have fruit out for snacking on, not chocolate. • Use audio/visual projection to record changes for all to see (no repeats & recaps); have GLEs in our packet. • Location. • The meeting room was too cold. The temperature was not regulated. • More pre-review time to look over drafts of July work. (I got the materials in plenty of time but had not anticipated allowing time in my schedule to review). • Room temperature on 1st day was chilly (but not on the second). • 1. A little more moving us along from the facilitator on Aug 8th when we were stagnating a bit. 2. warmer room. • Room was cold. • Receiving the GLEs on Aug.8 was delayed.
Other Comments...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Color coded GLEs worked well, Suggest that DESE keep color coding in final draft. • Great accommodations. • The final copy of the strands given back to us in color- that was really helpful! Thanks. • Again, this was a great learning experience for me. • Overall the accommodations were great. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this enriching learning activity. • Can the final copies of the AGLEs be in color? • Could I have the names & emails of the Missouri group for my CEC mailing list re: CEC Spring Conference Mailings? – Lynn Fain • I liked separating the 4 days into 2 groups of 2 days. We were able to read & reflect on our July work before the Aug. work & we were able to come back with a fresh perspective.

MAP-A
Science Pilot Training Kansas City
December 11–14, 2006

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Average
Overall the training worked well.	0	0	1	17	8	4.27
The overview and manual walk through were helpful.	0	0	2	11	13	4.42
Applying the Step-by-Step procedures to a student sample helped me understand the new MAP-A process.	1	0	5	10	10	4.08
The Writing Activity was helpful.	0	2	10	9	5	4.00
The Planning Worksheet Activity was helpful.	0	2	3	13	8	4.04
The questions I had about the pilot were answered.	0	0	1	12	13	4.46
The materials provided were helpful.	0	0	2	11	13	4.42
The facility worked well for this meeting.	3	1	3	10	9	3.81

<p>Three things I liked best about this experience...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location • Information • Working with others • Paired with grade level MAP-A people • Knowledge people in charge • Willingness to answer individual questions • Informative • Close location • Relevant material • Manual was helpful • Helpful trainer • Great food • Very useful • Materials • Food • Informal atmosphere • Interaction and discussion with people from other districts • Other perceptions of the MAP-A • Materials • Getting this info early enough to process • Not your fault (facility) hopefully you can get money back because of the band. Room temp was also uncomfortable • PowerPoint • Training materials • Meeting other teachers from the field • Getting other ideas. • Knowledgeable staff • Excellent food • Collaboration with others visual presentations, exploring real life activities for students. • It gave me a chance to talk to other high school teachers and get their input into completing a science MAP-A • Having time to choose API's
<p>Three things I would change about this experience....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorter time • Workshop closer to my school • Earlier start and leave times • Bring elementary teacher • Working on individuals in own classroom was most helpful

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next door people were loud • Slower pace • Too much chatting at my table • Amount of time – I think a morning would have been enough • Writing about another kiddo is hard and I can process in a room full of people • Afternoon was a waste • Since we all have done MAP-A, the “pretend” exercise (Kathy) was unnecessary. We were all ready and eager to roll on our own kids. • Music next door • Time length (too long) • I wish I knew more about science. • Ministers next door too loud. • Work in small groups of 2 -3 • We needed more time for the writing activities and the planning activity
Questions I still have...	

**MAP-A
Science Pilot Training Springfield
December 11–14,2006**

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Average
Overall the training worked well.	0	0	0	15	11	4.42
The overview and manual walk through were helpful.	0	1	0	14	11	4.35
Applying the Step-by-Step procedures to a student sample helped me understand the new MAP-A process.	0	0	1	12	13	4.46
The Writing Activity was helpful.	0	1	3	13	9	4.15
The Planning Worksheet Activity was helpful.	0	0	4	15	7	4.12
The questions I had about the pilot were answered.	0	0	3	12	10	4.28
The materials provided were helpful.	0	0	1	12	13	4.46
The facility worked well for this meeting.	0	1	1	14	10	4.27

<p>Three things I liked best about this experience...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I understand better because of the step by step walk through • The writing activity was so helpful and being able to share with others • More in dept than the MAP-A math and comm.. arts • Able to converse with others • Time to work with grade level colleagues • Students samples • Collaborating with peers, becoming knowledgeable for my district, clear guidelines. • Sharing ideas with others • Getting ideas from others • Receiving reassurance on activities • Gaining practice experience. • Breakfast, lunch, talking to colleagues • Group work • Hands on writing activities • Trainers were well informed professional. All questions were answered. • Still absorbing the information. Overall good training. • Lunch, mileage, manual • Handouts, work samples, soda • I appreciate that we were able to do a write up for our own student. The hands on of working with API'S • Collaboration • Length • Fairly well paced
<p>Three things I would change about this experience....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More user friendly API's • More time to look over API's • Clearer on activities 1 and 2 on last worksheet. Math and Comm Arts have been taught. • You have a roomful of teachers who are familiar with MAP-A. Perhaps don't spend as much time on basic MAP-A Science. • Tables were a little cramped. • Processing the info takes time, there is no changing that. • I won't tell a group to stop talking and get on task when they already were on task!
<p>Questions I still have...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I will let you know as I go along • I'm having a problem being able to match the process and content areas • How to combine the IS strand. API's with the PP and FM • To use same activity. I understand some students could have tweaking, didn't know it was an option. • How to assess those included in Reg. Ed. Classes

MAP-A
Science Pilot Training Columbia
December 11–14, 2006

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Average
Overall the training worked well.	0	0	1	14	14	4.45
The overview and manual walk through were helpful.	0	0	2	10	17	4.52
Applying the Step-by-Step procedures to a student sample helped me understand the new MAP-A process.	0	0	1	12	16	4.52
The Writing Activity was helpful.	0	1	2	11	15	4.38
The Planning Worksheet Activity was helpful.	0	1	0	14	13	4.39
The questions I had about the pilot were answered.	0	0	3	12	14	4.38
The materials provided were helpful.	0	0	0	9	20	4.69
The facility worked well for this meeting.	0	1	1	5	22	4.66

<p>Three things I liked best about this experience...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ProFile walkthrough • Examples • Time to work on API's for my specific students • Presenter explained things and was knowledgeable. • Lunch was great • Materials. • Presenter did great. I wasn't so confused as I was from MAP-A last year. This year training for MAP-A has been good. • Questions were answered helped me understand what they were looking for, and materials area a great self help. • Didn't go page by page in manual • Lots of examples were gone over • Sat with same grade level] • Clear and concise information • Help and input from fellow teachers. • All the resources! • Nice accommodations • Grouped by grade level • Food was much better at this location than in the past • Gaining more insight into the science pilot • The communication of the staff/materials • Possibly because I had done this before it was easier to understand • Well organized and flowed smoothly so that time was not wasted. • Chocolate • Facilitators with knowledge • Ways contact help • Working with a partner • Time to collaborate knowledge staff (Susan, Lisa) • Speed of training, good speaking voice • Information presented in good manner • Writing a sample activity
<p>Three things I would change about this experience....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lunch (buffet style) • Maybe a microphone. I'm not for sure everyone heard everything. • I couldn't see the info when you had the web site on the screen • Worked well maybe have a training for those who have never done MAP-A separately for computer program basics of process • Ask teacher who can't bring a science teacher to bring information about what curriculum will be covered

	during the collection period
Questions I still have...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only question I still have is....we have to click yes on the ye and no each time eve though we done submit student tangible work? Is this on the science MAP-A only? • Still somewhat overwhelming • Using ProFile

MAP-A
Science Pilot Training St. Louis
December 11 -14, 2006

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Average
Overall the training worked well.	0	0	0	15	15	4.50
The overview and manual walk through were helpful.	0	0	0	10	20	4.67
Applying the Step-by-Step procedures to a student sample helped me understand the new MAP-A process.	0	0	0	14	17	4.55
The Writing Activity was helpful.	0	1	2	15	14	4.31
The Planning Worksheet Activity was helpful.	0	0	1	10	20	4.61
The questions I had about the pilot were answered.	0	0	2	10	19	4.55
The materials provided were helpful.	0	0	0	10	21	4.68
The facility worked well for this meeting.	0	0	1	8	22	4.68

<p>Three things I liked best about this experience...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very clear explanation • Knowledgeable presenters • Color coding and organization of materials • Workshop was very practical. • Working with other teachers • Having questions answered receiving resources • Working with groups who had our aged kids • Working with other teachers from other schools that materials the instructional leaders were very informative. • This is easier than math • More obtainable than I expected. • Having questions answered professionally • Being given contact information • The professionalism exhibited. • The presenters presented in an effective precise manner at a good pace. • The presenter was very knowledgeable about the context. • The interactive activity was a good learning experience. • The drive with Sheila • Visiting with Susan and Lisa • Listening to the teachers. • Meeting others. • Seeing API's for science, getting ideas from others. • More info. • Stress on application • Knowledgeable instructors • Clarification of application • Working with teams of professionals of same grade. • The extent to which things were explained. • The good step by step examples. • Planning worksheet • Application explanation • Talking about Map A process with other teachers. • Divided by grade level; PowerPoint paper copy • The best thing was being able to network with other professionals. • Going into ProFile to practice • Good clear instruction and use of technology. • Organization, place, writing activity
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning, working with other 8th grade teachers • Facility • Good location • Informative • Green sheets • Interactions with peers • CD for input • Examples of applications • The presenters were very helpful! • Materials • The food was excellent. • Color coded • Seen others from out student populations • No manuals
<p>Three things I would change about this experience....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibly more group processing (pair/share) to check for understanding. • Better coffee for Sheila • Later start time for the drive ins • More colored sheets of paper • Have at a facility with computers. • Not so much sitting. • Bring an additional person from my school. • I think the manual could use some color coding for certain top pages even using post it tabs the flipping back and forth can be tedious and confusing. • Laptops available to use • Go closer to home • More trainings • Change scoring times • Two lines at lunch • No interactive work with peers; students are too different • More examples • Need more bathrooms • Have more trainings • More examples • Fill out with teachers • Have follow up before they are due.
<p>Questions I still have...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I really need to get started, I'm sure I will have questions. • On going....how best to find the time. • Acquisition and application are still confusing.

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I'm sure they will come up but you have given me tools to find them out.• I'll be in touch if I have any. |
|--|--|

Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate, Science Pilot
Teacher Survey

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Measured Progress, and the Assessment Resource Center wish to thank you for your participation in the MAP-A Science Pilot and for taking the time to complete the following survey. This survey is instrumental for teacher input and feedback regarding the MAP-A Science Pilot. Information gathered through this survey will be helpful in determining any changes that may be necessary before full implementation of this process in the 2007-2008 school year.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact Susan Izard at Measured Progress either through email (sizard@measuredprogress.org) or by phone (1-800-431-8901).

PART 1 Background Information

1. How many years have you taught students with significant cognitive disabilities?
1-5 - **6** 6-10 - **4** 11-15 - **4** 16-20 - **2** 21+ - **4**
2. How many years of experience do you have with the MAP-A?
1 - **3** 2 - **5** 3 - **4** 4 - **2** 5+ - **6**
3. Where do you currently teach?
Public School - **20** State-operated School Other _____
4. What is the grade level(s) of the student(s) to whom you administered the MAP-A Science Pilot?
Elementary (5) - **13** Intermediate (8) - **5** High School (11) - **2**
5. In what kind of community do you teach?
Rural - **6** Urban - **1** Suburban - **13**
6. How many students completed the MAP-A Science Pilot?
1 - **17** 2 - **3**
7. Approximately how much time outside of your school day did you use assembling the MAP-A Science Pilot?
0-5 hours - **11** 6-10 hours - **5** 11-15 hours - **1** 16-20 hours - **3**
More than 20 hours - **0**

PART 2 Pilot Information (Rate each of the following statements. In the comment section provided after each statement please give specific feedback.)

TRAINING

1. The training prepared me for completing the MAP-A Science Pilot.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	0	2	12	6
<p>What worked?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific examples, and the discussion of what to consider. • I found this to be pretty straight forward after having done math/reading. • Knowing how to read and interpret strands how to make it “applicable”. • Getting together with other teachers and coming up with activities. • Although we do Science activities in my classroom we don’t have a specific time set aside for that. At first I wasn’t sure anything I was doing was correct after having others look at it, I felt much better. • Group discussions. • Practice. • Loved the computer program. • The examples and the time to work on planning for the students we would be testing with the trainers there to help us. • API’s gave a good scope and sequence base. • Ideas to mix the two API’s together. • Having time to write out assessment activities with a group where we could brainstorm. • Going over the API’s and suggestions being given to use for the API’s. 				
<p>What did not work?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completing it during the testing window. • Not sure – thought I got it, but just peeked at my pilot submission and got a NS. Confusion... • Not having “reference”/example MAP-A’s. • Too vague and hard to understand. • It was difficult to match a process standard to the content standard. 				
<p>What would you change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more specific examples of what’s acceptable as matching API’s. • Give a scoring training in conjunction with training. • More examples of what’s right. • More practice needed. • The order of the standards. I would put the content standard first and the process standard second. • Difficulty connecting API’s – Teach staff to obtain content strand – then match to process strand – this may increase staff’s ability to connect API’s and reduce NS. • Given suggestions about how to implement 2 separate strands at the same time. • More samples on showing application. • Give numerous examples of matching API’s to process standards. 				

2. The training materials were useful once I began work on the MAP-A Science Pilot.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	0	0	12	8
What worked?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It gave me something to look back at and help this old mind remember the topics we talked about. • They were exactly the same easy to follow. • I was able to go back and check to see if I was on track. 				
What did not work?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making the connection of activities to the standards was challenging. 				
What would you change?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More examples. • There needs to be more training on connecting API's to standards and application. 				

3. The manual was helpful to me as I assembled the MAP-A Science Pilot.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	0	1	11	7
What worked?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't remember. • Didn't need it too much. • Step by Step. • Using ProFile was a big help – It wouldn't let you picks API's that didn't go together. • Exact order. • Showed me how to assemble. 				
What did not work?				
What would you change?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more examples to refer to @ each grade level. • Move beginner friendly to new MAP-A admin. 				

4. The sample entries provided in Chapter 3 and Appendix C were helpful.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	0	0	14	6
What worked? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't remember. • Helped to get ideas of right/wrong. • Seeing how to correlate and make it application. • Samples – Great. • Gave me ideas! 				
What did not work? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More examples. 				
What would you change? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more. • Give more. • More examples – phrases to assist in application and accuracy/independence levels. • Need more differences between acquisitions and applications. 				

PROFILE Did you use ProFile? YES - 13 NO - 7
(If no, proceed to question 8)

5. The directions provided with ProFile were easy to follow.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	0	0	6	13
What worked? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I had no problems. • It seems like the bugs from earlier LA and Mat have been worked out. • Made it hard to mess up – liked the drop down box. • Using ProFile was easy! I don't understand why someone wouldn't use it. I like that it checks off what's been done and that it wouldn't let you pick API's you can't use. • ProFile was great. 				
What did not work? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not always user friendly at times. 				
What would you change? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easier movement from computer to computer. 				

6. ProFile was easy to use.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
		0	1	3

What worked?

- I had no problems.
- Drop down boxes.
- Loved ProFile.
- The fact that it does not let you make a mistake on the strands.
- ProFile makes this process so much easier.

What did not work?

- Not always user friendly at times.
- I had problems when I had entered dates and score but the content sheet did not mark.
- It was confusing to me when I clicked on the first one and then moved to the second strands. I had difficulty with being consistent when entering the program and recording information.

What would you change?

- Have it print page numbers.

7. ProFile made printing the required forms simple.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
		0	0	2

What worked?

- I had no problems.
- The “print all” button was a big help keeping papers organized this year.
- No problems with printer reading program.
- It showed you exactly what you needed. Print all button was good.
- Everything in one place.

What did not work?

What would you change?

OTHER

8. E-mails and phone calls were returned and/or responded to promptly by...					
	DESE	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
		0	0	1	5
	ARC	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
		0	0	2	7
	MEASURED PROGRESS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
		0	0	2	5
	Comments:				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I did not call either DESE or Measured Progress. • I only needed to call Measured Progress for a ProFile problem and they called me right back and fixed the problem. • Lisa and Becky always got right back to me when I emailed them. • I never emailed or called anyone. • Didn't have to use this. • We tried to contact ARC about a question and were not able to reach anyone. 				

9. Questions I had were answered clearly by...					
	DESE	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
		0	0	4	1
	ARC	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
		0	0	4	4
	MEASURED PROGRESS	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
		0	0	4	1
	Comments (What types of questions did you have?):				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What ways to complete MAP-A & how to mail back. • Didn't have any experience with this. 				

10. I preferred the plastic case for pilot materials over a binder.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	0	3	14

What worked?

- It was easier to handle, and carry around.
- Smaller and can be re-used multiple years.
- Binders took up a lot of space in the classroom and required the additional step of going to the office to use the 3 hole punch.
- Ease of use, need of space.
- Takes up less space.
- I liked the binder because it took up less space and it was able to hold all the required materials.
- Slender and workable.
- The plastic case was easier to handle, did not require punching.
- It was small.
- Much easier to manage.
- Thinner – can be reused.

What did not work?

- I wonder if grades lose or mix up papers if they're not stapled at least.
- I forgot to put them into the plastic cases.
- If I had my math and comm. Arts be too much to keep in order.

What would you change?

- I think binders make it easier to look through and organize.

11. The return materials were easy to use.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	0	0	5	15

What worked?

- Very easy.
- Too the point.
- The postage paid packet was very easy to use.

What did not work?

- Having to pay for pick –up (we didn't but that is what they tried to tell us).

What would you change?

ASSESSMENT DESIGN

12. The Alternate Performance Indicators were easy to understand.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	3	8	8
What worked? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar to others. • Most all verbs and explanations worked. 				
What did not work? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not being a science major, makes understanding some of the API's more difficult. • Some need clarification i.e. the computer is not a measurement tool. • Like I said earlier, apparently I missed something if mine was NC because API didn't match activity because I felt confident it did. • While grading/scoring, teachers need to clarify how a child "explored" etc. • I think that many people didn't look at the big idea of the API's they chose. • They are very broad – not specific enough. 				
What would you change? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions we had as scorers that need to be addressed in training? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is looking on the internet or a website measuring temperature? 2. Is looking at pictures of animals "exploring objects in nature?" 3. Is feeding a pet frog "explaining the environment?" • Training on teachers clarifying how a child explored. • In training, perhaps that could be stressed more. • Suggestions or definitions of each. • Example to clarify a little more. • Some need to be clarified in training with teachers ie...cannot use internet to measure temperature, exploring objects in nature. • More details – possibly more specific examples after statement. 				

13. I was able to pair process and content Alternate Performance Indicators in ways that made sense.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	0	1	13	6
What worked?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was fairly easy. • I believed it made it easier to make it an application activity. • I was able to do this but at times it was difficult because I wanted to use them again. • Working backwards by choosing the content standard and then finding a process standard to work with it. • The “asking questions” API was easy to pair. 				
What did not work?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some took longer, the first set was easy. • I kept second guessing and questioning. It took a lot of time to mix and match. • Sometimes matching was hard. • Difficult to match with activities the kids can do. • The other set “impact of Science”. • It was some what difficult to connect the IS standard. 				
What would you change?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The order of process standards and content standards on ProFile and in the manual. 				

14. The amount of information required as evidence of student performance on the 4 required strands for the MAP-A Science Pilot was manageable.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	3	11	3
What worked?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It wasn't overwhelming. 				
What did not work?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again the “IS” made it difficult to get correct data. • I like the way it is organized much better than the way CA and Math is done 				
What would you change?				

15. I was able to develop science activities that made sense for both the content and process APIs.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	2	5	9	3
<p>What worked?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process API's were ok. • Making them applicable. • Many things we were already doing went right along – weather, measurement, etc. I hadn't thought of them as science though. • At 8th level, not enough choices. Etc. 				
<p>What did not work?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some were harder than others. • For 8th grade, it was hard to create FM and PP activities that were appropriate for an MR student. • Trying to keep it functional. • Difficult. • The Impact of science paired with an alternate API. • I struggled somewhat with the IS Strand. • It was difficult considering the how sever the students disability was. It did force me to think of activities that were appropriate for my students. 				
<p>What would you change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any other content API's from the middle school to choose from? • I think many people probably feel they are not addressing science but actually they are. I don't know that there is anything to change but just give examples. • More training. • Develop instruction for MAP-A Science. • Provide science activities – ideas that match API's. 				

16. The MAP-A Science Pilot provided an accurate assessment of the student's abilities and/or performance.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4
<p>What worked?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I loved having a science teacher as a team leader. • Flexibility in tasks. • This test provides an assessment for the MAP-A teacher not the student. 				
<p>What did not work?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not necessarily. It might for the activities listed, but does not show in an accurate assessment of students abilities? • Any teacher will tell you that MAP-A's provide an assessment of the teacher's ability to complete the parameters of the MAP-A correctly. I also question the graders abilities. 				
<p>What would you change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel it graded the teacher's paperwork skills more than student ability. 				

17. Additional Comments
<p>What worked?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot Science was at a different time than the LA & Math, decreasing the time crush a little.
<p>What did not work?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In KC, general MAP-A training closed out before everyone who needed/wanted it could sign up. Every teacher needs the opportunity to be trained. • Mostly grading the teacher on his/her picks.
<p>What would you change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it is at all possible for this to be done before or after the other two assessments. It is a ton of work for teachers who have a large number of MAP-A's. • Need more specific examples/training. • Need more opportunities for training. • More training on API's data collection, connecting to standards. • Take out blind scores. • Saw another scorer looking off and changing her answers.
<p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was my first MAP-A and it was not what I had expected. ProFile was user friendly and made my job much easier. • It is hard to do all 3 subjects at the same time. • For names on the test either have it be first then last or last then first.

MAP-A 2007 Science Pilot Scoring
June 5-7, 2007
Scorer Feedback

1. Do you have comments or suggestions regarding the science portion of the MAP-A?

- It was user friendly. This was my first experience with MAP-A but heard it was much better than former MAP-A's.
- More training on connecting API's.
- Content training.
- Some of the API's are vague.
- I like the way it was organized grouping strands together.
- Teachers need to make sure they pay attention to the terms used in the indicators to be accurate in activities.
- Teachers may benefit from more examples combining the 2.
- 8th grade was difficult to combine.
- The main difficulty appeared to be connecting API's .
- Also noted difficulty in abstaining application.
- Make sure everyone must attend training.
- Encourage use of ProFile by all means necessary
- Make sure that all teachers attend training!
- All teachers will need to be trained*. Teachers will need to work with a science teacher to help understand the concepts
- *Not "train the trainer"
- Schedule enough trainings so no gets closed out.
- All teachers should attend training.
- Create a data base of activities and what API's it could assess.

2. Do you have comments or suggestion regarding science content training, MAP-A science assessment training, or other related training-including training materials-for teachers?

- More examples of good MAP-A projects.
- The training was a little confusing but once I got started it wasn't as bad as I anticipated .
- Have content API and process API switch places so teachers look at the content first. It will help teachers have API apply.
- Many teachers used tools such as the internet for inquiry instead of tools such as thermometers. Teachers need to be trained on science materials.
- Examples of activities (what is science and what is not for example sorting silverware).
- Is there anyway that you can run workshops to "mock score?" Learning to score helps me so much more .
- Need more training in how the API's can connect with each other.
- More training in how what we are accessing relates to the API's.
- The plastic folders were much nicer than the binders easier to keep track of materials.
- The training sessions allowing for brainstorming and collaboration were extremely helpful.
- Need more variety of grade level samples.
- How to pair IS with other API required.
- Difference between grading for accuracy and independence.
- If RPDC is going to train teachers make sure they have training from the state, not their peers. I have found that misinformation is being given during training.
- Staff should be taught to obtain content strand then match to process strand.

- Difficulty in application maybe eliminated by listing application ideas/phrases as examples.
- Give plenty of opportunities for teachers collaborate on their ideas for activities. This gives them a chance to learn and check their ideas for matching API's and verify application.
- Let teachers know to simplify – not reinvent the wheel!
- Give examples of correct MAP-A's stress during training to look at the big idea for API's and how individual API relates to it.
- Emphasize how to make the strands show application.
- Acquisition vs. application – how it was talked about today and yesterday.
- I think teachers need to know the difference between a task specific prompt and a non specific prompt and be (training) encouraged to use that vocabulary. I also think that it needs to stress teachers that the activities must connect to both the content and process standard.
- Internet is not a measuring tool
- Show examples of wood specific scoring like 1 pt, 1 pt = 2 100%
- Give us many examples at all levels.
- Go over: Internet not a tool to measure temp. What exactly is expected on “explore” nature? Is looking at pictures enough, or do you have to look at the actual object/animal?
- Teachers need to know:
 - Internet is not a tool to measure temperature
 - Clarify “explore objects in nature”
- Remind (stress) to the teachers to refer to the “big Idea” and glossery. This may help them design the task.

3. Do you have hints or tips for teachers regarding science instruction or assessment? Do you have suggestions for science activities for MAP-A students?

- Teachers: Don't make it harder than it is!
- Relax.
- Get together with others giving MAP-A to collaborate.
- Make sure you API's connect!
- Use ProFile Check to make sure both API's are covered.
- Go to the content training and MAP-A training.
- Provide some very basic concepts and provide some activities to coincide with the API's.
- Working with general education science teachers may be helpful in designing activities that connect to the API's.
- Use the science assessment and spawn off in to activities for CA and Math based on the science activity. Ex. Sink or float experiment – Sci; chart data – math; write about it – CA.
- QC before turning it in.
- Make application a part of your instruction all the time.
- Realize this test can actually be scored low because of teacher failure, not student.
- Also keep it simple! Some went way over what was needed!
- I would say that many teachers don't feel that they are doing science but when they look closely they see they are...weather, (calendar), measurement, etc.
- Keep it simple.
- It is beneficial to do large group experimental activities. That way it becomes application and you are collecting data for a group of children instead of having to do them on at a time.
- Do not include the prompt in any way in accuracy.
- Clarify prompt – content specific prompt.
- Clarify independence + no help

- Clarify activity must be within a science experiment – e.g. sorting cutlery: is that science?
- Have to do both API's in same student work record not one on one and one on the other.
- Prompts effect only independence not accuracy.
- I have seen several science task description in this Pilot that would easily lend it self to CA & MA assessment as well.

4. Do you have comments or suggestion related to the pilot scoring process?

- Excellent.
- It was a great experience.
- Much smoother process that I thought it would be.
- After the first scorer has finished scoring, place those papers in a manner such that the second scorer is unable to see.
- Going through the scoring process has allowed me to see things I could do or things I could do differently in my class.
- It helped me to understand how to better give the test.
- Scores need to be removed each time.
- I saw a scorer changing her score compare to another.
- I really enjoyed the process, the accommodations were wonderful.

MAP-A
Train-the-Trainer Workshop
September 5th, 2007

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
1. Overall the training worked well. Comment:	1	2	3	4 7/20 = 35%	5 13/20 = 65%
2. The Overview and Manual Walk Through were helpful. Comment:	1	2	3	4 5/20 = 25%	5 15/20 = 75%
3. The addition of the Justification Form and Individual Student History Report for duplicate APIs was clearly explained. Comment:	1	2	3	4 4/20 = 20%	5 16/20 = 80%
4. Applying the Step-by Step procedures to student Sample Entries helped me understand the MAP-A process. Comment:	1	2	3	4 7/20 = 35%	5 13/20 = 65%
5. The student Sample Entries were helpful. Comment:	1	2	3 2/20 = 10%	4 4/20 = 20%	5 14/20 = 70%
6. The Science Sample Entries helped me understand how to connect Process and Content Strands to Science Activities. Comment:	1	2 1/20 = 5%	3 3/20 = 15%	4 3/20 = 15%	5 13/20 = 65%
7. The Lessons Learned portion was helpful. Comment:	1	2	3	4 5/20 = 25%	5 15/20 = 75%

8. The Process Information was helpful. Comment:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">1/20 = 5%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8/20 = 40%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11/20 = 55%</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5			1/20 = 5%	8/20 = 40%	11/20 = 55%
1	2	3	4	5							
		1/20 = 5%	8/20 = 40%	11/20 = 55%							
9. The questions I had about the MAP-A were answered. Comment:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">2/20 = 10%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8/20 = 40%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10/20 = 50%</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5			2/20 = 10%	8/20 = 40%	10/20 = 50%
1	2	3	4	5							
		2/20 = 10%	8/20 = 40%	10/20 = 50%							
10. The materials provided were helpful. Comment:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 20%;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3/20 = 15%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17/20 = 85%</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5				3/20 = 15%	17/20 = 85%
1	2	3	4	5							
			3/20 = 15%	17/20 = 85%							
11. Three things that worked well in this experience...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hands on, Flawed activities/Samples (14) • Discussions, Q & A (4) • Planning Worksheet Activity (4) – would like to revise for use with Math and Com Arts • Poster (from Diana Humphrey) • Group Work (4) • The opportunity to allow the group to ask questions as we went through the training. • The pace of the training (2) • Thanks for listening and answering questions. • Clear manual and power point (2) • LOVED the improvements to the manual, especially the flawed/corrected examples (4) • Food, treats, refreshments (2) • Professional materials – easy to read and understand (2) • Manual walk through (4) • Writing an actual Science activity (3) • Power Point with page numbers easy to follow! • New Forms • NEW APIs • The Glossaries • Doing the Student Work Record • ProFile Review & Updates (2) • Good information on “Big Idea” • Very well organized presentation. • “This was the first meeting (training) that I’ve attended where the assistant commissioner of Education attended. I really appreciate Heidi’s attendance and her willingness to seek input on the MAP-A process from us.” • Extra Handouts 										

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How does MAP-A actually assess student skills for those students who have severe disabilities as oppose to assessing the teacher's ability to gather information?• Very good training overall – Thanks so much! (2)• Just hope I can do a good job when I do training.
--	--

2007-08

**Missouri Assessment
Program - Alternate
(MAP-A)**

Science Standard-Setting Report
June 3 & 4, 2008
Columbia, Missouri



Prepared by Measured Progress for the
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Introduction

In response to requirements outlined in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Amendments of 1997, the reauthorization of IDEA in 2004, and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), states have developed alternate assessments for students with disabilities. A variety of measurement formats have been implemented in these assessment systems (Thompson & Thurlow, 2001; Roeber, 2002; Smith, 2003; Malehorn, 1994; Navarrete, Wilde, Nelson, Martinez, & Hargett, 1990). Due to differential requirements within their Individual Education Plans (IEPs), students with disabilities may be administered different assessments appropriate to their level of ability. The test scores and performance level categories of these students, however, are reported as a single group. Given the nature of the alternate assessments, setting performance level standards for the alternate assessments can be challenging in terms of educational and policy considerations.

A number of standard setting methods have been developed over the last 30 years (Berk, 1986; Reckase, 2000; Hambleton, Jaeger, Plake, & Mills, 2000; Cizek, 2001; Hambleton & Powell, 1983; Kane, 1994; Livingston & Zieky, 1982; Lunz, 1995). Most of the methods (e.g., Bookmark, Body of Work, etc.) were developed in large-scale assessment settings. Each has its advantages as well as a number of limitations. The choice for a particular application should be based on a thorough review of existing methods in terms of their pros and cons for the concrete testing situation at hand (Cizek, 1996; Reckase, 2000; Hambleton, 2001). The most important criteria are:

- (a) The appropriateness of the method for the concrete situation;
- (b) The feasibility of the method implementation under the current circumstances;
- (c) The existing validity evidence for the quality of the selected method.

Given the complexity of alternate assessments (e.g., differential assessments, unique learning attributes of this population, etc.), there is increased emphasis on developing new

standard setting methods, or modifying existing methods, appropriate to these new conditions. Not many methods can address the complexity, so states tend to retrofit existing methods to their alternate assessment programs. Some of the very popular standard setting methods used in alternate assessment programs so far include Modified Angoff (Angoff, 1971), Bookmark (Lewis , Mitzel, & Green, 1996), Body of Work (Kingston, Kahl, Sweeney, & Bay, 2001), and Judgmental Policy Capturing (Jaeger, 1995).

Feasibility and validity are of great importance when evaluating a standard setting method (Cizek, 1996). The modified Body of Work (mBoW) procedure was chosen for the Standard setting activities for the Missouri Alternate Assessment in Science. In this method, panelists review student portfolios that represent the range of student scores. The panelists independently classify each student portfolio into one of four performance levels based on their understanding of the alternate performance level descriptors. Because the logistic burden of classifying each portfolio into one of four performance levels at the outset, as outlined in the BoW approach, is quite high, a modified approach was implemented. Panelists first focused on the middle cut, classifying portfolios above or below this cut. As a second step they took the portfolios they had classified below the middle cut and classified them into the lower two achievement levels. As a final step panelists took the portfolios they had classified above the middle cut and classified them into the upper two achievement levels. This modified version of the method has been in use for a number of years, substantially reduces the logistical burden of the method, and has been found to yield reasonable and defensible cut points. This report documents the procedures and results of the mBoW procedure implemented for the Missouri Alternate Assessment in Science.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Tasks Completed Prior to the Standard-Setting Meeting.....	2
1.1 Creation of Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs)	2
1.2 Preparation of Materials for Panelists	2
1.3 Preparation of Presentation Materials.....	2
1.4 Preparation of Instructions for Facilitators Documents	3
1.5 Preparation of Systems and Materials for Analysis During the Meeting	3
1.6 Selection of Panelists	3
1.6.1 Participant Demographics.....	4
2. Tasks Completed During the Standard-Setting Meeting.....	6
2.1 Orientation	6
2.2 Standard-Setting Process.....	6
2.2.1 Discuss Achievement Level Descriptors	7
2.2.2 Round 1 & 2 : Middle Cut Judgments	7
2.2.3 Round 1 & 2: Lower Cut Judgments	9
2.2.4 Round 1 & 2: Upper Cut Judgments	10
2.2.5 Tabulation of Round 2 Results.....	10
2.2.6 Round 3 Judgments.....	12
2.2.7 Recommendations for Modifications to ALDs	16
2.2.8 Complete the Evaluation.....	16
3. Tasks completed after the Standard-Setting meeting	18
3.1 Analysis and Review of Panelists’ Feedback	18
3.2 Preparation of Recommended Cut Scores	19
3.3 Preparation of Standard-Setting Report.....	25
APPENDIX A: Draft Achievement Level Descriptors.....	28
APPENDIX B: Agenda.....	32
APPENDIX C: Rating Forms	34
APPENDIX D: Evaluation.....	48
APPENDIX E: Opening Session Power Points	52
APPENDIX F: Facilitator Script.....	66
APPENDIX G: Standard Setting Panelists	80
APPENDIX H: Panelist Descriptor Recommendations.....	84
APPENDIX I: Evaluation Results	86
APPENDIX J: Panelist Ratings	99

Standard Setting Process

The Missouri Alternate Assessment in Science occurred June 3rd and 4th, 2008. At the June standard-setting meeting, cut-points were recommended for the alternate Science assessment in grades five, eight, and eleven using the data from the spring 2008 administration. This report documents the procedures and results of the June standard-setting meeting.

Each panel consisted of eleven to twelve participants. Each panel completed the standard-setting process for one grade level for two days. The modified Body of Work (mBoW) standard-setting method (Kingston, Kahl, Sweeney, & Bay, 2001) was implemented for all grades. In the Body of Work method, panelists are presented with a set of actual student work (in this case, student science entries) and make their judgments based on those work samples. Specifically, panelists examine each student work sample and determine which performance level best matches the particular skills and abilities the student exhibits through his/her performance on the work sample.

The Body of Work standard setting method was developed specifically for use with assessments that are designed to allow for a range of student responses, such as a portfolio and performance based assessments. The modified BoW procedure was used for science standard-setting in the same manner that it had been utilized for setting standards on the MAP-A mathematics and communication arts in 2006.

To help ensure consistency of procedures between panels, all participants attended a large-group training session at the beginning of the meeting. In addition, each panel was led through the standard setting process by a trained facilitator from Measured Progress.

This report is organized into three major sections, describing tasks completed prior to, during, and following the standard-setting meeting.

1. TASKS COMPLETED PRIOR TO THE STANDARD-SETTING MEETING

1.1 Creation of Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs)

The ALDs presented to panelists provided the official description of the set of knowledge, skills, and abilities that students are expected to display in order to be classified into each performance level. These descriptors were created prior to the standard-setting meeting by staff of the Missouri Department Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). The draft descriptors were created to mirror the already existing mathematics and communication arts descriptors. The draft descriptors are provided as Appendix A of this report.

1.2 Preparation of Materials for Panelists

The following materials were assembled for presentation to the panelists at the standard setting-meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Draft Alternate Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) for grades 5, 8 and 11
- MAP-A Portfolios representing the range of possible scores
- Rating Forms for each step in the process
- Evaluation Form for panelists to respond to the overall process, the factors that influenced their decisions and their overall confidence in the cut scores being recommended

The ALDs, meeting agenda, rating forms, and evaluation form are provided in Appendix A through D of this report, respectively.

1.3 Preparation of Presentation Materials

The PowerPoint presentations used in the opening session were prepared prior to the meeting. Two sets of PowerPoint slides are included as Appendix E of this document: the first set provides an overview of the Missouri Alternate Assessment, the criteria for participation in the assessment, and an explanation of the administration and scoring procedures. The second set

provides an overview of the issues of standard setting, specifics about the standard setting process, and an overview of the activities the panelists would be completing during the standard-setting meeting.

1.4 Preparation of Instructions for Facilitators Documents

A document was created for the group facilitators to refer to while working through the process. This document outlines the step-by-step process that the facilitator leads the panelists through during standard setting. Facilitators are provided a training prior to the standard setting meeting where they become familiar with the process, materials and facilitator script. The facilitators for the MO standards setting meeting consisted of two program managers and an assistant director. Responsibilities during the meeting include: time management, keeping participants on task, interacting with participants, and facilitating the group discussions. The facilitators are also responsible for the security of the materials and collecting panelist rating forms. The facilitator document for Science is provided in Appendix F.

1.5 Preparation of Systems and Materials for Analysis During the Meeting

The computational programming to carry out all analyses during the standard-setting meeting was completed and thoroughly tested prior to the standard-setting meeting. The program designed to calculate cuts and impact data was written using SAS statistical software.

1.6 Selection of Panelists

Panelists were recruited and selected to reflect as diverse of a population as possible. The Assessment Resource Center (ARC) and Missouri DESE staff worked together to recruit panelists, with DESE’s final approval over participant selection.

The goal of the panelist recruitment was to assemble panels of approximately 12 participants. Ideally, each panel was to include a minimum of six special education teachers

experienced in working with students with significant disabilities, three subject area content teachers, and three school administrators, higher education personnel, stakeholders from interest groups related to significant disabilities, and/or parents of students with significant cognitive disabilities. An additional goal was for the panels to reflect a balance of gender, race/ethnicity, and geographic location. Finally, panelists were selected who were familiar either with the grade level subject matter or the special education population for which they would be setting standards. The numbers of panelists who participated in the standard setting ranged from eleven to twelve per group, as shown in Table 1 below. A list of the panelists’ affiliations and their roles can be found in Appendix G.

Table 1: Numbers of Participants by Group

Panel	Number of Panelists
Science - Grade 5	12
Science - Grade 8	12
Science - Grade 11	11
Total	35

1.6.1 Participant Demographics

As part of the application process for panelist recruitment panelists were asked to self-report demographic information. Table 2 shows the gender of the participants in each grade group, and Table 3 shows their ethnicity. Table 4 shows the work experience of the participants in each grade group based on the number of years of teaching experience of the participants.

Table 2: Gender of Participants by Group

Panel	N	Male	Female
Science - Grade 5	12	8.3%	91.7%
Science - Grade 8	12	16.7%	83.3%
Science - Grade 11	11	27.3%	72.7%

Table 3: Ethnicity of Participants by Group

Panel	N	Asian/Pacific Islander	African American	American Indian	Hispanic	White	Other	No Response
Science - Grade 5	12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	91.7%	0.0%	8.3%
Science - Grade 8	12	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	83.3%	0.0%	8.3%
Science - Grade 11	11	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	91.9%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 4: Number of Years Teaching of Participants by Group

Panel	N	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+	No Response
Science - Grade 5	12	8.3%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%	8.3%
Science - Grade 8	12	41.7%	25%	8.3%	0.0%	16.7%	8.3%
Science - Grade 11	11	9.1%	36.4%	9.1%	27.3%	18.2%	0.0%

2. TASKS COMPLETED DURING THE STANDARD-SETTING MEETING

2.1 Orientation

The standard-setting meeting began with a general orientation session that was attended by all panelists. The purpose of the orientation was to ensure that all panelists heard the same message about the need for and goals of standard setting and about their part in the process. The orientation consisted of three parts. First, DESE welcomed the panelists and thanked them for participating, provided some context about the Missouri Alternate Assessment and the need for setting standards, and some general information about their role in the process. Next, a Measured Progress Special Education Assistant Director provided an overview of the MAP-As, including participation criteria, and administration and scoring procedures. Finally, a Measured Progress psychometrician gave an introduction to the issues of standard setting and to the standard-setting method that was being used for Missouri, and provided an overview of the activities that the standard-setting panelists would be completing. Panelists were given an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the session.

Once the general orientation was complete, each panel reconvened into its breakout room, where the panelists received more detailed training and completed the standard-setting activities.

2.2 Standard-Setting Process

The standard-setting process included three rounds; in the first round, panelists reviewed and discussed the ALDs and then recommended cut-points individually without discussion. Then, in Rounds 2 and 3, they recommended cut-points individually, following extensive group

discussion. Because of the large quantity of assessment materials the panelists had to familiarize themselves with, the three rounds of ratings were further broken down into smaller tasks.

Panelists started with the middle cut, between *Basic* and *Proficient*, by sorting the MAP-As into two piles: those they felt represented below proficient performance and those they felt represented performance that was proficient or above. Once the MAP-As were sorted into two piles, they then sorted each of those piles into two piles, starting with the subset of MAP-As they had classified as below proficient. Each of these sorting tasks was done in two rounds; after the two rounds were completed for all three cuts, Round 3 was completed simultaneously for all three cuts.

2.2.1 Discuss Achievement Level Descriptors

The first step in the process, once the panelists convened into their grade groups, was to discuss the Achievement Level Descriptors. This important step of the process was designed to ensure that panelists thoroughly understood the needed knowledge, skills, and abilities for portfolios to be classified as *Below Basic*, *Basic*, *Proficient*, and *Advanced*. Panelists began by reviewing the descriptors individually and then discussed them as a group, clarifying each level and coming to consensus as to the definitions of each. Bulleted lists of characteristics for each level were generated based on the group discussion and posted in the room for panelists to refer to during Round 1.

2.2.2 Round 1 & 2 : Middle Cut Judgments

In the first round, panelists worked individually with the ALDs, the rating form for the middle cut, and the set of MAP-As ordered from easiest to most difficult by total score. Each set of MAP-As consisted of approximately 35 portfolios (34 in grade 5, 36 in grade 8, and 35 in grade 11), with two portfolios for each observed score ranging from the minimum observed

score to the maximum possible score (22). For each portfolio, the panelists considered the skills and abilities demonstrated by a student, and decided which performance level was the best match for each portfolio.

The panelists began the rating process by individually reviewing the set of MAP-As, beginning with the first (the lowest scoring MAP-A in the set), then every fifth MAP-A after that up through the highest scoring MAP-A. This step enabled panelists to familiarize themselves with MAP-As across the full range of performance represented and also to narrow in on the set of MAP-As they felt was near the cut between *Basic* and *Proficient*. Once they identified the subset of MAP-As around the *Basic* and *Proficient* cut, they reviewed all of them in the subset, sorting them into the two piles. All of the MAP-As below their chosen subset were placed into the below proficient pile, and all those above were placed into the proficient or above pile. This allowed the panelists to separate the MAP-As into two piles without being overwhelmed by having to review all of them. Panelists were told that they would have multiple opportunities later in the process to move MAP-As between piles.

Once the panelists were finished working their way through the portfolios individually, without consulting with their colleagues, they completed the rating form, recording their ratings for each portfolio in the “Round 1” column of the rating form. While the portfolios were presented in order of total score, panelists were not required to rate them in strictly increasing order. Instead, panelists were encouraged to take a holistic look at the *portfolio*, rather than making a judgment based primarily on the ordering of the portfolios.

Panelists were given the following materials:

- Administration Manual to be used as a reference tool as needed
- MAP-As that represented the possible range of scores
- Rating Form – Middle Cut

Prior to beginning the group discussion, and using a show of hands, the facilitator recorded how many panelists placed each portfolio into each performance level on chart paper. Starting with the first portfolio for which there was disagreement as to how it should be categorized, the panelists began discussing the categorization of the portfolios according to their initial ratings. Panelists were encouraged both to share their own point of view as well as to listen to the thoughts of their colleagues. The goal was to allow each panelist the opportunity to explain why he or she sorted a particular MAP-A into one pile or the other. Facilitators made sure the panelists knew that the purpose of the discussion was not to come to consensus: at every point throughout the standard-setting process, panelists were asked to provide their own individual best judgment.

Once the discussions were complete, the panelists filled in the Round 2 column of their portfolios rating form, making any necessary adjustments to their Round 1 ratings.

2.2.3 Round 1 & 2: Lower Cut Judgments

Once Rounds 1 and 2 were completed for the middle cut, the panelists set the pile of MAP-As they had categorized as proficient or above aside, and began reviewing the full set of MAP-As in their below proficient pile. The task was to separate that pile of MAP-As into two sub-groups, representing the lower two achievement levels: *Below Basic* and *Basic*. As with the middle cut, the task for the lower cut was done in two rounds and, after each round, each panelist's categorizations were recorded on the Lower Cut Rating Form. For the first round panelists recorded their initial individual judgments, then there was discussion on any portfolios where panelists were not in agreement. Panelists were then given the opportunity to record their Round 2 ratings. Panelists may or may not have made any adjustments to their Round 1 ratings.

2.2.4 Round 1 & 2: Upper Cut Judgments

In this step, the panelists separated the pile of proficient or above MAP-As into an additional two piles representing the upper two achievement levels: *Proficient* and *Advanced*. As with the previous two cuts, the ratings were done in two rounds and each panelist recorded his/her Round 1 and Round 2 judgments on the Upper Cut Rating Form

2.2.5 Tabulation of Round 2 Results

After all panelists had completed their individual ratings, Measured Progress staff calculated the mean cut-points for the group based on the Round 2 ratings. (The full Round 2 ratings can be found in Appendix I). Cuts were calculated using SAS statistical software by first determining each panelist's individual cuts using logistic regression (PROC LOGISTIC), then averaging across panelists to get the overall cuts. In statistics, logistic regression is a model used for prediction of the probability of occurrence of an event by fitting data to a logistic curve. In standard setting, an event consists of a panelist's classification of a portfolio. Each panelist classified each portfolio into an achievement level. By setting up dichotomies, denoting whether a portfolio is classified below or above each category, a logistic curve can be established. This logistic curve essentially represents the empirical relationship among the total score of each portfolio and a panelist's ratings. The inflection point of the logistic curve corresponds to an estimate of the panelists cut point. For each panelist, a logistic curve was fit for each cut point (*Below Basic/Basic*, *Basic/Proficient*, and *Proficient/Advanced*) and the estimates for each cut point were averaged across panelists.

Finally, impact data were calculated, consisting of the percentage of students who fell into each performance level based on the group mean Round 2 ratings. A psychometrician shared the percent of students who fell in each performance level with the group to assist them in their

group discussion and Round 3 ratings. The psychometrician also informed panelists which portfolios the mean cut scores fell between. Panelists were not given the raw score range of the performance levels, as this information often leads to panelists re-scoring the portfolios. Please note that participants were only shown the Round 2 results for their own grade. The Round 2 results are outlined in Table 5.

Table 5: Round Two Results

Grade	Achievement Level	Mean Cut	Standard Error	Raw Score		Percent of Students
				Min	Max	
5	Below Basic	N/A	N/A	0	14	54.7
	Basic	14.41	0.25	15	17	3.4
	Proficient	17.67	0.39	18	21	18.8
	Advanced	21.56	0.01	22	22	23.1
8	Below Basic	N/A	N/A	0	8	23.0
	Basic	9.00	0.15	9	14	27.4
	Proficient	14.67	0.23	15	21	30.1
	Advanced	21.69	0.36	22	22	19.5
11	Below Basic	N/A	N/A	0	12	50.2
	Basic	12.14	0.68	13	16	4.8
	Proficient	16.54	0.20	17	20	25.1
	Advanced	20.31	0.13	21	22	19.9

The mean panelist cut score and the spread or dispersion of the panelist cut scores are outlined in columns three and four, respectively. The mean panelist cut score gives precise information about where each cut was placed between its adjacent raw score points. The mean scores are rounded up to the nearest whole number to obtain the minimum raw score required to be classified in each achievement level. It is for this reason that a mean cut is not calculated for *Below Basic*: Examinees simply need to obtain a score of 0 to be classified as below basic. The percent of students classified in each achievement level is displayed in the final column of Table 5. For example, in Grade 5, 54.7% of students scored between zero and 14.

2.2.6 Round 3 Judgments

Once the panelists completed their Round 2 ratings, the facilitator once again asked for a show of hands and tallied the number of panelists who categorized each portfolio into each performance level on chart paper. As in Round 2, starting with the first portfolio for which there was disagreement as to its categorization, the panelists discussed their rationale for how they rated the Round 2 portfolios. Again, the purpose of the discussion was for the panelists to benefit from the points of view of their colleagues, not to come to consensus about the ratings.

Panelists were also asked to include the impact data (percent of students classified in each category) as part of their discussion. In presenting the impact data, the psychometrician explained to the panelists that its purpose was to provide a “reasonableness check,” and that they should resist letting it influence their decisions in isolation. Instead, if any of the percentages seemed too high or too low, they were told to return to the assessment and to the Achievement Level Descriptors, and consider whether they needed to make adjustments to their Round 2 ratings.

Once the discussions had been completed, the panelists recorded their ratings in the Round 3 rating sheet and the sheets were submitted for data analysis. The results of the panelists’ Round 3 ratings are outlined in Table 6. The full panelist ratings for Rounds 2 and 3 can be found in Appendix I.

Table 6: Round Three Results

Grade	Achievement Level	Mean Cut	Standard Error	Raw Score		Percent of Students
				Min	Max	
5	Below Basic	N/A	N/A	0	13	53.9
	Basic	13.02	0.26	14	17	4.2
	Proficient	17.67	0.39	18	21	18.8
	Advanced	21.56	0.01	22	22	23.1
8	Below Basic	N/A	N/A	0	8	23.0
	Basic	8.97	0.20	9	15	27.7
	Proficient	15.24	0.38	16	21	29.8
	Advanced	21.58	0.17	22	22	19.5
11	Below Basic	N/A	N/A	0	10	34.5
	Basic	10.61	0.43	11	16	20.5
	Proficient	16.54	0.20	17	20	25.1
	Advanced	20.35	0.13	21	22	19.9

A graphical display of the results across grades is also provided in Figures 1 and 2. The percent of students in each performance level, based on the panelist recommendations is outlined in Figure 1, while the proportion of the total score that each performance level represents is outlined in Figure 2.




Figure 1: The percent of students falling at each achievement level




Figure 2: The percent of total raw score range for each achievement level

2.2.7 Recommendations for Modifications to ALDs

After completing Round 3, the panelists were given an opportunity to provide feedback on the Achievement Level Descriptors. Panelists were asked to focus on providing language that is clearer and more teacher- and parent-friendly. Panelists were informed that the suggestions they made were just recommendations and that they may or may not be implemented by DESE. The descriptor recommendations provided by the panelists are included in Appendix H.

2.2.8 Complete the Evaluation

As the last step in the standard-setting process, panelists in all three groups anonymously completed an evaluation form. A copy of the evaluation is presented as Appendix D, and the results of the evaluations are presented as Appendix I. Further discussion about some of the results can be found in section 3.1.

3. TASKS COMPLETED AFTER THE STANDARD-SETTING MEETING

Upon conclusion of the standard-setting meeting, several important tasks were completed. These tasks centered on reviewing the standard-setting meeting and addressing anomalies that may have occurred in the process or in the results and making any final revisions or adjustments.

3.1 Analysis and Review of Panelists' Feedback

Upon completion of the evaluation forms, panelists' responses were reviewed. This review did not reveal any anomalies in the standard-setting process or indicate any reason that a particular panelist's data should not be included when the final cut-points were calculated. It appeared that all panelists understood the rating task and attended to it appropriately.

The results of the evaluations for each of the three panels were somewhat mixed. Some of the panelists made comments about not feeling that they understood the process until the first afternoon or the second day of the process. It appears, based on the conversations that took place in the small groups, that some of the misunderstanding about the process had more to do with the portfolios that panelists were asked to look at and rate. Not all of the portfolios fell neatly into one of the Achievement Level Descriptors. This was especially true of the lower scoring portfolios with the lowest total raw scores. In this case many of these raw scores came about from one entry being unscorable and the other entry being scored. Panelists discussed how this should impact their decisions. The one scorable entry taken by itself met a higher Achievement Level Descriptor, however the fact that half of the required evidence was unscorable had to be factored in for a final decision by each panelist. During these types of conversations staff from

DESE, the Assessment Resource Center and Measured Progress were brought into the room to help panelists get to a place where they felt they could continue with the process.

When taking a look at the overall process questions, the factors that were used to make decisions and the overall feeling by panelists as to whether or not they had placed the cuts correctly it appears that the majority of panelists were comfortable with the standard setting process. Panelists were asked to respond to their overall impression of the process used for setting the science standards. The majority of panelists, 67% felt the overall process was good or very good, 23% were unsure and 9% (3 panelists) felt it was poor or very poor. Seventy-seven percent of the panelists found the assessment samples to be the most influential factor in setting standards, followed by their own experience in the field (65%). Eighty-nine percent of the panelists felt that the discussion with other panelists was useful or very useful. Overall when asked whether or not they felt that the cut scores their panel had set were correctly placed 71% felt they were probably or definitely placed correctly, 23% were unsure and 6 % (or 2 panelists) felt they were probably or definitely not correctly placed.

The above results have been somewhat typical in standard setting activities for science alternate assessments. As a whole, many participants and educators have had difficulty with the measurement of science content. This issue tends to be further exacerbated in alternate assessments. Complete results of the evaluations, presented for all groups combined, and by grade level, are provided in Appendix I.

3.2 Preparation of Recommended Cut Scores

The results of the June standard setting activities for the Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate (MAP-A) Science assessment raised a few areas of concern. First, the Grade 5 and 8 panelists set the *Proficient/Advanced* cut at 22, the maximum possible score. This meant that a

perfect score was required to be classified as *Advanced*. It is not believed that this was the panelists' intention. At no time were the panelists presented with the raw score cut points or the raw score ranges of the achievement levels. They were provided with the location of the cut points, in relation to the portfolios that they fell between. In Grades 5 and 8, the panelist placed the *Proficient/Advanced* cut so that the two highest portfolios (both of which had a perfect score) were classified as *Advanced*. Panelists were also provided with the percent of students that would be classified in each performance level. The percent of students classified as *Advanced* was quite high for all three grades. None of the impact data provided any indication that a perfect score was required to be classified as *Advanced*. Second, the Grade 5 panelists set the *Below Basic/Basic* and *Basic/Proficient* cuts in such a way that only four percent of the students who took the assessment were classified as *Basic* and almost 60% of students were classified below proficient. The Grade 5 panelists did not seem to be concerned about this distribution, despite efforts of the on-site psychometrician, DESE representative, and facilitator. In contrast, the panelists in Grade 11, who were faced with a similar issue after the presentation of Round 2 impact data (3.4% of the students were classified as *Basic*), did incorporate the information and adjusted the placement of the cut scores in Round 3. After careful consideration, and discussion with DESE staff, it was determined that the panelist cut scores should be smoothed across grades.

According to the achievement level descriptors, the definitions of *Below Basic*, *Basic*, *Proficient*, and *Advanced* are consistent across grade level. The differences in the descriptors are based on the different Science Strands that are assessed at each grade level. The correspondence of the achievement level descriptors coupled with the small range of possible score points and the desirability of having similar score patterns across grades suggests that similar cuts should be

established for all grade levels. Because the raw score is our best means of linking the scales across the grades, the same raw-score cuts were established for each grade. This was achieved by averaging the Round 3 mean panelist cut scores across grades. For example, the mean Round 3 panelist cut scores for the *Basic/Proficient* Science cuts were 17.67, 15.24, and 16.54 in grades 5, 8, and 11, respectively (Table 6). The mean of these scores is 16.48. This corresponds to an operational *Basic/Proficient* raw score cut of 17 (i.e., a student must receive a score of 17 or higher in order to be classified as *Proficient*). It is worthwhile noting that the recommended cut is rounded for operational use, after the panelist recommendations have been averaged across grades. An mean cut score across grades was calculated for the *Below Basic/Basic* cut and the *Basic/Proficient* cut. A summary of the Round 3 mean panelist cuts and the mean of these cuts is outlined in Table 7.

Table 7: A Summary of Round 3 and Smoothed Cuts.

Grade	Round 3			Smoothed	
	Grade 05	Grade 08	Grade 11	Mean	Operational
Below Basic/Basic	13.02	8.97	10.61	10.87	11
Basic/Proficient	17.67	15.24	16.54	16.48	17
Proficient/Advanced	21.56	21.58	20.35	21.16	22

Unfortunately, averaging the three *Proficient/Advanced* cuts (21.56, 21.58, and 20.35 for Grades 5, 8, and 11, respectively) led to an operational cut score of 22. Averaging the Round 3 results did not eliminate the need for a perfect score to be classified as advanced. After much discussion with the Department, it was determined, from a policy standpoint that “perfection” should not be required to be classified as advanced. Consequently, it was decided that the Round

3 Grade 11 results for the *Proficient/Advanced* cut would be applied to the other two grades. The *Proficient/Advanced* cut was set at 21 for all three grades.

The result of the smoothed cuts, including raw score ranges and impact data are presented in Table 8. A graphical display of the smoothed results across grades is also provided in Figures 3 and 4. The percent of students in each performance level, based on the panelist recommendations is outlined in Figure 3, while the proportion of the total score that each performance level represents is outlined in Figure 4.

Table 8: Final Results

Grade	Achievement Level	Mean Cut	Raw Score		Percent of Students
			Min	Max	
5	Below Basic	N/A	0	10	35.7
	Basic	10.87	11	16	21.0
	Proficient	16.48	17	20	14.9
	Advanced	20.35	21	22	28.4
8	Below Basic	N/A	0	10	36.6
	Basic	10.87	11	16	15.6
	Proficient	16.48	17	20	22.0
	Advanced	20.35	21	22	25.7
11	Below Basic	N/A	0	10	34.5
	Basic	10.87	11	16	20.5
	Proficient	16.48	17	20	25.1
	Advanced	20.35	21	22	19.9




Figure 3: The percent of students falling at each achievement level




Figure 4: The percent of total raw score range for each achievement level

3.3 Preparation of Standard-Setting Report

Following final compilation of standard-setting results, Measured Progress prepared this report, which documents the procedures and results of the June 2008 standard-setting meeting in order to establish performance standards for the Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate in Science.

Experiences in other states, where science has been added to alternate assessments for the first time, show that many teachers are struggling with the science content and therefore the student samples that are available for setting science standards in the first year are not of the best quality. This is true of the samples that were available for standard setting in Missouri. Based on this issue and further conversations with DESE, Measured Progress recommends that a validation focus group be convened to review the science cuts in another year or two.

References

- Angoff, W. H. (1971). Scales, Norms, and Equivalent Scores. In R.L. Thorndike (Ed.), *Educational Measurement* (2nd ed.) (pp. 508-60). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Bay, L. (2000). *1998 NAEP Writing Achievement Levels-Setting Process Performance Profiles Study*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, LA
- Berk, R. A. (1986). A Consumer's Guide to Setting Performance Standards on Criterion-Referenced Tests. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 137-172.
- Cizek, G.J. (2001). *Setting performance standards: Concepts, methods, and perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cizek, Gr. J. (1996). Standard Setting Guidelines. *Educational Measurement: issues and Practice*, 15, 13-21.
- Cizek, G.J. & Bunch, M.B. (2007). *Standard Setting: A Guide to Establishing and Evaluating Performance*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hambleton, R. Jaeger, R., Plake, B. & Mills, C. (2000). Setting Performance Standards on Complex Educational Assessments. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 24 (4), December 2000, 355. 366.
- Hambleton, R. K. (2001) Setting Performance Standards on Educational Assessments and Criteria for Evaluating the Process. In G. J. Cizek (Ed.) *Setting Performance Standards: Concepts, Methods, and Perspectives*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 89-116.
- Hambleton, R. K., & Powell, S. (1983). A Framework for Viewing the Process of Standard Setting. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, 6(1), 3-24.
- Jaeger, R. M. (1995). Setting Performance Standards through Two-Stage Judgmental Policy Capturing. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 8, 15-40.
- Kane, M. (2001). So Much Remains the Same: Conception and Status on Validation in Setting Standards. In G. J. Cizek (ed.), *Setting performance standards: Concepts, methods, and perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 53-88.
- Kane, M. T. (1994). Validating the Performance Standards Associated with Passing Scores. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(3), 425-461.
- Kingston, N. M., Kahl, S. R., Sweeney, K. P., & Bay, L. (2001). Setting Performance Standards Using the Body of Work Method. In G.J. Cizek (Ed.), *Setting performance standards: Concepts, methods, and perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 219-248.

- Lewis, D. M., Mitzel, H. C., & Green, D. R. (1996, June). *Standard Setting: A Bookmark Approach*. Paper Presented at the Council of Chief State School Officers National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment, Phoenix, AZ.
- Livingston, S. A., & Zieky, M. J. (1982). *Passing Scores: A Manual for Setting Standards of Performance on Educational and Occupational Tests*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Lunz, M. (1995). *Methods of setting criterion standards for performance examinations*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Malehorn, H. (1994). Ten measures better than grading. *The Clearing House*, 67(6), 323-24. [EJ490760].
- Navarrete, C., Wilde, J. Nelson, C., Martinez, R., & Hargett, G. (1990). *Informal Assessment in Educational Evaluation: Implications for Bilingual Education Programs*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 28 pages. [ED337041].
- Reckase, M. D. (2000). A Survey and Evaluation of Recently Developed Procedures for Setting Standards on Educational Tests. In: *Student performance Standards on the National Assessment of Educational progress: Affirmations and Improvement*. Ed. By M. L. Bourqey & Sh. Byrd, Washington: NAEP, pp. 41 . 70.
- Roeber, Ed. (2002). *Setting standards on alternate assessments, Synthesis Report*. NCEO-42. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Smith, C. B. (2003). *Alternate Forms of Assessment*. ERIC topical biography and commentary. ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication, Bloomington, IN.
- Thompson, S. J., & Thurlow, M. L. (2001). *2001 State Special Education Outcomes: A Report on State Activities at the Beginning of a New Decade*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcome.

APPENDIX A: DRAFT ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Grade 5	Science
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.

Grade 8	Science
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy, and Properties and Principles of Force and Motion. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy, and Properties and Principles of Force and Motion. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy, and Properties and Principles of Force and Motion. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy, and Properties and Principles of Force and Motion. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.

Grade 11	Science
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Processes and Interactions of the Earth’s Systems and Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Processes and Interactions of the Earth’s Systems and Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Processes and Interactions of the Earth’s Systems and Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Processes and Interactions of the Earth’s Systems and Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.

APPENDIX B: AGENDA

MISSOURI ASSESSMENT PROGRAM- ALTERNATE STANDARD SETTING
SCIENCE
June 3&4, 2008
AGENDA

TUESDAY, JUNE 3

8:30 – 9:00	Registration & Breakfast
9:00 – 10:30	Introduction, Overview, and Training of Standard Setting Process
10:30 – 10:45	Break
10:45 – 12:00	Move to Grade Level/Content Area Work Rooms
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch
12:45 – 2:30	Continue in Work Rooms
2:30 – 2:45	Break
2:45 – 4:00	Continue in Work Rooms
4:00	Adjourn

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4

8:00 – 8:30	Breakfast
8:30 – 10:30	Move to Grade Level/Content Area Work Rooms
10:30 – 10:45	Break
10:45 – 12:00	Continue in Work Rooms
12:00 – 12:45	Lunch
12:45 – 2:30	Continue in Work Rooms
2:30 – 2:45	Break
2:45 – 4:00	Continue in Work Rooms
4:00	Adjourn

APPENDIX C: RATING FORMS

Complete this form FIRST

ID Number: _____

**MAP-A Science Grade 05
Rating Form – Middle Cut**

	Round 1		Round 2	
	Below Proficient	Proficient or Above	Below Proficient	Proficient or Above
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				

Transcribe these figures into the appropriate columns on the Lower and Upper Cut Rating Forms



Below Proficient includes:
BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*

Proficient or Above includes:
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

**MAP-A Science Grade 05
Rating Form – Lower Cut**

	Round 1			Round 2		
	BB	B	Proficient or Above	BB	B	Proficient or Above
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						

Transcribe your Round 2 “Proficient or Above” Ratings from the Middle Cut Rating Form Here



Below Proficient includes:
BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*

Proficient or Above includes:
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

**MAP-A Science Grade 05
Rating Form – Upper Cut**

	Round 1			Round 2		
	Below Proficient	P	A	Below Proficient	P	A
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						



Transcribe your Round 2 “Below Proficient” ratings from the Middle Cut Rating Form here

Below Proficient includes:
BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*

Proficient or Above includes:
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

Complete this form FIRST

ID Number: _____

**MAP-A Mathematics Science 05
Rating Form – All Cuts**

	Round 3			
	BB	B	P	A
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				

BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

**MAP-A Science Grade 08
Rating Form – Middle Cut**

Complete this form FIRST

ID Number: _____

	Round 1		Round 2	
	Below Proficient	Proficient or Above	Below Proficient	Proficient or Above
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				

Transcribe these figures into the appropriate columns on the Lower and Upper Cut Rating Forms



Below Proficient includes:
 BB: *Below Basic*
 B: *Basic*

Proficient or Above includes:
 P: *Proficient*
 A: *Advanced*

**MAP-A Science Grade 08
Rating Form – Lower Cut**

	Round 1			Round 2		
	BB	B	Proficient or Above	BB	B	Proficient or Above
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						

Transcribe your Round 2 “Proficient or Above” Ratings from the Middle Cut Rating Form Here



Below Proficient includes:
BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*

Proficient or Above includes:
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

Complete this form **THIRD**

ID Number: _____

**MAP-A Science Grade 08
Rating Form – Upper Cut**

	Round 1			Round 2		
	Below Proficient	P	A	Below Proficient	P	A
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						



Transcribe your Round 2 “Below Proficient” ratings from the Middle Cut Rating Form here

Below Proficient includes:
BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*

Proficient or Above includes:
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

**MAP-A Mathematics Science 08
Rating Form – All Cuts**

	Round 3			
	BB	B	P	A
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				

BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

MAP-A Science Grade 11
Rating Form – Middle Cut

	Round 1		Round 2	
	Below Proficient	Proficient or Above	Below Proficient	Proficient or Above
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				

Transcribe these figures into the appropriate columns on the Lower and Upper Cut Rating Forms



Below Proficient includes:
BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*

Proficient or Above includes:
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

Complete this form **SECOND**

ID Number: _____

**MAP-A Science Grade 11
Rating Form – Lower Cut**

	Round 1			Round 2		
	BB	B	Proficient or Above	BB	B	Proficient or Above
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						

Transcribe your Round 2 “Proficient or Above” Ratings from the Middle Cut Rating Form Here



Below Proficient includes:
BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*

Proficient or Above includes:
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

Complete this form THIRD

ID Number: _____

**MAP-A Science Grade 11
Rating Form – Upper Cut**

	Round 1			Round 2		
	Below Proficient	P	A	Below Proficient	P	A
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						



Transcribe your Round 2 “Below Proficient” ratings from the Middle Cut Rating Form here

Below Proficient includes:
BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*

Proficient or Above includes:
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

Complete this form **FOURTH**

ID Number: _____

**MAP-A Mathematics Science 11
Rating Form – All Cuts**

	Round 3			
	BB	B	P	A
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				

BB: *Below Basic*
B: *Basic*
P: *Proficient*
A: *Advanced*

APPENDIX D: EVALUATION

Science Standard Setting Panel Evaluation Form

Evaluation of the Standard setting Procedures for the Missouri Alternate Assessment

1. What is your overall impression of the process used to set performance standards for the Missouri Alternate Assessment? (*Circle one*)

- A. Very Good
- B. Good
- C. Unsure
- D. Poor
- E. Very Poor

2. How clear were you with the achievement level descriptors? (*Circle one*)

- A. Very Clear
- B. Clear
- C. Somewhat Clear
- D. Not Clear

3. How would you judge the length of time of this meeting for setting performance standards? (*Circle one*)

- A. About right
- B. Too little time
- C. Too much time

4. What factors influenced the standards you set? (For each, circle the most appropriate rating from 1=Not at all Influential to 5=Very Influential)

A. The achievement level descriptors

Not at all Influential	Moderately Influential	Very Influential
1	2	3
4	5	

B. The assessment samples

Not at all Influential	Moderately Influential	Very Influential
1	2	3
4	5	

C. Other panelists

Not at all Influential		Moderately Influential		Very Influential
1	2	3	4	5

D. My experience in the field

Not at all Influential		Moderately Influential		Very Influential
1	2	3	4	5

E. Other (please specify _____)

Not at all Influential		Moderately Influential		Very Influential
1	2	3	4	5

5. Do you believe the cut scores set by the panel are correctly placed?

- A. Definitely Yes
- B. Probably Yes
- C. Unsure
- D. Probably No
- E. Definitely No

Please explain your answer:

6. How could the standard setting process have been improved?

For each statement below, please circle the rating that best represents your judgment.

7. The opening session was:

Not at all Useful				Very Useful
1	2	3	4	5

8. The achievement level descriptors were:

Not at all Clear				Very Clear
1	2	3	4	5

9. Providing additional details to the achievement level descriptors was:
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Not at all Useful | | | | | Very Useful |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
10. The discussion with other panelists was:
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Not at all Useful | | | | | Very Useful |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
11. The portfolio rating task was:
- | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|
| Not at all Clear | | | | | Very Clear |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
12. The impact data provided prior to the last round of ratings was:
- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| Not at all Useful | | | | | Very Useful |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

Additional Comments

13. Please provide any additional comments or suggestions about the standard setting process. Use extra paper if necessary.

APPENDIX E: OPENING SESSION POWER POINTS

Slide 1

Missouri Assessment Program Alternate (MAP-A) Science Standard Setting



The logo for the Missouri Assessment Program Alternate (MAP-A) is circular. It features a central figure holding a torch, surrounded by the text 'MAP-A' and 'Missouri Assessment Program Alternate'.

Slide 2

Who are MAP-A students?

To be eligible for the MAP-A, a student with a disability must meet the following criteria:

- ❑ The student has a demonstrated significant cognitive disability and adaptive behavioral skills. Therefore, the student has difficulty acquiring new skills, and skills must be taught in very small steps.
- ❑ The student does not keep pace with peers, even with the majority of students in special education, with respect to the total number of skills acquired.

Slide 3

Who are MAP-A students?

- ❑ The student's educational program centers on the application of essential skills to the Missouri Show-Me Standards.
- ❑ The IEP team, as documented in the IEP, does not recommend participation in the MAP subject area assessments or taking the MAP with accommodations.
- ❑ The student's inability to participate in the MAP subject-area assessments is not primarily the result of excessive absences; visual or auditory disabilities; or social, cultural, language, or economic differences.

Slide 4

Video Clips



Slide 5

What is the MAP-A?

The MAP-A is

- required by federal law;
- designed only for students with significant cognitive disabilities who meet age and participation criteria;
- administered at the same grade levels as students participating in Missouri's general assessment;

Slide 6

What is the MAP-A?

- scored using the MAP-A Scoring Rubric to obtain student performance levels which are then used to determine reportable scores; and
- reflective of input from an instructional team, which may include teachers, physical therapists, speech therapists, occupational therapists, paraprofessionals, job coaches, parents or guardians, and the student, if appropriate.

Slide 7

What is assessed?

Content Area	Grade Focus	Title of Strand
PROCESS STRANDS		
Science	Required at Grades 5, 8, and 11	Strand 7: Scientific Inquiry (IN)
	Required at Grades 5, 8, and 11	Strand 8: Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity (ST)
	CONTENT STRANDS	
	Required for Elementary Grade 5	Strand 3: Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms (LO)
	Required for Elementary Grade 5	Strand 4: Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environments (EC)
	Required for Middle School Grade 8	Strand 1: Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy (ME)
	Required for Middle School Grade 8	Strand 2: Properties and Principles of Force and Motion (FM)
	Required for High School Grade 11	Strand 5: Processes and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere) (ES)
Required for High School Grade 11	Strand 6: Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It (UN)	

Slide 8

What is the design?

Science			
Process Strand 7 and Content Strand		Process Strand 8 and Content Strand	
Process API 1	Content API 1	Process API 2	Content API 2
Entry/Data Summary Sheet		Entry/Data Summary Sheet	
Collection Period 1	Collection Period 2	Collection Period 1	Collection Period 2
Student Work Record	Student Work Record	Student Work Record	Student Work Record

Slide 9

What are the MAP-A requirements?

Content	Description
Entry/Data Summary Sheet	Serves as a record of student performance on each API assessed. The student's score for Level of Accuracy and Level of Independence for each API will be determined based on the percentages recorded on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet.
Student Work Records	Provides documentation of student work for each API assessed in both collection periods. Student Work Records should demonstrate the application of the API/s in a standards-based activity. You may show evidence of student work by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collecting student work samples such as worksheets, drawings, writings, journal entries, or projects; or • observing the student and recording his or her performance.

Slide 10

Entry/Data Summary Sheet						
Science						
Student Name: Andi			Grade: 5			
Content Area: Science			Process Strand: IN Content Strand: LO			
Process API: IN.5.1		Process API Description: Communicate observations and/or events				
Content API: LO2.3a		Content API Description: Identify the life cycle that animals go through				
Collection Period 1 January 14 – February 8			Collection Period 2 February 11 – March 7			
Dates below do not need to be in chronological order:			Dates below do not need to be in chronological order:			
Date	2/01/2008	1/05/2008	2/02/2008	2/22/2008	2/15/2008	2/20/2008
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %	50	80	60	80	90	80
Independence %	100	100	100	100	100	100
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 67 Independence: 100			Accuracy: 80 Independence: 100		
					API Entry Average	
					Level of Accuracy	74
					Level of Independence	100

Slide 11

Student Work Record		
Science		
<input type="checkbox"/> Actual student product is attached.		
Student Name: Andi		Date: 2/01/2008
Content Area: Science		Process Strand: IN Content Strand: LO
Process API: IN.5.1		Process API Description: Communicate observations and/or events
Content API: LO2.3a		Content API Description: Identify the life cycle that animals go through
<p>Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to both APIs, and how it demonstrates application.)</p> <p>The class pet gerbils had babies. The students observed the baby gerbils shortly after birth. Each student selected one baby to observe, and using a data chart and picture or symbol cards recorded color, length, presence/absence of fur, whether the gerbil's eyes were opened or closed, and point in the life cycle (baby or adult). The class then discussed their observations and their data charts were combined and posted on the bulletin board as part of the living organisms unit.</p>		
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy .	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence .	
Andi observed the baby gerbil and discussed how it looked. She identified point in life cycle as baby and correctly recorded color and length. 3/5.	Andi independently completed each portion of the data chart.	
Level of Accuracy: <u>60</u> %	Level of Independence: <u>100</u> %	

Slide 12

Student Work Record		
Science		
<input type="checkbox"/> Actual student product is attached.		
Student Name: Andi		Date: 2/22/2008
Content Area: Science		Process Strand: IN Content Strand: LO
Process API: IN.5.1		Process API Description: Communicate observations and/or events
Content API: LO2.3a		Content API Description: Identify the life cycle that animals go through
<p>Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to both APIs, and how it demonstrates application.)</p> <p>The students continued observing the baby gerbils, using a data chart and picture or symbol cards to record color, length, presence/absence of fur, and whether the gerbil's eyes were opened or closed, and point in the life cycle.</p>		
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy .	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence .	
Andi observed the baby gerbil and discussed how it looked. She was able to describe point in the life cycle and correctly recorded color, length, and whether the gerbil's eyes were opened. 4/5.	Andi independently completed each portion of the data chart.	
Level of Accuracy: <u>80</u> %	Level of Independence: <u>100</u> %	

What does the MAP-A Assess?

- The MAP-A documents student learning directly connected to the Show-Me Standards through the Alternate Grade-Level Expectations (Alternate-GLEs) for students who are MAP-A eligible. The assessment has three criteria:
 - Level of Accuracy
 - Level of Independence
 - Connection to the Standards


MAP-A Rubric

SCORE	4	3	2	1	No Score
Level of Accuracy	Student performance of skills "based on Alternate Performance Indicators" demonstrates a high level of understanding of concepts. 76-100% Accuracy	Student performance of skills "based on Alternate Performance Indicators" demonstrates some understanding of concepts. 51-75% Accuracy	Student performance of skills "based on Alternate Performance Indicators" demonstrates a limited understanding of concepts. 26-50% Accuracy	Student performance of skills "based on Alternate Performance Indicators" demonstrates a minimal understanding of concepts. 0-25% Accuracy	Entry contains insufficient information to determine a score.
Level of Independence	Student requires minimal verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 76-100% Independence	Student requires some verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 51-75% Independence	Student requires frequent verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 26-50% Independence	Student requires extensive verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 0-25% Independence	Entry contains insufficient information to determine a score.
Connection to the Standards		There is evidence of applying the Alternate Performance Indicator in two standards-based activities, one per collection period.	There is evidence of applying the Alternate Performance Indicator in at least one standards-based activity, one out of two collection periods.	There is some evidence of a connection to the Alternate Performance Indicator.	There is insufficient evidence of a connection to the Alternate Performance Indicator.


Who scored the MAP-As?

- The Assessment Resource Center hired scorers in Missouri and provided training.
- DESE staff were present at the training and available as needed to answer questions.


Slide 1




Slide 2



Slide 3



Slide 4




Two Key Phases

- Data collection phase
 - Your job for the next two days
- Policy/Decision making phase
 - State Department
 - Legislature

4



Slide 5




Many Standard Setting Methods

- Angoff
- Body of Work
- Bookmark

5



Slide 6



Choice of Method is Based on Many Factors

- Prior usage/history
- Recommendation/requirement by some policy making authority
- Type of assessment

6



Slide 7

Body of Work Method

- Is especially useful for assessments that consist primarily or entirely of constructed-response items
- Has been used successfully by Measured Progress in the past
- Allows panelists to use samples of actual student work to make their determinations
- Was used for setting standards in Mathematics and Communication Arts

7 

Slide 8

Body of Work Method

- You will be basing your decisions on a set of student portfolios (MAP-As)
- MAP-As cover the range of possible scores and are presented in order from lowest to highest total score

8 

Slide 9

What is your role in this process?

- To classify each MAP-A into the achievement level in which you feel it belongs:
 - *Below Basic*
 - *Basic*
 - *Proficient*
 - *Advanced*

9 

Slide 10

Body of Work Method

- Prior to beginning the process of rating the MAP-As, you will:
 - thoroughly review and discuss the Achievement Level Descriptions (ALDs)
 - create bulleted lists on chart paper of the knowledge, skills and abilities that a student must demonstrate in order to be categorized into a given achievement level.
- It is critical that panelists come to a common understanding of the ALDs.

Measured Progress

Slide 11

Overview

- Middle Cut: Below Proficient/Proficient or Above
 - Round 1 (individual)
 - Round 2 (group)
- Lower Cut: Below Basic/Basic
 - Round 1 (individual)
 - Round 2 (group)
- Upper Cut: Proficient/Advanced
 - Round 1 (individual)
 - Round 2 (group)
- Round 3 Ratings (all three cuts; group)

Measured Progress

Slide 12

Steps for Body of Work Method

- Round 1:
 - Panelists individually review the MAP-As
 - There is no discussion with colleagues
 - Panelists make their first set of ratings
- Round 2:
 - All panelists in the group will discuss the Round 1 ratings
 - Panelists make their second set of ratings

Measured Progress

Slide 13

Steps for Body of Work Method

- Rounds 1 and 2 will be completed first for the middle cut (below proficient vs. proficient or above)
- Rounds 1 and 2 will next be completed for the lower cut (*Below Basic* vs. *Basic*)
- Finally, Rounds 1 and 2 will be completed for the upper cut (*Proficient* vs. *Advanced*)

13



Slide 14

Steps for Body of Work Method

- Once Rounds 1 and 2 have been completed for all three cuts, Round 3 occurs:
 - Group discussion of the Round 2 ratings
 - Look at all three cuts simultaneously: more holistic approach
 - You will also be given impact data, indicating the percentage of students who would fall into each category according to the Round 2 ratings
 - Final round of ratings

14



Slide 15

A few final notes:

- You may disagree about the order of the MAP-As; that's fine
- You will categorize the MAP-As as you see fit, whether your ratings agree with the order or not
- However, it is not your job to rescore the MAP-As: you need to stay focused on the task at hand; Categorizing the MAP-As.

15



Slide 16

A few final notes

- Your group does not need to come to consensus about how the MAP-As should be categorized
- You may change your ratings as a result of the discussions, or you may not
- You should be open-minded when listening to your colleagues' rationales for their ratings
- However: we want your individual best judgment in each round of rating

16 

Slide 17

Steps for Body of Work Method

- Note also:
 - This session is intended to be an overview
 - Your room facilitator will give you lots more details and will guide you through the process step by step

17 

Slide 18

Any Questions about the Body of Work Procedure?



Slide 19

A presentation slide with a white background and a teal gradient at the top and bottom. The title "What Next?" is centered at the top. Below it is a bulleted list. The slide number "19" is in the bottom left, and the "Measured Progress" logo is in the bottom right.

What Next?

- Some meeting logistics
- After this session, you will break into grade level groups

19

Measured Progress

Slide 20

A presentation slide with a white background and a teal gradient at the top and bottom. The title "What Next?" is centered at the top. Below it is a bulleted list. The slide number "20" is in the bottom left, and the "Measured Progress" logo is in the bottom right.

What Next?

- Once in your breakout room, you will:
 - Review the Achievement Level Descriptions and create your bulleted lists
 - Complete Rounds 1 & 2 for the middle cut
 - Complete Rounds 1 & 2 for the lower cut
 - Complete Rounds 1 & 2 for the upper cut
 - Complete Round 3 for all three cuts

20

Measured Progress

Slide 21


A presentation slide with a white background and a teal gradient at the top and bottom. The title "What Next?" is centered at the top. Below it is a bulleted list. The slide number "21" is in the bottom left, and the "Measured Progress" logo is in the bottom right.

What Next?

- Provide feedback on the Achievement Level Descriptions
- As the final step, we will ask you to complete an evaluation of the standard setting process
 - Your honest feedback is important for us, both for improving future standard settings, and for evaluating the results of this one

21

Measured Progress



APPENDIX F: FACILITATOR SCRIPT

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR GROUP FACILITATORS (MAP-A) SCIENCE STANDARD SETTING

June 3 and 4, 2008

Introductions

1. Welcome group, introduce yourself (name, affiliation, a little selected background information).
2. Have each participant introduce him/herself.
3. Ask participants to complete Non-Disclosure Forms. Collect forms

Review Assessment Materials

Overview: Some of the panelists administered the assessment to students, while others did not. In order to ensure that all panelists have an understanding of the knowledge and skills assessed, thoroughly review the student portfolios and APIs with the group.

- 1) Review the student portfolios
- 2) Review the APIs

Discuss Achievement Level Descriptions

Overview: In order to establish a thorough understanding of the expected performance of students on the test, panelists must have a clear understanding of:

- 1) the definition of the four achievement levels, and
- 2) what the key characteristics are that distinguish students in adjacent achievement level categories.

The purpose of this activity is for the panelists to come to consensus about what characterizes students in each of the four achievement level categories. This activity is critical since the ratings panelists will be making in Rounds 1 through 3 will be based on these understandings.

Activities:

1. Introduce task. In this activity they will:
 - a. Individually review the Achievement Level Descriptions;
 - b. discuss Descriptions as a group; and
 - c. generate bulleted lists that describe the main characteristics that define students in each achievement level category.
2. Have panelists individually review all Achievement Level Descriptions. They can make notes if they like. The goal here is for the panelists to come to a common understanding of what it means to be in each achievement level. It is not unusual for panelists to

disagree with the descriptions they will see; almost certainly there will be some panelists who will want to change them. However, the task at hand is for panelists to have a common understanding of what knowledge, skills, and abilities are described by each Achievement Level Description. Panelists will have an opportunity to provide feedback and suggestions for edits to the Descriptors after the standard setting activities are completed.

3. After individually reviewing the Descriptions, have the panelists discuss each one as a group, starting with *Basic*, and provide clarification. The purpose of this is to have a collegial discussion in which to bring up/clarify any issues or questions that any individual may have and to reach consensus on an understanding of the description.
4. During the discussion for each achievement level, using chart paper, create a bulleted list for each level, specifying the characteristics that best describe students in that level. The panelists want to answer the question, what characteristics must a student demonstrate in order to be classified in the *Basic* category. Or, put another way, what are the most important characteristics that distinguish a *Below Basic* student from a student in the *Basic* category. They will then repeat this process for the *Proficient* and *Advanced* categories.

Ratings: Middle Cut

Overview of Middle Cut Ratings: The panelists will begin the rating process by separating the MAP-As into two piles, those that represent performance that is below proficient (*Below Basic* or *Basic*) vs. proficient or above (*Proficient* or *Advanced*). The ratings will be done in two rounds. The first round will be done individually, without consulting with their colleagues. In the second round, they will have an opportunity to discuss their Round 1 ratings with the other panelists.

Middle Cut Round 1: The first step in the process will be for the panelists to individually review the MAP-As, beginning with #1, and then every fifth MAP-A after that (i.e., #6, #11, etc.). Once they have narrowed in on the MAP-As they feel are near the cut point between below proficient and proficient or above, they will review all the MAP-As in that range. As they proceed through the MAP-As, the panelists should ask themselves whether the knowledge, skills and abilities demonstrated in each are consistent with performance that is below proficient, or proficient or above. At the end of Round 1, each panelist will complete the Round 1 section of the Middle Cut Rating Form, indicating the level they feel each MAP-A should be categorized into.

Activities:

1. Make sure panelists have the following materials:
 - a. Set of MAP-As
 - b. Achievement Level Descriptions
 - c. Rating Form for the Middle Cut
2. Orient panelists to the set of MAP-As. Explain that the MAP-As are ordered by the student's total raw score, which was obtained using a straight forward summing of the 2

content entries (3 domain scores summed = content entry score.) Make sure they know that, if they disagree with the order of the MAP-As, they are free to categorize them as they feel appropriate, regardless of their ordering. For example, if they feel that MAP-A #15 represents performance that is proficient or above, but #16 (which has a higher total score) represents below proficient performance, they should categorize them as such.

3. Provide an overview of Round 1. Emphasize the following:
 - a. The primary purpose is to separate the MAP-As into two piles.
 - b. Panelists will be working individually in this round, without consulting with their colleagues. They will have opportunities in Rounds 2 and 3 to discuss their categorizations and make changes.
 - c. Each panelist needs to base his/her judgments on his/her experience with the content, understanding of students, and the Achievement Level Descriptions.
 - d. If panelists are struggling with categorizing a particular MAP-A, they should use their best judgment and move on. They will have an opportunity to revise their categorizations.
 - e. Panelists should feel free to take notes if there are particular points about a certain MAP-A and how they think it should be categorized that they would like to discuss in Round 2.
4. Go over the rating form with panelists:
 - a. Have panelists write their ID number on the rating form. The ID number is on their name tag.
 - b. Lead panelists through a step-by-step demonstration of how to fill in the rating form.
 - c. There should be one and only one checkmark in each row for each round of ratings.
5. Give panelists an opportunity to ask questions about their task in Round 1, then tell them they may begin.
6. Have panelists individually review the MAP-As, beginning with #1, and then every fifth one after that (i.e., #6, #11, etc.), ending with the last MAP-A. It is important that panelists continue all the way through the last MAP-A so they have a good sense of the entire range of performance represented. As they are reviewing the MAP-As, the panelists should keep in mind the Achievement Level Descriptions. They should consider the knowledge, skills and abilities demonstrated by each and how they relate to the definitions of the achievement levels. As they complete each MAP-A, have them place it into one of two piles: below proficient, vs. proficient or above.
7. Once they have narrowed in on the MAP-As they feel are near the cut point between below proficient and proficient or above, they will review all the MAP-As in that range, again placing each in the appropriate pile. **Note:** the panelists will not be reviewing all of the MAP-As at this time; this is done intentionally, to break the work into more manageable pieces.

8. Panelists may want to take notes as they work.
9. Once panelists have finished sorting the MAP-As, they will fill in the Round 1 section of the Middle Cut Rating Form.
10. As panelists complete the task, ask them to carefully inspect their rating forms to ensure they are filled out properly.
 - a. The ID number must be filled in.
 - b. Each MAP-A must be assigned to one and only one achievement level.
 - c. Although the MAP-As are presented in order from lowest- to highest-scoring, the panelists' category assignments do not need to be in strictly increasing order.

Middle Cut Round 2: In Round 2, the panelists will discuss their categorizations of the MAP-As into the two levels as a large group. After the discussions are complete, the panelists will do their second round of ratings.

Activities:

1. Make sure panelists have the following materials:
 - a. Set of MAP-As
 - b. Achievement Level Descriptions
 - c. Rating Form for the Middle Cut
2. Using a show of hands, indicate on a piece of chart paper how many panelists assigned each MAP-A to each category (below proficient vs. proficient or above).
3. Beginning with the first MAP-A for which there was disagreement as to its categorization, the panelists will discuss their rationale for categorizing it as they did.
 - a. Panelists only need to discuss those MAP-As for which there was disagreement as to how they should be categorized.
 - b. Panelists should be encouraged to listen to their colleagues as well as express their own points of view.
 - c. If the panelists hear a logic/rationale/argument that they did not consider and that they feel is compelling, then they may adjust their ratings to incorporate that information.
 - d. The group does not have to achieve consensus. If panelists honestly disagree, that is fine. We are trying to get the best judgment of each panelist. Panelists should not feel compelled or coerced into making a rating they disagree with.
 - e. As they finish the discussion for each MAP-A, each panelist should once again place it into the appropriate pile.

Encourage the panelists to use the discussion and feedback to assess how stringent or lenient a judge they are. If a panelist is categorizing MAP-As consistently higher or lower than the group, he/she may have a different understanding of the Achievement Level Descriptions than the rest of the group. **It is O.K. for panelists to disagree,**

but that disagreement should be based on a common understanding of the Achievement Level Descriptions.

4. Once the discussions have been completed, each panelist will complete the Round 2 section of the Middle Cut Rating Form, again indicating the level they feel each MAP-A should be categorized into.

Ratings: Lower Cut

Overview of Lower Cut Ratings: Once Rounds 1 and 2 have been completed for the middle cut, the process will be repeated for the lower cut. The panelists will set aside the pile of MAP-As that they have classified as proficient or above, and work only with the MAP-As they feel are below proficient. Working their way through each MAP-A in the pile, the panelists will subdivide them into two new piles: *Below Basic* and *Basic*. As with the middle cut ratings, in the first round of ratings, panelists will work individually and, in the second round, they will have an opportunity to discuss their categorizations before making their second round ratings.

Lower Cut Round 1: The process here will be basically the same as for the middle cut, except that they will be subdividing the MAP-As they categorized as below proficient into two achievement levels: *Below Basic* and *Basic*. They will individually work their way through each of the MAP-As they categorized as below proficient. As they proceed through the MAP-As, the panelists should ask themselves whether the knowledge, skills and abilities demonstrated in each are consistent with performance that is *Below Basic*, or *Basic*. At the end of Round 1, each panelist will complete the Round 1 section of the Lower Cut Rating Form, indicating the level they feel each MAP-A should be categorized into.

Activities:

1. Make sure panelists have the following materials:
 - a. Set of MAP-As
 - b. Achievement Level Descriptions
 - c. Rating Form for the Middle Cut
 - d. Rating Form for the Lower Cut
 - e. Rating Form for the Upper Cut (they will be preparing it for when they get to the upper cut ratings)
2. Ask the panelists to transfer their ratings in the Round 2: Proficient or Above column of the Middle Cut Rating Form into the Proficient or Above columns of the Lower Cut Rating Form; the ratings should be entered into the Proficient or Above column for both rounds. Once they have done that, have them transfer their Below Proficient ratings onto the Upper Cut Rating Form, again placing them in the Below Proficient columns for both rounds.
3. Have the panelists place the pile of MAP-As they categorized as above proficient, as well as the Upper Cut Rating Form, aside, where they will be out of their way.

4. Have the panelists individually review each MAP-A in their below proficient pile; they will have reviewed some of them while doing their middle cut ratings, but they should revisit those briefly to refresh their memory.
5. As they are reviewing the MAP-As, the panelists should keep in mind the Achievement Level Descriptions. They should consider the knowledge, skills and abilities demonstrated by each and how they relate to the definitions of the achievement levels. As they complete each MAP-A, have them place it into one of two piles: *Below Basic* or *Basic*.
6. **Note:** Because the panelists will be reviewing some MAP-As for the first time in this step, it is possible that they may feel that one or more should have been placed in the proficient or above pile in the previous step. Tell them that, in that case, they should categorize it as *Basic* for the time being, but make a note on it indicating that it needs to be recategorized. They will have an opportunity in Round 3 to change any of the categorizations; for now, however, they may not move MAP-As out of the below proficient category.
7. Once panelists have finished sorting the MAP-As, they will fill in the Round 1 section of the Lower Cut Rating Form.
8. As panelists complete the task, ask them to carefully inspect their rating forms to ensure they are filled out properly.
 - a. The ID number must be filled in.
 - b. Each MAP-A must be assigned to one and only one achievement level.
 - c. Although the MAP-As are presented in order from lowest- to highest-scoring, the panelists' category assignments do not need to be in strictly increasing order.

Lower Cut Round 2: In Round 2, the panelists will discuss their categorizations of the MAP-As into the two levels as a large group. After the discussions are complete, the panelists will do their second round of ratings.

Activities:

1. Make sure panelists have the following materials:
 - a. Set of MAP-As
 - b. Achievement Level Descriptions
 - c. Rating Form for the Lower Cut
2. Using a show of hands, indicate on a piece of chart paper how many panelists assigned each MAP-A to each category. In this case, you will be including three categories: *Below Basic*, *Basic*, and proficient or above. Even though the panelists will be confining their discussions to the *Below Basic/Basic* cut, including all three categories on the chart paper should help minimize any confusion.

3. Beginning with the first MAP-A for which there was disagreement as to whether it should be categorized as *Below Basic* or *Basic*, the panelists will discuss their rationale for categorizing it as they did.
 - a. Panelists only need to discuss those MAP-As for which there was disagreement as to whether it should be categorized as *Below Basic* or *Basic*.
 - b. Panelists should be encouraged to listen to their colleagues as well as express their own points of view.
 - c. If the panelists hear a logic/rationale/argument that they did not consider and that they feel is compelling, then they may adjust their ratings to incorporate that information.
 - d. The group does not have to achieve consensus. If panelists honestly disagree, that is fine. We are trying to get the best judgment of each panelist. Panelists should not feel compelled or coerced into making a rating they disagree with.
 - e. As they finish the discussion for each MAP-A, each panelist should once again place it into the appropriate pile.

Encourage the panelists to use the discussion and feedback to assess how stringent or lenient a judge they are. If a panelist is categorizing MAP-As consistently higher or lower than the group, he/she may have a different understanding of the Achievement Level Descriptions than the rest of the group. **It is O.K. for panelists to disagree, but that disagreement should be based on a common understanding of the Achievement Level Descriptions.**

4. Once the discussions have been completed, each panelist will complete the Round 2 section of the Lower Cut Rating Form, again indicating the level they feel each MAP-A should be categorized into.
5. Check the Round 2 section of the Lower Cut Rating Form to ensure they have been completed properly and deliver the forms to the war room for data entry. These forms will be returned to the panelists to facilitate with Round 3.

Ratings: Upper Cut

Overview of Upper Cut Ratings: Once Rounds 1 and 2 have been completed for the middle and lower cuts, the process will be repeated one more time for the upper cut. The panelists will set aside the two piles of MAP-As that they have classified as either *Below Basic* or *Basic*, and work only with the MAP-As they feel are proficient or above. Working their way through each MAP-A in the pile, the panelists will subdivide them into two new piles: *Proficient* and *Advanced*. As with the middle and lower cut ratings, in the first round of ratings, panelists will work individually and, in the second round, they will have an opportunity to discuss their categorizations before making their second round ratings.

Upper Cut Round 1: The process here will be basically the same as for the lower cut, except that they will be subdividing the MAP-As they categorized as proficient or above into two achievement levels: *Proficient* and *Advanced*. They will individually work their way through each of the MAP-As they categorized as proficient or above. As they proceed through the MAP-

As, the panelists should ask themselves whether the knowledge, skills and abilities demonstrated in each are consistent with performance that is *Proficient*, or *Advanced*. At the end of Round 1, each panelist will complete the Round 1 section of the Upper Cut Rating Form, indicating the level they feel each MAP-A should be categorized into.

Activities:

1. Make sure panelists have the following materials:
 - a. Set of MAP-As
 - b. Achievement Level Descriptions
 - c. Rating Form for the Upper Cut
2. Have the panelists place the piles of MAP-As they categorized as *Below Basic* or *Basic* aside, where they will be out of their way.
3. Have the panelists individually review each MAP-A in their proficient or above pile; they will have reviewed some of them while doing their middle cut ratings, but they should revisit those briefly to refresh their memory.
4. As they are reviewing the MAP-As, the panelists should keep in mind the Achievement Level Descriptions. They should consider the knowledge, skills and abilities demonstrated by each and how they relate to the definitions of the achievement levels. As they complete each MAP-A, have them place it into one of two piles: *Proficient* or *Advanced*.
5. **Note:** Because the panelists will be reviewing some MAP-As for the first time in this step, it is possible that they may feel that one or more should have been placed in the below proficient pile in the first step. Tell them that, in that case, they should categorize it as *Proficient* for the time being, but make a note on it indicating that it needs to be recategorized. They will have an opportunity in Round 3 to change any of the categorizations; for now, however, they may not move MAP-As out of the proficient or above category.
6. Once panelists have finished sorting the MAP-As, they will fill in the Round 1 section of the Upper Cut Rating Form.
7. As panelists complete the task, ask them to carefully inspect their rating forms to ensure they are filled out properly.
 - a. The ID number must be filled in.
 - b. Each MAP-A must be assigned to one and only one achievement level.
 - c. Although the MAP-As are presented in order from lowest- to highest-scoring, the panelists' category assignments do not need to be in strictly increasing order.

Upper Cut Round 2: In Round 2, the panelists will discuss their categorizations of the MAP-As into the two levels as a large group. After the discussions are complete, the panelists will do their second round of ratings.

Activities:

1. Make sure panelists have the following materials:
 - a. Set of MAP-As
 - b. Achievement Level Descriptions
 - c. Rating Form for the Upper Cut
2. Using a show of hands, indicate on a piece of chart paper how many panelists assigned each MAP-A to each category. In this case, you will be including three categories: below proficient, *Proficient*, and *Advanced*. Even though the panelists will be confining their discussions to the *Proficient/Advanced* cut, including all three categories on the chart paper should help minimize any confusion.
3. Beginning with the first MAP-A for which there was disagreement as to whether it should be categorized as *Proficient* or *Advanced*, the panelists will discuss their rationale for categorizing it as they did.
 - a. Panelists only need to discuss those MAP-As for which there was disagreement as to whether they should be categorized as *Proficient* or *Advanced*.
 - b. Panelists should be encouraged to listen to their colleagues as well as express their own points of view.
 - c. If the panelists hear a logic/rationale/argument that they did not consider and that they feel is compelling, then they may adjust their ratings to incorporate that information.
 - d. The group does not have to achieve consensus. If panelists honestly disagree, that is fine. We are trying to get the best judgment of each panelist. Panelists should not feel compelled or coerced into making a rating they disagree with.
 - e. As they finish the discussion for each MAP-A, each panelist should once again place it into the appropriate pile.

Encourage the panelists to use the discussion and feedback to assess how stringent or lenient a judge they are. If a panelist is categorizing MAP-As consistently higher or lower than the group, he/she may have a different understanding of the Achievement Level Descriptions than the rest of the group. **It is O.K. for panelists to disagree, but that disagreement should be based on a common understanding of the Achievement Level Descriptions.**

4. Once the discussions have been completed, each panelist will complete the Round 2 section of the Upper Cut Rating Form, again indicating the level they feel each MAP-A should be categorized into.
5. Check the Round 2 section of the Upper Cut Rating Form to ensure they have been completed properly and deliver the forms to the war room for data entry. These forms will be returned to the panelists to facilitate with Round 3.

Tabulation of Round 2 Results

Once Round 2 has been completed for all three cuts, the data will be analyzed and information will be provided that the panelists will use for Round 3.

Ratings: Round 3 – All Cuts

Overview of Round 3: The primary purpose of Round 3 is to ask the panelists to discuss their Round 2 ratings for all three cuts as a whole group and to revise their ratings on the basis of that discussion. They will discuss their ratings in the context of the ratings made by other members of the group. Prior to beginning the Round 3 discussions, using a show of hands, indicate on a piece of chart paper how many panelists assigned each MAP-A to each of the four achievement level categories. Also show on the chart paper which MAP-As will be assigned to each level according to the group mean cut points from Round 2 (you will be provided this information by the data analysis team). Focusing on the MAP-As that are near the cut points, the panelists will discuss why they categorized each MAP-A as they did, making sure that all different points of view are included in the discussion.

To aid with the discussion, panelists will also be given impact data, showing the approximate percentage of students who would be classified into each achievement level category based on the room mean cut points from Round 2.

This round will be similar to the Round 2 discussions, except that the panelists will be discussing all three cut points. The purpose of this round is to look at the results holistically, rather than each cut individually. Therefore, the panelists should start the discussions with the lower cut, then proceed to the middle cut and, finally, the upper cut.

Once panelists have reviewed and discussed the Round 2 categorizations, they will be given the opportunity to change or revise their Round 2 ratings.

Activities:

1. Make sure panelists have the following materials:
 - a. The Round 3 rating form
 - b. Set of MAP-As
 - c. Achievement Level Descriptions
2. Have panelists write their ID number on the rating form.
3. Provide an overview of Round 3. Paraphrase the following:
 - a. As in Rounds 1 and 2, the primary purpose is to categorize each MAP-A into the achievement level category where you feel it belongs.
 - b. Each panelist needs to base his/her judgments on his/her experience with the content area, understanding of students, discussions with other panelists and the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to answer each item.
 - c. In addition to the categorization of each MAP-A, panelists should also consider the impact data: based on their knowledge of students and the Achievement Level Descriptions, do the percentages of students falling into each category make

sense? If they do, that is an indication that the cut points are placed appropriately. If they don't, the panelists may want to consider revising their ratings.

4. Review the feedback information with the panelists.
 - a. Show the panelists how the MAP-As will be categorized based on the room mean Round 2 cut point placements.
 - b. Go over the impact data, explaining that if the Round 2 ratings were to be used to set the final cut points, these are the approximate percentages of students who would be classified into each achievement level category.
5. Give panelists an opportunity to ask questions about the feedback information or about the task for Round 3.
6. Beginning with the MAP-As for which there was disagreement as to whether they should be categorized as *Below Basic* or *Basic*, the panelists should begin discussing the categorization of the MAP-As according to the Round 2 ratings. Once they have completed the discussion for the lower cut, they will then proceed to the middle cut and then, finally, to the upper cut.
 - a. Panelists only need to discuss those MAP-As for which there was disagreement as to how they should be categorized.
 - b. Panelists should be encouraged to listen to their colleagues as well as express their own points of view.
 - c. If the panelists hear a logic/rationale/argument that they did not consider and that they feel is compelling, then they may adjust their ratings to incorporate that information.
 - d. The group does not have to achieve consensus. If panelists honestly disagree, that is fine. We are trying to get the best judgment of each panelist. Panelists should not feel compelled or coerced into making a rating they disagree with.
 - e. As they finish the discussion for each MAP-A, each panelist should place it into one of four piles: *Below Basic*, *Basic*, *Proficient*, or *Advanced*.

Encourage the panelists to use the discussion and feedback to assess how stringent or lenient a judge they are. If a panelist is categorizing MAP-As consistently higher or lower than the group, he/she may have a different understanding of the Achievement Level Descriptions. **It is O.K. for panelists to disagree, but that disagreement should be based on a common understanding of the Achievement Level Descriptions.**

7. Once the discussions are complete for the full set of MAP-As, have the panelists fill in the Round 3 Rating Form. When you collect the rating forms, carefully inspect them to ensure they are filled out properly.
 - a. The ID number must be filled in.
 - b. Each MAP-A for Round 3 must have one (and only one) rating.

Grade Level Achievement Level Descriptors

After recommended cut scores have been established for the grade spans, the panels will be asked to revisit the draft achievement level descriptors. They will be asked to make recommendations for language that is teacher and parent friendly.

Complete Evaluation Form

Upon completion of the standard setting process, have panelists fill out the evaluation form. Emphasize that their honest feedback is important.

APPENDIX G: STANDARD SETTING PANELISTS

2008 MAP-A Science Standard Setting Panelist Distribution									
	Elementary Panel		RPDC #	Middle School Panel		RPDC #	High School Panel		RPDC #
<i>Science Teachers</i>	Amy	Barlow	1	Dennis	Kocher	9	Paul	Rutherford	3
	John	Dyck	9	Melissa	Eckert	8			
<i>Parents</i>				Ellen	Rowland	3			
<i>Administrators</i>	Sheryl	Alermatt		Regina	Higgins	9	Walt	Brown	3
	Kathie	Wolff	8	John	Palmer	8	Christine	Taylor	6
	Meg	Sneed	3				Becky	Killian	7
	Mary	Gage	9				Diana	Humphreys	2
<i>Spec. Ed. Teachers</i>	Christine	Bates	6	Glenn	Dalton	1	Mindy	Brown	3
	Ronda	Brown	3	Jennifer	Siem	8	John	Cox	6
	Jennifer	Johnson	6	Nicole	Martinez	3	Lynn	Wapelhurst	2
	Catherine	McCormack	4	Leslie	Laws	7	Marsha	Meeker	4
	Susie	Register	2	Sneh	Kothari	8	Rachael	Thompson	6
	Laura	Borghardt	2	Heather	Suerig		Ronda	McDaniel	1
			Kathy	Gregory	8				

RPDC Code Key	
SE-Cape Girardeau	1
Heart of MO-Columbia	2
Kansas City	3
NE/Truman-Kirksville	4
NW-Maryville	5
S Central-Rolla	6
SW-Springfield	7
St. Louis	8
Central-Warrensburg	9

APPENDIX H: PANELIST DESCRIPTOR RECOMMENDATIONS

**MAP-A Draft Achievement Level Descriptors
Recommendations**

	Science
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work evidence may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work evidence is somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work evidence is connected to the strands and demonstrates application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work evidence is strongly connected to the strands and demonstrates strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.

APPENDIX I: EVALUATION RESULTS

OVERALL

	Very Good	Good	Unsure	Poor	Very Poor	N
What is your overall impression of the process used to set performance standards for the Missouri Alternate Assessment?	7	17	8	2	1	35
	Very Clear	Clear	Somewhat Clear	Not Clear		N
How clear were you with the achievement level descriptors?	8	17	9	1		35
	About Right	Too little time	Too much time			N
How would you judge the length of time of this meeting for setting performance standards	26	7	2			35
What factors influenced the standards you set?	Not at all Influential 1	2	Moderately Influential 3	4	Very Influential 5	N
The achievement level descriptors		3	20	12		35
The assessment samples			8	13	14	35
Other panelists	1	4	18	10	2	35
My experience in the field		2	10	17	5	34
	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Unsure	Probably No	Definitely No	N
Do you believe the cut scores set by the panel are correctly placed on the exam score scale?	4	21	8	1	1	35
How could the standard setting process have been improved?	See GradeSpan/Content Area Results					

For each statement below, please circle the rating that best represents your judgment.	Not at all Useful/Clear 1	2	3	4	Very Useful/Clear 5	N
The opening session was:		1	13	17	3	34
The achievement level descriptors were:	1	1	7	21	4	34
Providing additional details to the achievement level descriptors was:	2	2	9	14	8	35
The discussion with other panelists was:			4	16	15	35
The portfolio rating task was:		3	9	20	2	34
The impact data provided prior to the last round of ratings was:			10	15	6	31

GRADE 5

	Very Good	Good	Unsure	Poor	Very Poor	N
What is your overall impression of the process used to set performance standards for the Missouri Alternate Assessment?	1	7	4			12
	Very Clear	Clear	Somewhat Clear	Not Clear		N
How clear were you with the achievement level descriptors?	2	5	5			12
	About Right	Too little time	Too much time			
How would you judge the length of time of this meeting for setting performance standards	10	2				12
What factors influenced the standards you set?	Not at all Influential 1	2	Moderately Influential 3	4	Very Influential 5	N
The achievement level descriptors				8	4	12
The assessment samples			3	4	5	12
Other panelists		3	5	3	1	12
My experience in the field		2	5	4		11
	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Unsure	Probably No	Definitely No	N
Do you believe the cut scores set by the panel are correctly placed on the exam score scale?	1	7	4			12

~ I've looked at ALL aspects of the portfolio to make a determination.
 ~ We had a variety of people with different backgrounds, providing input.
 ~ There were very few numbered MAP-A's that I had to place in a higher or level cut score category.
 ~ We had a little trouble coming to a consensus, but overall I believe we had a good cut scores.
 ~ Some people in our group have done work in scoring MAP-A and I think they lowered our cut scores.
 ~ Yes - but it is concerning that so many were below basic because they didn't connect to the standards - it seems the teachers were not clear on how to set up their MAP-A.
 ~ We seemed somewhat sure but still had some voiced concerns.
 ~ I felt that everyone put time and their knowledge to make the best judgment. The decisions made were pretty clear cut.
 ~ There was some disagreement on a few items. Also, the way they were scored (ordered) was not necessarily the way I felt they should have been.
 ~ We had lots of discussion about the portfolios and had great difficulty with understanding why portfolio #17 ranked so high.
 ~ Questionable due to being 1st year for science other than pilot - appears that more training needed regarding connection to standards. Facilitator needs to be either trained or experienced to expedite process to ask guiding questions.

How could the standard setting process have been improved?~ More descriptive (measureable words) achievement level descriptors.~ A more clearly defined explanation of what factors should not influence our rating. For example, should we consider data errors, should we penalize for activity descriptions not matching accuracy and independence explanations.~ Note: one panelist was very unprofessional in that she put feet upon another chair with shoes off. Very distracting and took away from the setting. ~ Additionally training on how the portfolios were scored. What made some unscorable, etc!~ Explain more about the scores at the beginning. Being a first time standard setter, I did not really understand the process and why we were making cut scores. ~ Maybe more insight into the scoring process before we did our part. It was hard to tell why some of the portfolios were ranked high or low and with out knowing what made part of a portfolio "unscorable" we were unsure of how to rate the other part. ~ Our facilitator needed a bit ore training and knowledge regarding the process. When the tests are given to us are #1 low to ? high are we not somewhat biased? ~ The facilitator did a good job - but I think it would have helped her to have more training herself in the actual MAP-A. She stated she was unfamiliar with our test. ~ Our leader from Measured Progress, Amanda was very nervous. I feel she needed more training. She was not familiar with the assessment.~ By perhaps not giving the panelist the portfolio in scored order - it seems to influence the decisions.

For each statement below, please circle the rating that best represents your judgment.	Not at all Useful/Clear 1	2	3	4	Very Useful/Clear 5	N
The opening session was:		1	7	4		12
The achievement level descriptors were:		1	4	5	1	11

Providing additional details to the achievement level descriptors was:			4	4	4	12
The discussion with other panelists was:			1	4	7	12
The portfolio rating task was:		1	6	5		12
The impact data provided prior to the last round of ratings was:			7	3	1	11
<p>Please provide any additional comments or suggestions about the standard setting process.</p> <p>~ I really need to look at this measurement and process as a whole.</p> <p>~ Many of our MAP-A's were poorly scored. This made it difficult to make a clear decision. A lot of down time.</p> <p>~ Referring to #11 above. The rating task was not explained well, by our Elementary adequately trained and didn't stay with the group throughout the process. Many cell phone interruptions gave the appearance she was more concerned with things out of the room/city than here.</p> <p>~ The proctors need more training!</p> <p>~ I think people who have never given the MAP-A had a great disadvantage in this process. I felt sorry for the science teachers because they really didn't understand or have prior knowledge. Maybe they could have an extra session at the beginning to explain more about the MAP-A in general. We had too much down time in the afternoon of the 2nd day! It took an hour for us to get back our scores. Is there any way this could be organized in a different way so we wouldn't have to wait to get the cut scores back?</p> <p>~ More than 1 statistician is needed.</p> <p>~ May need more than 1 statistician for the process.</p> <p>~ Hard to determine rating with unscorable portfolios. Didn't know if it should be ignored or figured in...Also, felt bad for our leader ---definitely needed more training.</p> <p>~ There was a large amount of down time.</p> <p>~ Having a 2nd statistician would have helped move the process along faster.</p>						

GRADE 8

	Very Good	Good	Unsure	Poor	Very Poor	N
What is your overall impression of the process used to set performance standards for the Missouri Alternate Assessment?	1	5	3	2	1	12
	Very Clear	Clear	Somewhat Clear	Not Clear		N
How clear were you with the achievement level descriptors?	1	8	2	1		12
	About Right	Too little time	Too much time			
How would you judge the length of time of this meeting for setting performance standards	6	5	1			12
	Not at all Influential		Moderately Influential		Very Influential	N
What factors influenced the standards you set?	1	2	3	4	5	
The achievement level descriptors			1	7	4	12
The assessment samples			3	4	5	12
Other panelists	1		6	4	1	12
My experience in the field			2	7	3	12
	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Unsure	Probably No	Definitely No	N
Do you believe the cut scores set by the panel are correctly placed on the exam score scale?	3	7	2			12

~ Much group discussion
 ~ The curve is balanced and shows the skill levels of these students appropriately.
 ~ After discussions within our group I believe the reasons why a panelist put a portfolio in a certain category were justified.
 ~ Seems like an appropriate proportion
 ~ I think a lot of this is very subjective not objective.
 ~ I thought we were right on! Our scores came out 50/50.

How could the standard setting process have been improved?~ Simplify~ I think it would have been beneficial to know the process the end result. I don't believe that was explained very well. The first day was very frustrating! We did not see the purpose and we were not sure what we were being asked to do. The second day was much better!~ At times, conversations were rambling and not conducive to overall findings on scorable papers. ~ The purpose was unclear, process seemed random, making it feel unimportant and irrelevant. ~ Anchor papers~ It seems we had different rules for every level and very little consistency. It also seems it is the first year and people wouldn't really know what to do. ~ More clarity on B, BB, P and A levels. ~ Redefining or elaborating the achievement level descriptors was very confusing and made our work get off to a different start.

For each statement below, please circle the rating that best represents your judgment.	Not at all Useful/Clear 1	2	3	4	Very Useful/Clear 5	N
The opening session was:			5	4	2	11
The achievement level descriptors were:	1		2	7	2	12
Providing additional details to the achievement level descriptors was:	2	2	4	3	1	12
The discussion with other panelists was:			2	7	3	12
The portfolio rating task was:		2	2	6	1	11
The impact data provided prior to the last round of ratings was:			2	6	2	10

Please provide any additional comments or suggestions about the standard setting process.

- ~ It took much time for me to catch on to the what were to look at and consider as we analyzed each portfolio - some prior and further explanation may have helped - some example.
- ~ Our facilitator was not sure what we were suppose to be doing, it was not until after lunch that she was able to tell us what information we needed to consider. I also felt the "rules" changed between rounds. After we found out what we were supposed to do, it was much better. I just felt sometime was wasted.
- ~ Validity is questioned as there appears to be different rules in almost every round.
- ~ There seemed to be a lack of significance.
- ~ Descriptors were very non-descriptive and having facilitators who weren't allowed to help as very frustrating.

GRADE 11

	Very Good	Good	Unsure	Poor	Very Poor	N
What is your overall impression of the process used to set performance standards for the Missouri Alternate Assessment?	5	5	1			11
	Very Clear	Clear	Somewhat Clear	Not Clear		N
How clear were you with the achievement level descriptors?	5	4	2			11
	About Right	Too little time	Too much time			
How would you judge the length of time of this meeting for setting performance standards	10		1			11
	Not at all Influential 1	2	Moderately Influential 3	4	Very Influential 5	N
The achievement level descriptors			2	5	4	11
The assessment samples			2	5	4	11
Other panelists		1	7	3		11
My experience in the field			3	6	2	11
	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Unsure	Probably No	Definitely No	N
Do you believe the cut scores set by the panel are correctly placed on the exam score scale?		7	2	1	1	11

~ I feel that teacher training is a significant factor in the %'s. Teachers need more training in #1 assessment as well as content. ~ Different factors such as: teacher knowledge science application to goals of student individually. ~ With a variety of expertise in the room, explanations and discussions, the cohesiveness of the group allowed for a positive and productive score setting. ~ Below basic and basic were off balance. ~ Originally the cut between below basic and basic was too broad making the below basic too high (a lot of unscorable portions). So will depend on how final cut went. ~ We looked at the samples very carefully. However, there were a lot of unscorable entries that messed up the placements. ~ We readjusted. Should fall out okay. ~ The gaps were not as expected. Cut off scores were to unequal at lower level.

How could the standard setting process have been improved?

~ using a smaller number of people per grade level - 1 each of all categories of people - 1 science, 1 reg teacher 1 reg. sped, etc.
 ~ more chocolate.
 ~ Don't make us check out @ noon from the hotel - either stay another night or have us finish @ noon.
 ~ This was a learning experience. I see no improvements.
 ~ Too much time when some people could not go on and had long wait times between activities.
 ~ For us to not have gotten them in order but rather by "letter" so we wouldn't have a pre-conceived idea of ranking.
 ~ Training of teachers implementing the MAP-A needs to be more intensive. Many of the errors/unscorables might have been teacher training issues.
 ~ no suggestions - it went well.
 ~ A training session for those unfamiliar with MAP-A might be helpful.

For each statement below, please circle the rating that best represents your judgment.	Not at all Useful/Clear 1	2	3	4	Very Useful/Clear 5	N
The opening session was:			1	9	1	11
The achievement level descriptors were:			1	9	1	11
Providing additional details to the achievement level descriptors was:			1	7	3	11
The discussion with other panelists was:			1	5	5	11
The portfolio rating task was:			1	9	1	11

The impact data provided prior to the last round of ratings was:			1	6	3	10
<p>Please provide any additional comments or suggestions about the standard setting process.</p> <p>~ Being my first time I really have no additional comments or suggestion other than thank you for choosing me. This was an experience and enjoyed the time to meet other people.</p> <p>~ It is always learning experience for me and I hope to continue to be able to be involved in it. Thank you.</p> <p>~ Achievement level Descriptors.</p> <p>~ Maybe connected on proficient clarified.</p> <p>~ Basic (practice skill).</p> <p>~ Good job Susan!</p>						

APPENDIX J: PANELIST RESULTS

Table 1: Round 2 Ratings: Grade 5

Portfolio	Raw Score	Panelist												Performance Level
		id 01	id 02	id 03	id 04	id 05	id 06	id 07	id 08	id 09	id 10	id 11	id 12	
1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	8	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1
7	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	11	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
14	12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	13	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1
16	13	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
17	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	15	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
20	15	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
21	16	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
22	16	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
23	17	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
24	17	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2
25	18	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
26	18	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3
27	19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3
28	19	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3
29	20	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	3
30	20	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3
31	21	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
32	21	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
33	22	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
34	22	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Table 2: Round 2 Ratings: Grade 8

Portfolio	Raw Score	Panelist												Performance Level
		id 01	id 02	id 03	id 04	id 05	id 06	id 07	id 08	id 09	id 10	id 11	id 12	
1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	7	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1
7	8	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1
8	8	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
9	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
10	9	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
11	10	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
12	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
13	11	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
14	11	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
15	12	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2
16	12	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
17	13	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
18	13	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2
19	14	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2
20	14	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
21	15	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3
22	15	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3
23	16	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	3
24	16	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
25	17	4	1	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	4	3
26	17	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
27	18	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3
28	18	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
29	19	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
30	19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
31	20	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
32	20	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
33	21	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
34	21	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
35	22	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
36	22	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4

Table 3: Round 2 Ratings: Grade 11

Portfolio	Raw Score	Panelist											Performance Level
		id 01	id 02	id 03	id 04	id 05	id 06	id 07	id 08	id 09	id 10	id 11	
1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
8	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
9	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
10	9	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1
11	10	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
12	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
13	11	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1
14	11	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
15	12	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
16	12	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
17	13	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
18	14	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2
19	14	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2
20	15	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
21	15	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
22	16	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	2	2	2
23	16	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	2	2
24	17	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3
25	17	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
26	18	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
27	18	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
28	19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
29	19	3	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	3
30	20	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
31	20	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
32	21	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
33	21	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4
34	22	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
35	22	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4

Table 4: Round 3 Ratings: Grade 5

Portfolio	Raw Score	Panelist												Performance Level
		id 01	id 02	id 03	id 04	id 05	id 06	id 07	id 08	id 09	id 10	id 11	id 12	
1	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	8	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1
7	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	11	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
13	12	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1
14	12	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	13	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1
16	13	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1
17	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
18	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
19	15	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
20	15	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
21	16	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
22	16	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
23	17	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
24	17	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2
25	18	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
26	18	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3
27	19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3
28	19	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3
29	20	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	3
30	20	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3
31	21	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
32	21	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
33	22	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
34	22	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Table 5: Round 3 Ratings: Grade 8

Portfolio	Raw Score	Panelist												Performance Level
		id 01	id 02	id 03	id 04	id 05	id 06	id 07	id 08	id 09	id 10	id 11	id 12	
1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	7	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	7	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1
7	8	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
8	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
10	9	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2
11	10	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
12	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
13	11	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
14	11	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
15	12	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2
16	12	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
17	13	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
18	13	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
19	14	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2
20	14	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2
21	15	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2
22	15	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
23	16	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3
24	16	3	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
25	17	4	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	4	3
26	17	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
27	18	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3
28	18	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
29	19	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3
30	19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
31	20	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
32	20	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
33	21	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
34	21	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
35	22	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
36	22	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4

Table 6: Round 3 Ratings: Grade 11

Portfolio	Raw Score	Panelist											Performance Level
		id 01	id 02	id 03	id 04	id 05	id 06	id 07	id 08	id 09	id 10	id 11	
1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	7	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
9	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
10	9	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
11	10	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
12	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
13	11	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
14	11	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
15	12	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
16	12	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
17	13	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
18	14	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
19	14	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
20	15	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
21	15	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
22	16	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
23	16	1	3	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	2	2
24	17	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3
25	17	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
26	18	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
27	18	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
28	19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
29	19	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3
30	20	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3
31	20	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
32	21	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
33	21	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	4
34	22	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
35	22	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4

Appendix D: Forms

This appendix describes and presents samples of the forms required in a completed MAP-A. The forms are described and outlined in Table 1. Data collection and submission requirements are outlined in Tables 2 – 5.

Table 1. MAP-A Forms

Content	Description
Table of Contents Checklist	Acts as a guide for organization of the completed MAP-A.
Validation Form	Provides documentation of the individuals who have reviewed and/or contributed to the MAP-A. Allows for optional brief reporting of extended absences and/or student's communication mode. The principal, assistant principal or special education director must sign this form prior to submission of the MAP-A.
Entry/Data Summary Sheets	Serves as a record of student performance on each API assessed. The student's score for Level of Accuracy and Level of Independence for each API will be determined based on the percentages recorded on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet.
API Duplication/Justification Form	Supplies specific content-based evidence to support the justification/rationale for duplicate use of the API.
Student Work Records	Provides documentation of student work for each API assessed in both collection periods. Student Work Records should demonstrate the application of the API in a standards-based activity. You may show evidence of student work by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collecting student work samples such as worksheets, drawings, writings, journal entries, or projects; or • observing the student and recording his or her performance.

Table 2. Minimum Page Requirements for MAP-A Submissions at Each Grade Level

Grade Level	Mathematics	Communication Arts	Science	Min. Total of Pages
Elementary, Grades 3 & 4	12	12	---	26
Elementary, Grade 5	12	12	6	32
Middle School, Grades 6 & 7	12	12	---	26
Middle School, Grade 8	12	12	6	32
High School, Grade 10	12	---	---	14
High School, Grade 11	---	12	6	20

Table 3. Mathematics MAP-A Data Collection and Submission Requirements

Strand	API	Collection Period	Data Collection Required	Forms Required		Min. Total of Pages
Strand 1	API 1	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	12
		2	3 data points			
	API 2	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	
		2	3 data points			
Strand 2	API 1	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	
		2	3 data points			
	API 2	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	
		2	3 data points			

Table 4: Communication Arts MAP A Data Collection and Submission Requirements

Strand	API	Collection Period	Data Collection Required	Forms Required		Min. Total of Pages
Strand 1	API 1	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	12
		2	3 data points			
	API 2	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	
		2	3 data points			
Strand 2	API 1	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	
		2	3 data points			
	API 2	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	
		2	3 data points			

Table 5: Science MAP A Data Collection and Submission Requirements

Strand	API	Collection Period	Data Collection Required	Forms Required		Min. Total of Pages
Process Strand 7 and Content Strand	Process API 1 and Content API 1	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	6
		2	3 data points			
Process Strand 8 and Content Strand	Process API 2 and Content API 2	1	3 data points	1 Entry/Data Summary Sheet	2 Student Work Records	
		2	3 data points			

Table 6: Requirements for Proper MAP A Documentation

	Mathematics	Communication Arts	Science
Grades Tested	3-8, 10	3-8, 11	5, 8, 11
# of Strands required per content area	2	2	4
# of APIs required per Strand	2	2	1
# of Entries Required	4	4	2
Minimum pages per content area	12	12	6

The following forms are required for the MAP-A.

1. Table of Contents Checklists
 - Grades 3, 4
 - Grade 5
 - Grades 6, 7
 - Grade 8
 - Grade 10
 - Grade 11
2. Validation Form
3. Entry/Data Summary Sheet
4. API Duplication/Justification Form
5. Student Work Record

The MAP-A requires content area strands specific to grade span. Correct strands must be recorded on the Entry/Data Summary Sheets for each student.

Content Area	Title of Strand	Grades
Mathematics	Strand 1: Numbers and Operations (NO)	All Grades
	Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric and Spatial Relationships (AR/GS)	Grades 3–5
	Strand 2: Data and Probability (DP)	Grades 6–8
	Strand 2: Measurement (ME)	Grade 10
Communication Arts	Strand 1: Reading (RD and/or RP)	All Grades
	Strand 2: Writing (WC)	Grades 3–5
	Strand 2: Writing (WP)	Grades 6–8, 11

Science	CONTENT STRANDS	
	• Strand 7: Scientific Inquiry (SI)	Required at all Grade Levels
	• Strand 8: Impact of Science, Technology and Human Activity (IS)	Required at all Grade Levels
	PROCESS STRANDS	
	• Strand 3: Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms (LO)	Required for Elementary Grade 5
	• Strand 4: Changes in the Ecosystems and Interaction of Organisms with their Environments (EC)	Required for Elementary Grade 5
	• Strand 1: Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy (ME)	Required For Middle School Grade 8
	• Strand 2: Properties and Principles of Force and Motion (FM)	Required for Middle School Grade 8
	• Strand 5: Process and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere) (ES)	Required fro High School Grade 11
	• Strand 6: Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It (UN)	Required for High School Grade 11

Table of Contents Checklist

Elementary

Student: _____	School Year: _____	Grade: 3 4
----------------	--------------------	------------

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner)

- Table of Contents Checklist
- Validation Form

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP) Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP) Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC) Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC) Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO) Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO) Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Table of Contents Checklist

Elementary

Student: _____	School Year: _____	Grade: 5
----------------	--------------------	----------

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner)

- Table of Contents Checklist
- Validation Form

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Science Strand 7: Scientific Inquiry (IN) and Strand 3 (LO) or 4 (EC)

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Science Strand 8: Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity (ST) and Strand 3 (LO) or 4 (EC)

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Table of Contents Checklist

Middle School

Student: _____	School Year: _____	Grade: 6 7
----------------	--------------------	------------

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner.)

- Table of Contents Checklist
- Validation Form

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Data & Probability (DP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Data & Probability (DP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Table of Contents Checklist

Middle School

Student: _____	School Year: _____	Grade: 8
----------------	--------------------	----------

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner.)

- Table of Contents Checklist
- Validation Form

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Data & Probability (DP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Data & Probability (DP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Science Strand 7: Scientific Inquiry (IN) and Strand 1 (ME) or 2 (FM)

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Science Strand 8: Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity (ST) and Strand 1 (ME) or 2 (FM)

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Table of Contents Checklist

High School

Student: _____	School Year: _____	Grade: 10
----------------	--------------------	-----------

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner.)

- Table of Contents Checklist
- Validation Form

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Measurement (ME)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Mathematics Strand 2: Measurement (ME)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Table of Contents Checklist

High School

Student: _____	School Year: _____	Grade: 11
----------------	--------------------	-----------

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner.)

- Table of Contents Checklist
- Validation Form

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #1

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WP)

Alternate Performance Indicator #2

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Science Strand 7: Scientific Inquiry (IN) and Strand 5 (ES) or 6 (UN)

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Science Strand 8: Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity (ST) and Strand 5 (ES) or 6 (UN)

- Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
- Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Validation Form

Student: _____

Grade: _____

District & School of Attendance: _____

This form provides documentation of the individuals who have reviewed and/or contributed to this MAP-A.

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: Person Responsible for
the MAP-A Administration

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____

Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

OPTIONAL- Use this space to provide information regarding the student's mode of communication.

Please obtain administrator's (principal, assistant principal, or special education director) signature prior to submission.

Signature Date

Print Name

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name:				Grade:		
Strand:		Big Idea:		Concept:		
API :						
Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>						
	Collection Period 1 January 10 – February 4			Collection Period 2 February 7 – March 4		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.			Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.		
Date						
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %						
Independence %						
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy:			Accuracy:		
	Independence:			Independence:		

	API Entry Average
Level of Accuracy	
Level of Independence	

API Duplication Justification Form
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name:		Grade:
Content Area:		Strand:
API #:	API Description:	
<p>You indicated that this student has been assessed on this API in previous years.</p> <p>The instructional decision to duplicate an API from a prior year's MAP-A assessment must be justified on this form. The justification must be included with the MAP-A submission.</p>		
Justification/Rationale: (Supply specific justification for duplicate use of the API.)		
Plan of Student Progress: (Supply specific plans in place to assure student growth across API's content.)		

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Science

Student Name:				Grade:		
Process Strand:		Big Idea:		Concept:		
Process API:						
Content Strand:		Big Idea:		Concept:		
Content API:						
	Collection Period 1 January 10 – February 4			Collection Period 2 February 7 – March 4		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.			Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.		
Date						
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %						
Independence %						
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy:			Accuracy:		
	Independence:			Independence:		

	API Entry Average
Level of Accuracy	
Level of Independence	

Student Work Record
Mathematics/Communication Arts
 Attach student work sample if appropriate

Student Name:		Grade:	Date:
Strand:	Big Idea:		Concept:
API:			
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)			
Evaluation of Student's Performance:			
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy .		Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence .	
Level of Accuracy _____%		Level of Independence _____%	

Student Work Record
Science

Attach student work sample if appropriate

Student Name:		Grade:	Date:
Process Strand:	Big Idea:		Concept:
Process API:			
Content Strand:	Big Idea:		Concept:
Content API:			
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to both APIs, and how it demonstrates application.)			
Evaluation of Student's Performance:			
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy .		Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence .	
Level of Accuracy: _____%		Level of Independence: _____%	

Include student work sample here, if appropriate.

Submit student work sample on 8 ½ X 11 paper.

This page is a placeholder. **Do not** tape, staple, or otherwise attach student work to this page.

Do not submit photos.

Appendix E: MAP-A Achievement Level Descriptors and Cut Scores

Achievement Level Descriptors

Grades 3 5	Mathematics
Level not Determined	Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric and Spatial Relationships. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric and Spatial Relationships. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric and Spatial Relationships. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric and Spatial Relationships. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.

Grades 6 8		Mathematics
Level not Determined	Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.	
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Data and Probability. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Data and Probability. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Data and Probability. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Data and Probability. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	

Grade 10		Mathematics	
Level not Determined	Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.		
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.		
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.		
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.		
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.		

Grades 3 5		Communication Arts
Level not Determined	Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.	
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of the Reading Development and Processes and Standard English Conventions. Student work may be loosely connected to the standards. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Basic	Student has a limited understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of the Reading Development and Processes and Standard English Conventions. Student work may be somewhat connected to the standards. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Proficient	Student has some understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of the Reading Development and Processes and Standard English Conventions. Student work may be connected to the standards and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	
Advanced	Student has a high level of understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of the Reading Development and Processes and Standard English Conventions. Student work may be closely connected to the standards and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	

Grades 6 8		Communication Arts
Level not Determined	Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.	
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of Reading and Writing Development and Processes. Student work may be loosely connected to the standards. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Basic	Student has a limited understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of Reading and Writing Development and Processes. Student work may be somewhat connected to the standards. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Proficient	Student has some understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of Reading and Writing Development and Processes. Student work may be connected to the standards and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	
Advanced	Student has a high level of understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of Reading and Writing Development and Processes. Student work may be closely connected to the standards and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	

Grades 11		Communication Arts
Level not Determined	Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.	
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of Reading and Writing Development and Processes. Student work may be loosely connected to the standards. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Basic	Student has a limited understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of Reading and Writing Development and Processes. Student work may be somewhat connected to the standards. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Proficient	Student has some understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of Reading and Writing Development and Processes. Student work may be connected to the standards and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	
Advanced	Student has a high level of understanding of the concepts contained in the grade appropriate APIs within the standards of Reading and Writing Development and Processes. Student work may be closely connected to the standards and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	

Grade 5		Science	
Level not Determined	Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.		
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.		
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.		
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.		
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms and Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environment. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.		

Grade 8		Science
Level not Determined	Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.	
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy, and Properties and Principles of Force and Motion. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy, and Properties and Principles of Force and Motion. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.	
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy, and Properties and Principles of Force and Motion. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy, and Properties and Principles of Force and Motion. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.	

Grade 11		Science	
Level not Determined	Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.		
Below Basic	Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Process and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere), and Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.		
Basic	Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Process and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere), and Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.		
Proficient	Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Process and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere), and Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.		
Advanced	Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Scientific Inquiry, Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity, Process and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere), and Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.		

MAP-A Cut Scores

MAP-A cut scores for Mathematics, Communication Arts, and Science are found in the following table.

Grade Span	Content Area	Ach. Level	2010 2011 Raw Score Range
3-5	Math	BB	3-15
		B	16-26
		P	27-39
		A	40-44
3-5	CA	BB	3-18
		B	19-29
		P	30-40
		A	41-44
5	Science	BB	3-10
		B	11-16
		P	17-20
		A	21-22
6-8	Math	BB	3-20
		B	21-28
		P	29-40
		A	41-44
6-8	CA	BB	3-20
		B	21-32
		P	33-41
		A	42-44
8	Science	BB	3-10
		B	11-16
		P	17-20
		A	21-22
10	Math	BB	3-19
		B	20-30
		P	31-41
		A	42-44
11	CA	BB	3-23
		B	24-33
		P	34-40
		A	41-44
11	Science	BB	3-10
		B	11-16
		P	17-20
		A	21-22

Appendix F: Administration Training Materials

MAP-A 2010 – 2011 ADMINISTRATION TRAINING SPECIAL SESSION—MAP-A SHORT COURSE



Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Assessment Resource Center

Who are MAP-A Students?

- ☐ Severe cognitive disabilities
- ☐ Do not keep pace with peers
- ☐ Educational focus centers on essential skills
- ☐ IEP team recommends alternate assessment
- ☐ Excessive absences, visual or auditory disabilities, social, cultural, language, or economic differences alone don't call for MAP-A

Topics

- ☐ What is the MAP-A?
- ☐ Students Assessed with MAP-A
- ☐ Creating the MAP-A Assessment
- ☐ Design of the MAP-A
- ☐ MAP-A Scoring Dimensions

Who are MAP-A Students?

- ☐ Primary Disability Diagnosis
 - 53% MR
 - 17% Autism
 - 11% Multiple Disabilities
 - 9% Other Health Diagnoses
 - 10% Various

What is the MAP-A?

- ☐ Tests and Assessments
- ☐ No Child Left Behind
 - All students participate in state tests
- ☐ Missouri Assessment Program
 - Mathematics, Communication Arts, and Science
 - Links Missouri's Show-Me Standards, Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
 - Alternate assessment provides opportunities for all Missouri students

Creating the MAP-A Assessment

- ☐ Know your student
- ☐ Select/design assessment tasks
 - Know and can do
 - Grade-appropriate APIs
 - Consider student accuracy and independence
- ☐ Write brief description
- ☐ Administer activities & record data
 - 6 data points
- ☐ Describe student performance

Step by Step Process

1. Verify student eligibility for participation in the MAP-A. Refer to the student's IEP.
2. Determine the composition of the instructional team that will assess the student and fully inform all participants about the MAP-A.
3. Identify the mandatory strands in each content area.
4. Select Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs) for each required content area strand.
5. Review the requirements for documentation for the MAP-A.
6. Determine the data collection system for documentation of student performance.
7. Collect and record data throughout the assessment period.
8. Select one Student Work Record per entry to include in the MAP-A for each collection period.
9. Complete the Student Work Record.
10. Complete the Entry/Data Summary Sheet for each entry.
11. Assemble the MAP-A documentation.
12. Submit completed MAP-A.

MAP-A Design

- ☐ Mathematics
 - 3-8 and 10
- ☐ Communication Arts
 - 3-8 and 11
- ☐ Science
 - 5, 8, and 11

MAP-A Design

Content Area	Title of Strand	Grade Focus
Mathematics MA	Numbers and Operations (NO)	3 – 8 & 10
	Algebraic Relationships (AR)	3, 4, & 5
	<i>and/or</i> Geometric and Spatial Relationships (GS)	
	Data and Probability (DP)	6, 7, & 8
	Measurement (ME)	10
Communication Arts CA	Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process. (RD and/or RP)	3-8 & 11
	Compose well-developed text using standard English conventions. (WC)	3, 4, & 5
	Apply a writing process in composing text or write effectively in various forms and types of writing. (WP)	6 – 8 & 11

MAP-A Forms

- ☐ Table of Contents Checklist
- ☐ Validation Form
- ☐ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- ☐ API Duplication/Justification Form
- ☐ Student Work Record

MAP-A Design

Content Area	Title of Strand	Grade Focus
Science SCI <i>Process Strands</i>	Scientific Inquiry (IN)	5, 8, & 11
	Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity (ST)	5, 8, & 11
Science SCI <i>Content Strands</i>	Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms (LO)	5
	Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environments (EC)	5
	Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy (ME)	8
	Properties and Principles of Force and Motion (FM)	8
	Processes and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (ES)	11
	Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects within It (UN)	11



Table of Contents Checklist

Elementary

Student: _____ School Year: _____ Grade: 3 4 5

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner)

- ☐ Table of Contents Checklist
- ☐ Validation Form
- ☐ Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)
 - ☐ Alternate Performance Indicator #1
 - ☐ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
 - ☐ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
 - ☐ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record
- ☐ Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RD/RP)
 - ☐ Alternate Performance Indicator #2
 - ☐ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
 - ☐ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
 - ☐ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record
- ☐ Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC)
 - ☐ Alternate Performance Indicator #1
 - ☐ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
 - ☐ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
 - ☐ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record
- ☐ Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WC)
 - ☐ Alternate Performance Indicator #2
 - ☐ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
 - ☐ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
 - ☐ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record
- ☐ Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)
 - ☐ Alternate Performance Indicator #1
 - ☐ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
 - ☐ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
 - ☐ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record
- ☐ Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO)
 - ☐ Alternate Performance Indicator #2
 - ☐ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
 - ☐ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
 - ☐ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record
- ☐ Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS)
 - ☐ Alternate Performance Indicator #1
 - ☐ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
 - ☐ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
 - ☐ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record
- ☐ Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS)
 - ☐ Alternate Performance Indicator #2
 - ☐ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
 - ☐ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record
 - ☐ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record

Validation Form

Student: _____ Grade: _____
 District & School of Attendance: _____
 This form provides documentation of the individuals who have reviewed and/or contributed to this MAP-A.

Name: _____ Position: _____
 Contribution to the MAP-A: _____
 Person Responsible for the MAP-A Administration

Name: _____ Position: _____
 Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____
 Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____
 Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____
 Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

Name: _____ Position: _____
 Contribution to the MAP-A: _____

OPTIONAL- Use this space to provide information regarding the student's mode of communication.

Please obtain administrator's (principal, assistant principal, or special education director) signature prior to submission.

Signature _____ Date _____

API Duplication Justification Form
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: _____ Grade: _____
 Content Area: _____ Strand: _____
 API #: _____ API Description: _____

You indicated that this student has been assessed on this API in previous years.

The instructional decision to duplicate an API from a prior year's MAP-A assessment must be justified on this form. The justification must be included with the MAP-A submission.

Justification/Rationale: (Supply specific justification for duplicate use of the API.)

Plan of Student Progress: (Supply specific plans in place to assure student growth across API's content.)

Page: _____

Mode of Communication

OPTIONAL - Use this space to provide information regarding the student's mode of communication.

Grant is an eleven-year-old student with an educational diagnosis of autism that affects his ability to access the academic curriculum in the following ways: difficulty with task focus, adapting to change and effectively communicating his wants, needs and ideas. Grant responds best to a highly structured environment, predictable routine, visual support strategies, direct instruction of target skills with opportunity to generalize those skills.

Grant's oral communication is significantly limited. His spontaneous language typically consists of single words (including immediate echolalia) and occasional short, telegraphic phrases. Grant tends to be prompt dependent, waiting for an initial sound cue to respond verbally.

OPTIONAL - Use this space to provide information regarding the student's mode of communication.

Dane is non-verbal. He uses a wrist walker to say a variety of phrases and words. He also uses two different communication boards in the classroom that are not as portable.

Dane expresses his displeasure with grunts and whines quite often. He laughs a lot when he is enjoying activities.

Student Work Record
Mathematics/Communication Arts
 Attach student work sample, if appropriate.

Student Name: _____ Grade: _____ Date: _____
 Strand: RP _____ Big Idea: _____ Concept: _____
 API: _____
 Task/Activity: _____

Evaluation of Student's Performance:

Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.
Level of Accuracy	Level of Independence

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: _____ Grade: _____
 Strand: _____ Big Idea: _____ Concept: _____
 API: _____

Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? Yes X No

Date	Collection Period 1 January 12 - February 6			Collection Period 2 February 9 - March 6		
	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %						
Independence %						
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy:			Accuracy:		
	Independence:			Independence:		

Level of Accuracy	API Entry Average
Level of Independence	Level of Independence

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Science

Student Name: _____ Grade: _____
 Process Strand: Science - IN _____ Big Idea: _____ Concept: _____
 Process API: _____
 Content Strand: _____ Big Idea: _____ Concept: _____
 Content API: _____

Date	Collection Period 1 January 11 - February 5			Collection Period 2 February 8 - March 5		
	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %						
Independence %						
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy:			Accuracy:		
	Independence:			Independence:		

Level of Accuracy	API Entry Average
Level of Independence	Level of Independence

Student Work Record
Science
Attach student work sample if appropriate.

Student Name:	Grade:	Date:
Process Strand:	Big Idea:	Concept:
Process API:		
Content Strand:	Big Idea:	Concept:
Content API: EC1.6		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to both APIs, and how it demonstrates application.)		
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.		Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.
Level of Accuracy:		Level of Independence:

MAP-A Entry

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

- ## MAP-A Design
- MAP-A Entry
 - Building block of the MAP-A assessment
 - Demonstration of what a student knows and can do
 - Student Work Record
 - Basic component
 - Description of assessment activity
 - Evaluation of student participation

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: John | Grade: 10
Strand: Mathematics - NO | Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates | Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies
Stem: Recognize numerals.
API: NOR.5 Identify a 2-digit number.

Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? Yes No

Date	Collection Period 1 January 11 - February 5			Collection Period 2 February 9 - March 5		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.					
	01/25/2010	01/26/2010	01/27/2010	02/11/2010	02/16/2010	02/22/2010
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %	100	75	80	100	80	80
Independence %	70	100	100	80	100	100
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 83% Independence: 90%			Accuracy: 93% Independence: 93%		
						API Entry Average
						Level of Accuracy
						Level of Independence

- ## MAP-A Design
- MAP-A Entry
 - 2 Student Work Records
 - 1 Entry Data Summary Sheet

Student Work Record
Mathematics/Communication Arts
Attach student work sample if appropriate.

Student Name: John | Grade: 10 | Date: 1/25/2010
Strand: NO | Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates | Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies
Stem: Recognize numerals.
API: NOR.5 Identify a 2-digit number.

Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)
While working at the community center, John had a customer ask if he could tell the customer the carbohydrates of some of the products the customer wanted to buy. The customer had ten different items that he asked John to read the carbohydrates for. The carbohydrates are generally listed as 2-digit numbers on the item's box that John will have to identify.

Evaluation of Student's Performance:

Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.
John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John was able to read all of the 2-digit numbers accurately.	John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John read 7 of the 2-digit numbers independently and 3 of the numbers required content assistance from the paraprofessional. For the three with assistance, each number was read to John separately. Once this was done he could get the 2-digit number himself.
Level of Accuracy 100%	Level of Independence 70%

MAP-A Scoring Dimensions

- ☐ Connection to the Standards
 - Connecting to the API
 - Demonstrating Application
- ☐ Level of Accuracy
- ☐ Level of Independence

Connecting the Activity to the API

- ☐ What is the activity?
- ☐ What skills does it assess?

Student Name: John	Grade: 10	Date: 1/25/2010
Strand: NO	Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies
Stem: Recognize numerals.		
APE: NO8.5 Identify a 2-digit number.		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)		
While working at the community center, John had a customer ask if he could tell the customer the carbohydrates of some of the products the customer wanted to buy. The customer had ten different items that he asked John to read the carbohydrates for. The carbohydrates are generally listed as 2-digit numbers on the item's box that John will have to identify.		

Student Work Record Mathematics/Communication Arts Attach student work sample if appropriate		
Student Name: John	Grade: 10	Date: 1/25/2010
Strand: NO	Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies
Stem: Recognize numerals.		
APE: NO8.5 Identify a 2-digit number.		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)		
While working at the community center, John had a customer ask if he could tell the customer the carbohydrates of some of the products the customer wanted to buy. The customer had ten different items that he asked John to read the carbohydrates for. The carbohydrates are generally listed as 2-digit numbers on the item's box that John will have to identify.		
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.	
John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John was able to read all of the 2-digit numbers accurately.	John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John read 7 of the 2-digit numbers independently and 3 of the numbers required content assistance from the paraprofessional. For the three with assistance, each number was read to John separately. Once this was done he could get the 2-digit number himself.	
Level of Accuracy 100%	Level of Independence 70%	

Does the activity connect to the API?

You Decide

Connecting the Activity to the API

Strand 1: Numbers and Operations		
Big Idea	Concept	Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs)
3 Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	A Describe or represent mental strategies	Recognize numerals. NO8.1. Represent a number or a quantity (e.g., tap, draw objects or tallies). NO8.2. Discriminate between numerals and other printed symbols. NO8.3. Identify/recognize numerals 1 through 10 (e.g., point out a 5, given a choice of numerals). NO8.4. Communicate numerals 1 through 9 (e.g., write, use number cards, communication board). NO8.5. Identify a 2-digit number. NO8.6. Communicate 2-digit numbers. NO8.9.

Application

- ☐ What is the purpose of the activity?
 - Practice of the skill in the API
 - Some purpose other than practice

Student Name: John	Grade: 10	Date: 1/25/2010
Strand: NO	Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies
Stem: Recognize numerals.		
APE: NO8.5 Identify a 2-digit number.		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)		
While working at the community center, John had a customer ask if he could tell the customer the carbohydrates of some of the products the customer wanted to buy. The customer had ten different items that he asked John to read the carbohydrates for. The carbohydrates are generally listed as 2-digit numbers on the item's box that John will have to identify.		

Acquisition or Application?

Acquisition	Application through Standards-based Activities
Copy spelling words	Correct use of spelling words in a journal entry
Flashcard practice of math facts	Application of math facts to determine lunch count

Application or Acquisition?

You Decide

Acquisition or Application?

Acquisition	Application through Standards-based Activities
Flashcard practice of organism parts	Identifying organism parts to participate in a class game of Organism Bingo
Sort coins into piles of like coins	Sort coins needed to make a purchase (e.g., quarters for a juice from the vending machine)

Connection to the Standards Rubric

Score Point	Description
3	The Student Work Records provide documentation of the application of the API/s in two standards-based activities, one per collection period.
2	The Student Work Records provide documentation of the application of the API/s in one standards-based activity (one out of two collection periods).
1	The Student Work Records provide documentation of the API/s but do not include application of the API/s in standards-based activities.
NS	Insufficient information was given. There were no work samples included for the API/s or the work samples submitted were not connected to the API/s.

Acquisition or Application?

Acquisition	Application through Standards-based Activities
Copy science words	Correct use of science terms in a journal entry to describe an investigation.

MAP-A Scoring Dimensions

- ☐ Connection to the Standards
- ☐ Level of Accuracy
- ☐ Level of Independence

Level of Accuracy

Entry/Data Summary Sheet Mathematics/Communication Arts						
Student Name: John				Grade: 10		
Content Area: Mathematics				Strand: NO		
API #: NOB.5				API Description: Identify a 2-digit number.		
Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
Date	Collection Period 1 January 14 – February 8			Collection Period 2 February 11 – March 7		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.					
Date	1/25	1/20	1/24	2/11	2/06	2/09
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy	100	75	80	100	81	85
Independence %	70	100	100	80	100	100
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 85			Accuracy: 89		
	Independence: 90			Independence: 93		

Level of Accuracy	API Entry Average
Level of Independence	92

MAP-A Scoring Dimensions

- ☐ Connection to the Standards
- ☐ Level of Accuracy
- ☐ Level of Independence

Level of Accuracy

Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.

John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John was able to read all of the 2-digit numbers accurately.

Level of Accuracy 100 %

Level of Independence

Entry/Data Summary Sheet Mathematics/Communication Arts						
Student Name: John				Grade: 10		
Content Area: Mathematics				Strand: NO		
API #: NOB.5				API Description: Identify a 2-digit number.		
Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
Date	Collection Period 1 January 14 – February 8			Collection Period 2 February 11 – March 7		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.					
Date	1/25	1/20	1/24	2/11	2/06	2/09
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy	100	75	80	100	81	85
Independence %	70	100	100	80	100	100
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 85			Accuracy: 89		
	Independence: 90			Independence: 93		

Level of Accuracy	API Entry Average
Level of Independence	92

Level of Accuracy Rubric

Score Point	Entry Average %	Description
4	76 -100	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 76-100% of the time across the two data collection periods.
3	51-75	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 51-75% of the time across the two data collection periods.
2	26-50	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 26-50% of the time across the two data collection periods.
1	0-25	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 0-25% of the time across the two data collection periods.
NS		Insufficient information was given. The Entry/Data Summary Sheet was incomplete. Each entry must have six data points (three per collection period) as indicated on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet.

Level of Independence

- ☐ Task Specific Prompts
- ☐ Non-Task Specific Prompts
 - Redirection or focus prompts do not lower independence scores EXCEPT when the API includes "Attend to..."

Content Area: Communication Arts

Strand: Writing

API Stem: Describe a familiar object, person, characters, places and/or events using words/pictures/symbols/objects/actions.

API: WP2.9 Attend to descriptions of objects.

Level of Independence

Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.

John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John read 7 of the 2-digit numbers independently and 3 of the numbers required content assistance from the paraprofessional. For the 3 with assistance, each number was read to John separately. Once this was done he could get the 2-digit number himself.

Level of Independence 70 %

MAP-A 2010 - 2011 ADMINISTRATION TRAINING GENERAL SESSION



Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Assessment Resource Center

Level of Independence Rubric

Score Point	Entry Average %	Description
4	76 -100	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 76-100% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required minimal (0-24% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
3	51-75	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 51-75% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required some (25-49% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
2	26-50	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 26-50% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required frequent (50-74% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
1	0-25	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 0-25% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required extensive (75-100% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
NS		Insufficient information was given. The Entry/Data Summary Sheet was incomplete. Each entry must have six data points (three per collection period) as indicated on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet.

2009-2010 Wrap-up

- ☐ 2009-2010 Score Reports
- ☐ 2009-2010 Impact Data
- ☐ 2009-2010 Scoring Issues
- ☐ Appeals

Questions

???

District Report

A+B C	Mathematics											
	Elementary School Grade 3, 4, 5				Middle School Grade 6, 7, 8				High School Grade 10			
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Advanced	0	0.00	0	0.00	147	26.76	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Proficient	0	0.00	0	0.00	172	30.78	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Basic	0	0.00	0	0.00	129	23.13	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Below Basic	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
NSP	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total count	0	0.00	0	0.00	548	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

MAP-A 2010 Missouri Assessment Program - Alternate	Communication Arts											
	Elementary School Grade 3, 4, 5				Middle School Grade 6, 7, 8				High School Grade 10			
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Advanced	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Proficient	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Basic	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Below Basic	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
NSP	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total count	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

District Report	Science											
	Elementary School Grade 3, 4, 5				Middle School Grade 6, 7, 8				High School Grade 10			
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Advanced	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Proficient	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Basic	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Below Basic	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
NSP	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total count	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Fake District	Science											
	Elementary School Grade 3, 4, 5				Middle School Grade 6, 7, 8				High School Grade 10			
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Advanced	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Proficient	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Basic	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Below Basic	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
NSP	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total count	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Communication Arts

MAP-A Student Performance 2008-2010							
Communication Arts							
Grade Span	Achievement Level	2008		2009		2010	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
Elementary School	Level Not Determined	19	0.87	20	0.92	16	0.59
	Below Basic	115	5.25	68	2.79	31	1.14
	Basic	271	12.36	210	8.62	103	3.79
	Proficient	837	38.18	943	38.70	732	26.93
	Advanced	950	43.34	1196	49.06	1836	67.55
	Total	2192	100.00	2437	100.00	2718	100.00
Middle School	Level Not Determined	36	1.79	22	0.98	19	0.77
	Below Basic	247	12.29	145	6.48	81	2.48
	Basic	496	24.68	424	18.96	209	8.50
	Proficient	696	33.13	821	36.72	793	32.24
	Advanced	665	28.11	824	36.85	1378	56.02
	Total	2010	100.00	2236	100.00	2460	100.00
High School	Level Not Determined	9	1.52	9	1.31	5	0.73
	Below Basic	92	15.51	65	12.35	20	2.92
	Basic	199	33.56	166	24.13	65	9.50
	Proficient	115	19.39	159	23.11	185	27.05
	Advanced	178	30.02	269	39.10	409	59.80
	Total	593	100.00	688	100.00	684	100.00

2009-2010 Scoring Issues

Samples

Student Work Sample
Mathematics/Communication Arts
 Student Name: _____ Grade: _____ Date: 11/12/10
 Student ID: _____ Below Basic Proficient Advanced Proficient Advanced

Score: _____

Task/Activity: _____

Directions: _____

Student Work: _____

Teacher/Parent Comments: _____

Level of Proficiency: _____

Mathematics

MAP-A Student Performance 2008-2010							
Mathematics							
Grade Span	Achievement Level	2008		2009		2010	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
Elementary School	Level Not Determined	21	0.96	21	0.86	16	0.59
	Below Basic	135	6.16	66	2.71	28	1.03
	Basic	291	13.28	270	11.08	107	3.94
	Proficient	817	37.27	921	37.79	717	26.39
	Advanced	928	42.34	1159	47.56	1850	68.06
	Total	2192	100.00	2437	100.00	2718	100.00
Middle School	Level Not Determined	35	1.74	17	0.76	21	0.85
	Below Basic	276	13.73	113	5.05	66	2.68
	Basic	252	12.54	194	8.68	127	5.16
	Proficient	848	42.19	923	41.28	781	31.75
	Advanced	599	29.80	989	44.23	1465	59.55
	Total	2010	100.00	2236	100.00	2460	100.00
High School	Level Not Determined	26	4.75	4	0.61	9	1.23
	Below Basic	22	4.02	21	3.21	9	1.23
	Basic	76	14.26	63	12.69	35	4.80
	Proficient	222	40.59	232	35.47	208	28.53
	Advanced	199	36.38	314	48.01	468	64.20
	Total	547	100.00	654	100.00	729	100.00

Appeals

<http://www.dese.mo.gov/div/improve/sia/dar/appealsprocedures.html>



Science

MAP-A Student Performance 2008-2010							
Science							
Grade Span	Achievement Level	2008		2009		2010	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
Elementary School	Level Not Determined	18	2.58	15	1.91	11	1.23
	Below Basic	204	29.18	214	27.30	128	14.30
	Basic	126	18.03	166	21.17	174	19.44
	Proficient	127	18.17	151	19.26	141	15.75
	Advanced	224	32.05	238	30.36	441	49.27
	Total	699	100.00	784	100.00	895	100.00
Middle School	Level Not Determined	20	3.05	5	0.67	6	0.78
	Below Basic	230	35.11	186	24.85	116	15.12
	Basic	101	15.42	151	20.16	146	19.04
	Proficient	142	21.68	194	25.90	177	23.08
	Advanced	162	24.73	213	28.44	322	41.98
	Total	655	100.00	749	100.00	767	100.00
High School	Level Not Determined	15	2.53	9	1.31	7	1.02
	Below Basic	196	33.05	233	33.87	109	15.94
	Basic	116	19.90	171	24.85	109	15.94
	Proficient	147	24.79	87	12.65	112	16.37
	Advanced	117	19.73	188	27.33	347	50.73
	Total	593	100.00	688	100.00	684	100.00

2010-2011 Roll-Out

- Enrollment Information
- Distribution of MAP-A Manuals
- MAP-A Calendar 2010-2011



Enrollment Information

<https://apps.arc.missouri.edu/mapaenroll/login2.aspx>

Important Dates

2010-2011 MAP-A Timeline

Enrollment Window	9/13/2010 – 11/5/2010
MAP-A Materials Ship to Districts.....	12/6/2010 – 1/7/2011
Transfer Student Participation Deadline.....	1/7/2011
Collection Period One	1/10/2011 – 2/4/2011
Collection Period Two	2/7/2011 – 3/4/2011
Deadline for Return Shipping	3/11/2011
ProFile Closes	3/25/2011

Distribution of Manuals

Missouri Assessment Program-Alternate (MAP-A)

Instructor's Guide
and Implementation Manual
2010-2011



DEVELOPED BY
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Measured Progress • Assessment Resource Center

ProFile

<https://profile.measuredprogress.org/MAP-A/login.aspx>



MAP-A Calendar 2010-2011



Spotlight for 2010-2011

- Instructional Team
 - Linked to IEP Team
 - Selects APIs

2. Determine the composition of the instructional team that will assess the student and fully inform all participants about the MAP-A.

- In Grades 5, 8, and 11, includes Science Content Expert

Sneak Preview for 2011-2012

- ☐ MAP-A Manual Changes
 - 3 Part Manual
 - Basic Information – print
 - Samples – online
 - APIs – online
- ☐ Paper Reporting Changes
 - Reduction in Number of Copies Printed

Update from DESE

- ☐ Dynamic Learning Maps Alternate Assessment System
 - Lin Everett, Assistant Director of Assessment, DESE
- ☐ Common Core State Standards and Race to the Top: A Primer
 - Jane VanDeZande, Director of Assessment, DESE

Final Q & A

???



Appendix G: MAP-A Scoring Criteria

Mathematics and Communication Arts must address **two strands** as indicated on the Assessment Blueprint. Within each strand, **two different** Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs) are assessed, each in a single entry. Science must address **four strands** (two process and two content) as indicated on the Assessment Blueprint, assessing one API per strand. Two APIs, one content and one process are assessed in a single entry. The rubric will be applied to each **entry** addressed in the MAP-A.

Level of Accuracy Rubric and Scoring

How accurate is the student's performance of the skills and concepts addressed in the MAP-A? See the rubric in Table 1 below. Table 2 describes how each level of this rubric dimension is scored.

Table 1. Level of Accuracy Rubric

	Score Point				
	4	3	2	1	No Score
Level of Accuracy (Based on Alternate Performance Indicators)	Student performance of skills demonstrates a high level of understanding of concepts. 76–100% Accuracy	Student performance of skills demonstrates some understanding of concepts. 51–75% Accuracy	Student performance of skills demonstrates a limited understanding of concepts. 26–50% Accuracy	Student performance of skills demonstrates a minimal understanding of concepts. 0–25% Accuracy	Entry contains insufficient information to determine a score.

Table 2: Description of Scoring Rubric Dimensions for Level of Accuracy

Score Point	Description
4	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 76–100% of the time across the two data collection periods.
3	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 51–75% of the time across the two data collection periods.
2	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 26–50% of the time across the two data collection periods.
1	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 0–25% of the time across the two data collection periods.
NS	Insufficient information was given. The Entry/Data Summary Sheet was incomplete. Each API must have six data points (three per collection period) as indicated on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet.

All data must be reported as a percentage score on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet. More information is provided in the *Instructor's Guide and Implementation Manual* regarding data collection strategies. The teacher averages the two data periods. The student's level of accuracy for each entry will be determined from the average score.

Level of Independence

How independent is the student in demonstrating knowledge and skills addressed in the MAP-A? See the rubric in Table 3 below. Table 4 describes how each level of this rubric dimension is scored.

Table 3: Level of Independence Rubric

Level of Independence	Score Point				
	4	3	2	1	No Score
	Student requires minimal verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 76–100% Independence	Student requires some verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 51–75% Independence	Student requires frequent verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 26–50% Independence	Student requires extensive verbal, visual, and/or physical assistance to demonstrate skills and concepts. 0–25% Independence	Entry contains insufficient information to determine a score.

Table 4: Description of Scoring Rubric Dimensions for Level of Independence

Score Point	Description
4	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 76–100% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required minimal (0–24% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
3	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 51–75% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required some (25–49% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
2	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 26–50% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required frequent (50–74% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
1	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 0–25% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required extensive (75–100% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
NS	Insufficient information was given. The Entry/Data Summary Sheet was incomplete. Each API must have six data points (three per collection period) as indicated on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet.

All data must be reported as a percentage score on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet. More information is provided in the *Instructor’s Guide and Implementation Manual* regarding data collection strategies. The teacher averages the two data periods. The student’s level of independence for each API entry will be determined from the average score.

For the purpose of determining level of independence on the MAP-A, percentages are assigned to work that students perform independently. Different levels of assistance may be necessary for the student to perform a skill or complete a task and would be considered task specific assistance.

Cues, prompts, or assistance needed to redirect attention to or focus on a task is considered non-task specific assistance and would not affect a student’s independence on the task.

A student who participates in an activity without a task specific prompt from the teacher scores 100% level of independence. Examples of task specific assistance are outlined in Table 5.

Table 5: Examples of Task Specific Assistance

Type of Assistance	Description
Gestural Prompt	Natural prompts of a nonverbal nature that tell a student what to do (e.g., hand movement, pointing, facial expressions). Gestural prompts are easy to use and do not involve direct physical contact.
Verbal Prompt	Spoken statements that help students respond correctly. Verbal prompts guide students on how to respond rather than tell them that they are to respond (e.g., how to do all or part of the skill); give them a rule to use; and/or provide hints.
Model	Demonstrating a desired behavior in order to prompt an imitative response.
Partial Physical Prompt	Requires that teachers physically guide the students through the target skill/task, but at a less intrusive level (e.g., hand over wrist, elbow, shoulder).
Full Physical Prompt	Requires that the teacher place his/her hand on top of student's hand and physically guide the student through the target behavior/task (hand over hand). The teacher, rather than the student, exerts the effort, which minimizes errors. Full physical prompts are the most intrusive type of prompt.

The cues or prompts in Table 6 typically refer to non-task specific assistance. The use of these types of redirection or focus on the task **should not be considered levels of assistance when determining level of independence.**

Table 6: Forms of Non-Task Specific Assistance

Form of Assistance	Description
Environmental Prompt	Naturally occurring cue used by teachers to alert all students to an appropriate behavior (e.g., the bell ringing to signal it is time to go to lunch, flipping the light switch to get everyone’s attention).
Redirection	Repeating directions, rules, etc. when needed to help a student get back on task.
Focus	Encouraging the student to stay with the task, or to keep going.
Minimum Physical Prompt	Requires that teachers lightly touch the student but do not control their movements. The light touch is used to redirect or focus the student on the task.

Connection to the Standards

Do the submitted Student Work Records provide evidence of the application of the Alternate Performance Indicator in standards-based activities? See the rubric in Table 7. Table 8 describes how each level of this rubric dimension is scored.

Table 7: Connection to the Standards Rubric

	Score Points			
	3	2	1	No Score
Connection to the Standards	There is evidence of applying the Alternate Performance Indicator/s in two standards-based activities, one in each of two collection periods.	There is evidence of applying the Alternate Performance Indicator/s in at least one standards-based activity, one out of two collection periods.	There is some evidence of a connection to the Alternate Performance Indicator/s.	There is insufficient evidence of a connection to the Alternate Performance Indicator/s.

Table 8: Description of Scoring Rubric Dimensions for Connection to the Standards

Score Point	Description
3	The Student Work Records provide documentation of the application of the API in two standards-based activities, one per collection period.
2	The Student Work Records provide documentation of the application of the API in one standards-based activity (one out of two collection periods).
1	The Student Work Records provide documentation of the API but do not include application of the API in standards-based activities.
NS	Insufficient information was given. There were no work samples included for the API or the work samples submitted were not connected to the API.

Following are guidelines for submitting work to ensure sufficient evidence is provided for the application of the APIs:

1. A Student Work Record must be submitted for each collection period.
2. Student Work Records must be dated. Each date must match a corresponding date on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet.
3. If tangible student work is submitted without a Student Work Record attached, the work will not be scored for Connection to the Standards.
4. If the Student Work Record does not have the student interaction and/or evaluation portions completed, the work will not be scored for Connection to the Standards.

Application in Mathematics and Communication Arts

Standards-based activities are more likely to show evidence of instruction toward the application of state standards. Even though entries may connect to the API, if Student Work Records do not show application of the skill, the score on the assessment will be affected.

When deciding if an activity is an example of acquisition or application, consider the answer to the question, “What is the purpose of the activity?” If the purpose of the activity is simply to practice something, it is most likely an example of acquisition. Application activities require the student to apply skills. In other words, the student must use a skill to complete an activity for a purpose other than practicing the skill. The application activity often results in some type of end product.

Application in Science

As previously mentioned, standards-based activities are more likely to show evidence of instruction toward the application of state standards. In Science, because it is required to link a Process Strand with a Content Strand, application is shown by having the student to apply a set of skills with an objective in mind.

For example: a student records the temperature of a thermometer, thus using the Process Strand skill of gathering scientific information. By connecting this skill to a Content Strand—such as understanding how weather affects humans—a possible application could be shown by having the student select items of clothing that are appropriate to the temperature on the thermometer.

If the purpose of the activity is simply to practice something, and there is no objective, it is most likely an example of acquisition. The student must use a skill to complete an activity for a purpose other than practicing the skill.

Table 9 compares acquisition activities (skill and drill) to standards-based application activities.

Table 9: Activities Demonstrating Acquisition versus Application

Acquisition	Application through Standards-based Activities
Key word drill and skill with flashcards	Key words highlighted in a weekly reader with student identifying highlighted words
Copy spelling words	Correct use of spelling words in a journal entry
Track switch activation	Track switch activation to turn a page in a storybook
Flashcard practice of math facts	Application of math facts to determine lunch count
Flashcard practice of organism parts	Identifying organism parts to make qualitative observations by participating in a class game of Organism Bingo
Increase duration of attending	Increase duration of attending to a story to identify the main idea
Sort ingredients by attribute	Sort ingredients of a mixture to identify/communicate their observation of what makes up the mixture
Sort coins into piles of like coins	Sort coins needed to make a purchase (e.g., quarters for a juice from the vending machine)
Copy science words	Correct use of science terms in a journal entry to describe an investigation.
Track switch activation	Track switch activation to turn a page in a science article, magazine, and/or textbook to participate in class exploration of life cycles.
Sort genetic information into piles of like genetic information	Sort genetic information of parents and off-spring to determine what information is passed along from the parents to new off-spring (e.g., humans, and/or animals) to communicate the results of their investigation.

Appendix H: Scorer Training Materials

MAP-A SCORER TRAINING

Assessment Resource Center
Spring 2011

What is the MAP-A?

- ☐ No Child Left Behind
 - All students participate in state tests
- ☐ Missouri Assessment Program
 - Mathematics, Communication Arts, and Science
 - Links Missouri's Show-Me Standards, Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
 - Alternate assessment provides opportunities for all Missouri students

Topics

- ☐ What is the MAP-A?
- ☐ Students Assessed with MAP-A
- ☐ Design of the MAP-A
- ☐ Scoring Dimensions
- ☐ Alternate Performance Indicators (API's)
 - Scoring Procedures
 - Making Scoring Decisions

Who are MAP-A Students?

- ☐ Severe cognitive disabilities
- ☐ Do not keep pace with peers
- ☐ Educational focus centers on essential skills
- ☐ IEP team recommends alternate assessment
- ☐ Excessive absences, visual or auditory disabilities, social, cultural, language, or economic differences alone don't call for MAP-A

What is the MAP-A?



Who are MAP-A Students?

- ☐ Primary Disability Diagnosis
 - 62% MR
 - 18% Autism
 - 13% Multiple Disabilities
 - 7% Other Traumatic Injury

MAP-A Forms

- ▣ Table of Contents Checklist
- ▣ Validation Form
- ▣ Entry/Data Summary Sheet
- ▣ API Duplication/Justification Form
- ▣ Student Work Record



Mode of Communication

OPTIONAL - Use this space to provide information regarding the student's mode of communication.

Grant is an eleven-year-old student with an educational diagnosis of autism that affects his ability to access the academic curriculum in the following ways: difficulty with task focus, adjusting to change and effectively communicating his wants, needs and ideas. Grant responds best to a highly structured environment, predictable routine, visual support strategies, direct instruction of target skills with opportunity to generalize those skills.

Grant's oral communication is significantly limited. His spontaneous language typically consists of single words (including immediate echolalia) and occasional short, telegraphic phrases. Grant tends to be prompt dependent, waiting for an initial sound cue to respond verbally.

OPTIONAL - Use this space to provide information regarding the student's mode of communication.

Dane is non-verbal. He uses a wrist talker to say a variety of phrases and words. He also uses two different communication boards in the classroom that are not as portable.

Dane expresses his displeasure with grunts and whines quite often. He laughs a lot when he is enjoying activities.

Table of Contents Checklist **Elementary**

Student: _____ School Year: _____ Grade: 3 4 5

(Organize MAP-A in the following manner)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Table of Contents Checklist ▣ Validation Form Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RIDRP) Alternate Performance Indicator #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Entry/Data Summary Sheet ▣ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record ▣ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record Communication Arts Strand 1: Reading (RIDRP) Alternate Performance Indicator #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Entry/Data Summary Sheet ▣ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record ▣ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WIC) Alternate Performance Indicator #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Entry/Data Summary Sheet ▣ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record ▣ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record Communication Arts Strand 2: Writing (WIC) Alternate Performance Indicator #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Entry/Data Summary Sheet ▣ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record ▣ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO) Alternate Performance Indicator #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Entry/Data Summary Sheet ▣ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record ▣ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record Mathematics Strand 1: Numbers & Operations (NO) Alternate Performance Indicator #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Entry/Data Summary Sheet ▣ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record ▣ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS) Alternate Performance Indicator #1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Entry/Data Summary Sheet ▣ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record ▣ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record Mathematics Strand 2: Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric & Spatial Relationships (AR/GS) Alternate Performance Indicator #2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▣ Entry/Data Summary Sheet ▣ Collection Period 1 Student Work Record ▣ Collection Period 2 Student Work Record
--	--

16

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: _____ Grade: _____

Strand: _____ Big Idea: _____ Concept: _____

API: _____

Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? Yes No

Data	Collection Period 1 January 12 - February 8			Collection Period 2 February 8 - March 8		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.					
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %						
Independence %						
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: _____			Accuracy: _____		
	Independence: _____			Independence: _____		

	API Entry Average
Level of Accuracy	
Level of Independence	

Validation Form

Student: _____ Grade: _____

District & School of Attendance: _____

This form provides documentation of the individuals who administered, contributed to and/or reviewed this MAP-A.

Individual responsible for MAP-A administration (typically the student's classroom teacher):
Name: _____
Position: _____

Individuals who contributed to this MAP-A:

Name: _____ Position: _____ Contribution: _____

Please obtain administrator's (principal, assistant principal, or special education director) signature prior to submission.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Print Name: _____

2010-2011 Page: _____

API Duplication/Justification Form
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: _____ Grade: _____

Content Area: _____ Strand: _____

API #: _____ API Description: _____

You indicated that this student has been assessed on this API in previous years.

The instructional decision to duplicate an API from a prior year's MAP-A assessment must be justified on this form. The justification must be included with the MAP-A submission.

Justification/Rationale: (Supply specific justification for duplicate use of the API.)

Plan of Student Progress: (Supply specific plans in place to assure student growth across API's content.)

2007-2008 Page: _____

Student Work Record
Mathematics/Communication Arts
Attach student work sample if appropriate.

Student Name:	Grade:	Date:
Strand: RP	Big Idea:	Concept:
API:		
Task/Activity:		
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.	
Level of Accuracy	Level of Independence	

MAP-A Design

- MAP-A Entry
 - Building block of the MAP-A assessment
 - Demonstration of what a student knows and can do
 - Student Work Record
 - Basic component
 - Description of assessment activity
 - Evaluation of student participation

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Science

Student Name:	Grade:			
Process Strand: Science - IN	Big Idea:			
Concept:				
Process API:				
Content Strand:	Big Idea:			
Concept:				
Content API:				
Collection Period 1 January 11 – February 2				
Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.				
Date	Student Work Record	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point
Data Type				
Accuracy %				
Independence %				
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy:		Independence:	
	Independence:			
				MAP Entry Average
				Level of Accuracy
				Level of Independence

MAP-A Design

- MAP-A Entry
 - 2 Student Work Records
 - 1 Entry Data Summary Sheet

Student Work Record
Science
Attach student work sample if appropriate.


Student Name:	Grade:	Date:
Process Strand	Big Idea:	Concept:
Process API:		
Content Strand	Big Idea:	Concept:
Content API: EC1.8		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to both APIs, and how it demonstrates application.)		
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.	
Level of Accuracy:	Level of Independence:	

MAP-A Entry

The diagram illustrates the components of a MAP-A Entry. At the top is an 'Entry/Data Summary Sheet' for Science, which includes fields for Student Name, Grade, Date, Process Strand, Big Idea, Concept, Process API, Content Strand, Big Idea, Concept, Content API, and two collection periods (January 11 – February 2 and February 8 – March 5). Below this sheet are two 'Student Work Record' forms for Science, each with fields for Student Name, Grade, Date, Process Strand, Big Idea, Concept, Process API, Content Strand, Big Idea, Concept, Content API, Task/Activity, and Evaluation of Student's Performance. Arrows indicate that the Entry/Data Summary Sheet is linked to the two Student Work Records.

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: John		Grade: 10	
Strand: Mathematics - NO	Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies	
Stem: Recognize numerals.			
API: NOR.5 Identify a 2-digit number.			
Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
Collection Period 1 January 11 - February 5		Collection Period 2 February 8 - March 5	
Dates below do not need to be in chronological order			
Date	<input type="text" value="01/25/2010"/>	<input type="text" value="01/26/2010"/>	<input type="text" value="01/27/2010"/>
Date	<input type="text" value="01/10/2010"/>	<input type="text" value="01/11/2010"/>	<input type="text" value="01/12/2010"/>
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %	<input type="text" value="100"/>	<input type="text" value="75"/>	<input type="text" value="80"/>
Independence %	<input type="text" value="70"/>	<input type="text" value="100"/>	<input type="text" value="80"/>
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 85%		Independence: 90%
	Level of Accuracy		API Entry Average
	Level of Independence		85%



Student Work Record
Mathematics/Communication Arts
Attach student work sample if appropriate

Student Name: John		Grade: 10	Date: 1/25/2010
Strand: NO	Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies	
Stem: Recognize numerals.			
API: NOR.5 Identify a 2-digit number.			
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)			
While working at the community center, John had a customer ask if he could tell the customer the carbohydrates of some of the products the customer wanted to buy. The customer had ten different items that he asked John to read the carbohydrates for. The carbohydrates are generally listed as 2-digit numbers on the item's box that John will have to identify.			
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		Evaluation of Student's Performance:	
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy .		Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence .	
John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John was able to read all of the 2-digit numbers accurately.		John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John read 7 of the 2-digit numbers independently and 3 of the numbers required content assistance from the paraprofessional. For the three with assistance, each number was read to John separately. Once this was done he could get the 2-digit number himself.	
Level of Accuracy 100%		Level of Independence 70%	

- ## How to Score a MAP-A Entry
- ☐ Does the Activity Connect to the API?
 - ☐ Does the Activity Demonstrate Application?
 - ☐ Verify the Accuracy Score
 - ☐ Verify the Independence Score
 - ☐ Refigure the Entry Averages if Necessary
 - ☐ Record the Score Information

- ## MAP-A Design
- ☐ How many entries in a MAP-A?
 - 2 Science (SCI) – 4 APIs
 - 4 Mathematics (MA) – 4 APIs
 - 4 Communication Arts (CA) – 4 APIs

- ## What is an API?
- ☐ **ALTERNATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (APIs)**
 - ☐ APIs may be defined as small, measurable segments of the content. These segments, or skills, are defined for use in the MAP-A assessment. Teachers create individualized activities to assess the degree to which a student knows and can apply these skills. Descriptions of these activities make up the MAP-A.

Connecting the Activity to the API

- Is the API appropriate to the grade span?
- Does the activity described connect to the API?

Connecting the Activity to the API

- What is the activity?
- What skills does it assess?

Student Name: John	Grade: 10	Date: 1/25/2010
Strand: NO	Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies
Stem: Recognize numerals.		
API: NOR.5 Identify a 2-digit number.		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)		
While working at the community center, John had a customer ask if he could tell the customer the carbohydrates of some of the products the customer wanted to buy. The customer had ten different items that he asked John to read the carbohydrates for. The carbohydrates are generally listed as 2-digit numbers on the item's box that John will have to identify.		

Student Work Record Mathematics/Communication Arts

Attach student work sample if appropriate

Student Name: John	Grade: 10	Date: 1/25/2010
Strand: NO	Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies
Stem: Recognize numerals.		
API: NOR.5 Identify a 2-digit number.		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)		
While working at the community center, John had a customer ask if he could tell the customer the carbohydrates of some of the products the customer wanted to buy. The customer had ten different items that he asked John to read the carbohydrates for. The carbohydrates are generally listed as 2-digit numbers on the item's box that John will have to identify.		
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.	
John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John was able to read all of the 2-digit numbers accurately.	John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John read 7 of the 2-digit numbers independently and 3 of the numbers required content assistance from the paraprofessional. For the three with assistance, each number was read to John separately. Once this was done he could get the 2-digit number himself.	
Level of Accuracy 100%	Level of Independence 70%	

Kayla

Student Work Record Mathematics/Communication Arts

Attach student work sample if appropriate

Student Name: Kayla Gibson	Grade: 3	Date: 1/18/2007
Strand: RP.2.2	Big Idea: Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process	Concept: During Reading
API: Predict and Check		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)		
We are starting a new story in our reading books. Before reading the story, Kayla will do a picture walk through the story. She will go through the book and look at the pictures and discuss what she thinks will happen in the story. She will write her predictions on a piece of paper. After making her predictions, we will read the story together then she will check her predictions		
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.	
Before reading the story, Kayla made her predictions about what she thought would happen at the beginning, middle and end. After reading, she checked her predictions to see if she was correct. She checked two out of three predictions correctly for an accuracy level of 67%.	She was able to make and check all of her predictions with no prompts for an independence level of 100%.	
Level of Accuracy 67%	Level of Independence 100%	

Connecting the Activity to the API

Strand 1: Numbers and Operations		
Big Idea	Concept	Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs)
3 Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	A Describe or represent mental strategies	Recognize numerals. NO8.1. Represent a number or a quantity (e.g., tap, draw objects or tallies). NO8.2. Discriminate between numerals and other printed symbols. NO8.3. Identify/recognize numerals 1 through 10 (e.g., point out a 5, given a choice of numerals). NO8.4. Communicate numerals 1 through 9 (e.g., write, use number cards, communication board). NO8.5. Identify a 2-digit number. NO8.6. Communicate 2-digit numbers. NO8.9.

Big Idea	Concept	Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs)
1 Develop and apply skills and strategies to the reading process	E Vocabulary	RD5.6. Use context clues to predict words. RD5.7. Use a basic dictionary and glossary (may be picture dictionary or personal dictionary). RD5.8. Demonstrate use of common inflectional endings (e.g., "s" for plural nouns).
	F Pre-Reading	Develop and apply pre-reading strategies to aid comprehension. RP1.1. Attend to pictures in text. RP1.2. Preview text and/or pictures. RP1.3. Demonstrate understanding that pictures/symbols/objects/actions have meaning. RP1.4. Access prior knowledge. (What do I know? [K-W-L] Informational passages only). RP1.5. Predict what storybook or article may be about, based on pictures/symbols/objects/actions, with evidence. RP1.7. Set a purpose for reading. (What do I want to know? [K-W-L] Informational passages only)
	G During Reading	During reading or read-alouds, develop and utilize strategies. RP2.1. Attend to the reading of the story and to the pictures. RP2.2. Predict and check. RP2.3. Check content and process using cueing systems. a. Meaning: Does the word make sense? b. Structure: Does the word sound right? c. Visual: Does the word look right? RP2.4. Self-question: who, what, where, when, why, and how? RP2.6. Visualize. (e.g., What does something important in the story or article, not depicted in illustrations, look like?)

Terms in Mathematics, Communication Arts and Science APIs

- ☐ AND, OR, AND/OR
- ☐ The terms “and,” “or,” and “and/or” used in a list of choices in an API require that any one of the items in the list must be addressed in order for the activity to connect to the API.
- ☐ The abbreviation “e.g.” (Lat.: *exempli gratia*) means “for example” and is used when a list includes one or more examples of the concept but other examples (perhaps many) also exist.
- ☐ EC5.13.a. Explore common herbivores (e.g., rabbits, deer, giraffe)

Does the activity connect to the API?

You Decide

Terms in Mathematics, Communication Arts and Science APIs

- ☐ The abbreviation “i.e.” (Lat.: *id est*) means “that is to say” and is used when what follows is an all-inclusive list of possibilities (may be one or many) demonstrating the concept under consideration.
- ☐ FM1.2.c. Investigate with an object moving in different directions (i.e., forward, backward, sideways, up and/or down).

How to Score a MAP-A Entry

- ☐ Does the Activity Connect to the API?
- ☐ Does the Activity Demonstrate Application?
- ☐ Verify the Accuracy Score
- ☐ Verify the Independence Score
- ☐ Refigure the Entry Averages if Necessary
- ☐ Record the Score Information

Glossary

- ☐ Glossary of terms found in the Science, Mathematics, and Communication Arts APIs begin on pg. 13 of the MAP-A Scoring Manual.

Acquisition or Application?

Acquisition	Application through Standards-based Activities
Copy spelling words	Correct use of spelling words in a journal entry
Flashcard practice of math facts	Application of math facts to determine lunch count

Acquisition or Application?

Acquisition	Application through Standards-based Activities
Flashcard practice of organism parts	Identifying organism parts to participate in a class game of Organism Bingo
Sort coins into piles of like coins	Sort coins needed to make a purchase (e.g., quarters for a juice from the vending machine)

Application

Student Work Record
 Actual student product is attached.

Student Name: Heather Smith	Grade: 7	Date: 2/02/2007
Content Area: Mathematics	Strand: (NO)	
API: NO4.5	Description: Identify odd and even numbers.	

Task/Activity Description: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)
 Heather was assigned a worksheet in Math class to work on. She was assigned only the evens to work on. This demonstrates an application because she had to apply the skill of identifying even numbers in order to do the correct problems.

Evaluation of Student's Performance:
 Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.
 Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.

There were a total of 60 problems on the worksheet. I included them all because I wanted to deduct points if she did any other problem but the evens. She did not do number 48 which is even, but did do numbers 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, and 59 which are odd. This gave her an accuracy level of 53 out of 60 or 88%.

Of the 60 problems on the page, Heather only needed 4 verbal prompts. This gave her an independence level of 56 out of 60 or 93%.

Level of Accuracy	88 %	Level of Independence	93 %
-------------------	------	-----------------------	------

2006-2007 MAP-A Profile MA Page: 7

Acquisition or Application?

Acquisition	Application through Standards-based Activities
Copy science words	Correct use of science terms in a journal entry to describe an investigation.

Application

Adding One-Digit Numbers Unit 39

Learning Objectives: We will learn to add single-digit numbers in the Arabic numbering system, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 are one-digit numbers.

Example: To add 2, 3, and 6, first find the sum of 2 and 3. Add 6 to this sum.

Activity: Add these one-digit numbers.

Handwritten student work shows various addition problems like 2+3, 3+6, 2+3+6, and 10+10. Some are circled in red. A "100" stamp is visible.

REMINDER: Write the definition of one-digit numbers.

Handwritten notes at the bottom: A = 50/100 = 50%, T = 50/100 = 50%, 4 words, 4 words.

Application

- What is the purpose of the activity?
 - Practice of the skill in the API
 - Some purpose other than practice

Student Name: John	Grade: 10	Date: 1/25/2010
Strand: NO	Big Idea: Compute fluently and make reasonable estimates	Concept: Describe or represent mental strategies
Stem: Recognize numerals.		
API: NO8.5 Identify a 2-digit number.		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)		
While working at the community center, John had a customer ask if he could tell the customer the carbohydrates of some of the products the customer wanted to buy. The customer had ten different items that he asked John to read the carbohydrates for. The carbohydrates are generally listed as 2-digit numbers on the item's box that John will have to identify.		

Application or Acquisition?

Student Work Record
 Actual student product is attached.

Student Name: Kayla Kendall	Grade: 4	Date: 2-2-07
Content Area: Reading	Strand:	
API: RD.1.0	Description: Match pictures to pictures of the same words. Words represent objects or pictures of objects.	

Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)
 Kayla is to apply what she learned and understand that some words name objects. She naming words she is to circle the correct word to match the picture. She got 4/4 correct.

Evaluation of Student's Performance:
 Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.
 Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.

Kayla was able to circle the correct naming word to match 4/4 pictures. She earned 4/4 = 100% in accuracy.

Kayla needed 2 of those words read to her, dictation and context. She did the other two by herself for 2/4 = 50% for a level of independence.

Level of Accuracy	100 %	Level of Independence	50 %
-------------------	-------	-----------------------	------

2006-2007 MAP-A Page #: 8/4

Application or Acquisition?

Name: Karla 2-2-2007

Naming Words for People

STUDY
Some words name people.
These words are called **naming words**.

police officer **nurse** **teacher**

Naming words can name people.

PRACTICE
Ring the words that name people.

1. dentist tooth

2. pan cook

3. barn farmer

4. doctor sick

Level of Accuracy

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: John	Grade: 10					
Content Area: Mathematics	Strand: NO					
API #: NOE.5	API Description: Identify a 2-digit number.					
Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
Collection Period 1 January 14 – February 8			Collection Period 2 February 11 – March 7			
Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.			Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.			
Date	1/25	1/20	1/24	2/11	2/06	2/09
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy	100	75	80	100	81	88
Independence %	70	100	100	80	100	100
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 85			Accuracy: 89		
	Independence: 90			Independence: 93		

	API Entry Average
Level of Accuracy	87
Level of Independence	92

Application or Acquisition?

You Decide

Level of Accuracy

Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.

John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John was able to read all of the 2-digit numbers accurately.

Level of Accuracy 100 %

How to Score a MAP-A Entry

- Does the Activity Connect to the API?
- Does the Activity Demonstrate Application?
- Verify the Accuracy Score
- Verify the Independence Score
- Refigure the Entry Averages if Necessary
- Record the Score Information

How to Score a MAP-A Entry

- Does the Activity Connect to the API?
- Does the Activity Demonstrate Application?
- Verify the Accuracy Score
- Verify the Independence Score
- Refigure the Entry Averages if Necessary
- Record the Score Information

Level of Independence

Entry/Data Summary Sheet Mathematics/Communication Arts						
Student Name: John			Grade: 10			
Content Area: Mathematics			Strand: NO			
API #: N08.5 API Description: Identify a 2-digit number.						
Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no X						
Collection Period 1 January 14 – February 8			Collection Period 2 February 11 – March 7			
Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.			Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.			
Date	1/25	1/20	1/24	2/11	2/06	2/09
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %	100	75	80	100	81	85
Independence %	100	100	100	80	100	100
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 85			Accuracy: 89		
	Independence: 90			Independence: 93		
						API Entry Average
						Level of Accuracy 87
						Level of Independence 92

Level of Independence

Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.

John had ten opportunities to read 2-digit numbers. John read 7 of the 2-digit numbers independently and 3 of the numbers required content assistance from the paraprofessional. For the 3 with assistance, each number was read to John separately. Once this was done he could get the 2-digit number himself.

Level of Independence 70 %

Level of Independence

Task Specific Assistance - Pg. 3

Type of Assistance	Description
Gestural Prompt	Natural prompts of a nonverbal nature that tell a student what to do (e.g. hand movement, pointing, facial expressions). Gestural prompts are easy to use and do not involve direct physical contact.
Verbal Prompt	Spoken statements that help students respond correctly. Verbal prompts guide students on how to respond rather than tell them that they are to respond (e.g., how to do all or part of the skill); give them a rule to use and/or provide hints.
Model	Demonstrating a desired behavior in order to prompt an imitative response
Partial Physical Prompt	Requires that teachers physically guide the students through the target skill/task, but at a less intrusive level (e.g., hand over wrist, elbow, shoulder).
Full Physical Prompt	Requires that the teacher place his/her hand on top of student's hand and physically guide the student through the target behavior/task (hand over hand). The teacher, rather than the student, exerts the effort which minimizes errors. Full physical prompts are the most intrusive type of prompt.

Entry/Data Summary Sheet Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: Cody			Grade: 11			
Strand: Communication Arts - WP			Big Idea: Write effectively in various forms and types of writing			
Concept: Audience and Purpose			Stem: Develop an awareness of audience and purpose in composing text.			
API: WPS.4 Write simple friendly letters, messages, and directions for making or doing something, considering a given audience.						
Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No						
Collection Period 1 January 12 - February 6			Collection Period 2 February 9 - March 6			
Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.			Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.			
Date	01/12/2009	01/14/2009	02/04/2009	02/09/2009	02/19/2009	03/06/2009
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %	86%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Independence %	71%	100%	100%	40%	100%	100%
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 95%			Accuracy: 100%		
	Independence: 90%			Independence: 80%		
						API Entry Average
						Level of Accuracy 96%
						Level of Independence 85%

MAP-A Web Profile 2008-2009

Page:

Level of Independence

Non-Task Specific Prompts

Form of Assistance	Description
Environmental Prompt	Naturally occurring cue used by teachers to alert all students to an appropriate behavior (e.g. the bell ringing to signal it is time to go to lunch, flipping the light switch to get everyone's attention).
Redirection	Repeating directions, rules, etc. when needed to help a student get back on task.
Focus	Encouraging the student to stay with the task, or to keep going
Minimum Physical Prompt	Requires that teachers lightly touch the student but do not control their movements. The light touch is used to redirect or focus the student on the task.

- The use of these types of redirection or focus on the task should not be considered when determining Level of Independence except when the API assessed includes "Attend to..." language.

Student Work Record Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: Cody			Grade: 11			Date: 01/12/2009		
Strand: WP			Big Idea: Write effectively in various forms and types of writing			Concept: Audience and Purpose		
Stem: Develop an awareness of audience and purpose in composing text.								
API: WPS.4 Write simple friendly letters, messages, and directions for making or doing something, considering a given audience.								
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.) Cody will write the grocery list for a recipe that will be prepared for a snack by the life skills class.								
Evaluation of Student's Performance:								
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.			Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.					
Cody wrote the grocery list to prepare waffles. He found the ingredients in the classroom and set them out for the life skills class to prepare. He found six of the seven ingredients for 86% accuracy.			Cody needed to be prompted to find two of the seven ingredients for independence of 71%.					
Level of Accuracy 86%			Level of Independence 71%					

MAP-A Web Profile 2008-2009

Page:

Student Work Record
Mathematics/Communication Arts
Attach student work sample if appropriate.

Student Name: Cody Grade: 11 Date: 02/09/2009

Strand: WP Big Idea: Write effectively in various forms and types of writing Concept: Audience and Purpose

Stem: Develop an awareness of audience and purpose in composing text.

API: WPS.4 Write simple friendly letters, messages, and directions for making or doing something, considering a given audience.

Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)
Cody will write the grocery list for a recipe that will be prepared for a snack by the life skills class.

Evaluation of Student's Performance:

Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy . Cody wrote a grocery list consisting of the five items the life skills class would need to make chocolate chip cookies. Cody accurately wrote the list of ingredients for 100% accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence . Cody needed task-specific prompts to write two of the five items. Cody's level of independence 40%.
Level of Accuracy 100%	Level of Independence 40%

MAP-A Web Profile 2008-2009 Page:

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: Cody Grade: 11

Strand: Communication Arts - WP Big Idea: Write effectively in various forms and types of writing Concept: Audience and Purpose

Stem: Develop an awareness of audience and purpose in composing text.

API: WPS.4 Write simple friendly letters, messages, and directions for making or doing something, considering a given audience.

Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? Yes No

Date	Collection Period 1 January 12 - February 6			Collection Period 2 February 9 - March 6		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.					
01/12/2009	01/14/2009	02/04/2009	02/09/2009	02/19/2009	03/06/2009	
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %	86%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Independence %	71%	100%	100%	40%	100%	100%
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 95% Independence: 90%			Accuracy: 100% Independence: 80%		

MAP Entry Average	98%
Level of Accuracy	98%
Level of Independence	85%

MAP-A Web Profile 2008-2009 Page:

How to Score a MAP-A Entry

- ❑ Does the Activity Connect to the API?
- ❑ Does the Activity Demonstrate Application?
- ❑ Verify the Accuracy Score
- ❑ Verify the Independence Score
- ❑ Refigure the Entry Averages if Necessary
- ❑ Record the Score Information

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: Cody Grade: 11

Strand: Communication Arts - WP Big Idea: Write effectively in various forms and types of writing Concept: Audience and Purpose

Stem: Develop an awareness of audience and purpose in composing text.

API: WPS.4 Write simple friendly letters, messages, and directions for making or doing something, considering a given audience.

Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? Yes No

Date	Collection Period 1 January 12 - February 6			Collection Period 2 February 9 - March 6		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.					
01/12/2009	01/14/2009	02/04/2009	02/09/2009	02/19/2009	03/06/2009	
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Independence %	0%	100%	100%	60%	100%	100%
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 95% Independence: 90%			Accuracy: 100% Independence: 80%		

MAP Entry Average	98%
Level of Accuracy	98%
Level of Independence	85%

Cody Collection Period 1

Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy . Cody wrote the grocery list to prepare waffles. He found the ingredients in the classroom and set them out for the life skills class to prepare. He found six of the seven ingredients for 86% accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence . Cody needed to be prompted to find two of the seven ingredients for independence of 71%.
Level of Accuracy 86%	Level of Independence 71%

Cody Collection Period 2

Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy . Cody wrote a grocery list consisting of the five items the life skills class would need to make chocolate chip cookies. Cody accurately wrote the list of ingredients for 100% accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence . Cody needed task-specific prompts to write two of the five items. Cody's level of independence 40%.
Level of Accuracy 100%	Level of Independence 40%

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Mathematics/Communication Arts

Student Name: Cody Grade: 11

Strand: Communication Arts - WP Big Idea: Write effectively in various forms and types of writing Concept: Audience and Purpose

Stem: Develop an awareness of audience and purpose in composing text.

API: WPS.4 Write simple friendly letters, messages, and directions for making or doing something, considering a given audience.

Has this student been assessed on this API in previous years? Yes No

Date	Collection Period 1 January 12 - February 6			Collection Period 2 February 9 - March 6		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.					
01/12/2009	01/14/2009	02/04/2009	02/09/2009	02/19/2009	03/06/2009	
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Independence %	0%	100%	100%	60%	100%	100%
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 87% Independence: 87%			Accuracy: 100% Independence: 80%		

MAP Entry Average	84%
Level of Accuracy	84%
Level of Independence	77%

Scoring Guide

Entry Scoring Questions & Procedures

- For each collection period:
- ❑ Do the dates on the Student Work Record correspond to the dates on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet?
 - ❑ Do the dates fall within the allowable collection period time frames?
 - ❑ How many data points were recorded?

Level of Accuracy Rubric

Score Point	Entry Average %	Description
4	76 -100	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 76–100% of the time across the two data collection periods.
3	51-75	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 51–75% of the time across the two data collection periods.
2	26-50	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 26–50% of the time across the two data collection periods.
1	0-25	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student provided an accurate answer or response an average of 0–25% of the time across the two data collection periods.
NS		Insufficient information was given. The Entry/Data Summary Sheet was incomplete. Each entry must have six data points (three per collection period) as indicated on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet.

Scoring Guide

Entry Scoring Questions & Procedures

- For each collection period:
- ❑ Does the activity described on the Student Work Record connect to the API or APIs?
 - ❑ Is the activity application?
 - ❑ Is the Level of Accuracy evaluation complete and accurate?
 - ❑ Is the Level of Independence evaluation complete and accurate?
 - ❑ Verify calculations in non-ProFile generated binders.

Scoring Guide

Entry Scoring Questions & Procedures

- Summarize for each entry:
- ❑ Record the Entry Average percentage for Level of Independence.
 - ❑ Assign rubric score for Level of Independence.

Scoring Guide

Entry Scoring Questions & Procedures

- Summarize for each entry:
- ❑ Record the Entry Average percentage for Level of Accuracy.
 - ❑ Assign rubric score for Level of Accuracy.

Level of Independence Rubric

Score Point	Entry Average %	Description
4	76 -100	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 76–100% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required minimal (0–24% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
3	51-75	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 51–75% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required some (25–49% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
2	26-50	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 26–50% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required frequent (50–74% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
1	0-25	The Entry/Data Summary Sheet indicates the student demonstrates skills and concepts independently an average of 0–25% of the time across the two data collection periods. The student required extensive (75–100% of the time) cueing, prompting, or assistance.
NS		Insufficient information was given. The Entry/Data Summary Sheet was incomplete. Each entry must have six data points (three per collection period) as indicated on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet.

Scoring Guide

Entry Scoring Questions & Procedures

Summarize for each entry:

- ▣ Assign rubric score for Connection to the Standards.

Scoring Rules Pg. 9

	Scoring Irregularity	Scoring Rule
01	No dates given on Entry/Data Summary Sheet and on Student Work Records.	Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.
02	Missing Entry/Data Summary Sheet	Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.
03	A collection period does not have a minimum of three data points.	Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.
04	An entry does not include at least one Student Work Record per collection period.	Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.

Connection to the Standards Rubric

Score Point	Description
3	The Student Work Records provide documentation of the application of the API/s in two standards-based activities, one per collection period.
2	The Student Work Records provide documentation of the application of the API/s in one standards-based activity (one out of two collection periods).
1	The Student Work Records provide documentation of the API/s but do not include application of the API/s in standards-based activities.
NS	Insufficient information was given. There were no work samples included for the API/s or the work samples submitted were not connected to the API/s.

Scoring Rules

	Scoring Irregularity	Scoring Rule
05	A submitted Student Work Record for an entry does not connect to the API/s.	Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.
06	One out of two collection periods are incomplete.	Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.
07	No API/s identified.	Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.
08	API/s is/are not grade span appropriate.	Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.

Scoring Guide

Entry Scoring Questions & Procedures

Summarize for each entry:

- ▣ Record scoring irregularities in the Comment Codes section.
- ▣ Use the Scoring Irregularities and Rules to make scoring decisions.

Scoring Rules

	Scoring Irregularity	Scoring Rule
09	A single API is used in more than one entry.	The first instance will be scored and the second instance will result in "Entry Not Submitted." Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for the second entry.
10	A single science content strand is used in more than one entry.	The first instance will be scored and the second instance will result in "Entry Not Submitted." Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for the second entry.

Scoring Rules

	Scoring Irregularity	Scoring Rule
11	Missing entry.	Will result in "Entry Not Submitted." Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.
12	API/s is/are not consistent across the 2 collection periods.	If the API/s is/are different in both collection periods the entry cannot be scored. Assign "No Score" for each dimension of the rubric for this entry.
13	Dates on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet and Student Work Records are not within the timeframes of the collection periods.	Any data from dates outside of the timeframes will not be used for scoring.

Dexter

Student Work Record
 Actual student product is attached.

Student Name: Dexter Phillips	Grade: 10	Date: 1/24/2007
Content Area: Mathematics	Strand: (NO)	
API: NO10.5	Description: Compute with the operations of addition and/or subtraction.	

Task/Activity Description: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to the API, and how it demonstrates application.)
 Dexter was given 5 deposit slips, each containing 3 checks. He had to correctly add the amount to complete the deposit slips. He used a calculator to complete the task.

Evaluation of Student's Performance:

Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy. <small>Dexter was provided with examples on the overhead prior to the activity. Of the 5 deposit slips, Dexter had 2 correct. His score today was 2 out of 5.</small>	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence. <small>Dexter required continuous prompting from his para-professional. Dexter did use a calculator.</small>
Level of Accuracy 40 %	Level of Independence 0 %

2006-2007 MAP-A Profile MA Page: 4

Scoring Rules

	Scoring Irregularity	Scoring Rule
14	One or more Student Work Records shows acquisition rather than application of the API/s.	The activity in these collection periods cannot be considered application.
15	Tangible student work submitted without a Student Work Record	The activity in this collection period cannot be considered application.
16	Student Work Record missing task/activity description	The activity in this collection period cannot be considered application.

Logan

Entry/Data Summary Sheet
Science

Student Name: Logan	Grade: 5
Process Strand: Science - IN Big Idea: Scientific understanding is developed through the use of scientific process skills, scientific knowledge, scientific investigation, reasoning, and critical thinking.	Concept: The nature of science relies upon communication results and of justification of explanations.
Process API: IN.1.1 Communicate observations and/or events using words, symbols, pictures, objects, and/or actions (e.g., to describe the weather as sunny, cloudy, rainy, windy; to draw a landscape; mountains, trees, rocks, soil, water).	
Content Strand: Science - LO Big Idea: There is a fundamental unity underlying the diversity of all living organisms.	Concept: Organisms have basic needs for survival.
Content API: LO.1.1 Explore living things (e.g., animals, plants, people).	

	Collection Period 1 January 11 - February 5			Collection Period 2 February 5 - March 5		
	Dates below do not need to be in chronological order.					
Date	1/18/2010	1/20/2010	1/22/2010	2/22/2010	2/24/2010	2/26/2010
Data Type	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point	Student Work Record	Data Point	Data Point
Accuracy %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Independence %	80%	100%	100%	60%	100%	100%
Average % for Collection Period	Accuracy: 100% Independence: 93%			Accuracy: 100% Independence: 87%		

API Entry Average	100%
Level of Accuracy	100%
Level of Independence	93%

Scoring Rules

	Scoring Irregularity	Scoring Rule
17	Submitted percentages are miscalculated.	Scorer corrects percentages.
18	Percentage calculations for Accuracy or Independence cannot be verified for a Student Work Record.	Percentage for Accuracy or Independence for the Student Work Record is replaced with zero and entry average is recalculated to determine rubric score.
?		

Logan

Student Work Record
 Attach student work sample if appropriate

Student Name: Logan	Grade: 5	Date: 1/18/2010
Process Strand: Science - IN Big Idea: Scientific understanding is developed through the use of scientific process skills, scientific knowledge, scientific investigation, reasoning, and critical thinking.	Concept: The nature of science relies upon communication results and of justification of explanations.	
Process API: IN.1.1 Communicate observations and/or events using words, symbols, pictures, objects, and/or actions (e.g., to describe the weather as sunny, cloudy, rainy, windy; to draw a landscape; mountains, trees, rocks, soil, water).		
Content Strand: Science - LO Big Idea: There is a fundamental unity underlying the diversity of all living organisms.	Concept: Organisms have basic needs for survival.	
Content API: LO.1.1 Explore living things (e.g., animals, plants, people).		

Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to both APIs, and how it demonstrates application.)
 Two healthy violet plants were brought to the classroom. One plant was put in a closet and one plant was put in the sun. Both plants were watered. The plants were shown to the students on a weekly basis. The teacher wrote to the students in their journals about the changes in the plants and the students responded. The responses were discussed during our daily journal time.

Evaluation of Student's Performance:

Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy. <small>Logan's level of accuracy performance was based on how accurate her observations were. The students had to write at least 2 sentences. The sentences had to have at least one verb the plant in the closet was being affected.</small>	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence. <small>Logan's level of independence was based on how many times she had to be prompted to remain on task. She started out with 10 points. Each time she had to be prompted she would lose 2 points.</small>
Level of Accuracy 100%	Level of Independence 80%

Logan

Student Work Record

Science

Attach student work sample if appropriate

Student Name: Logan	Grade: 5	Date: 2/22/2010
Process Strand: Science - IN	Big Idea: Scientific understanding is developed through the use of scientific process skills, scientific knowledge, scientific investigation, reasoning, and critical thinking.	Concept: The nature of science relies upon communication results and of justification of explanations.
Process API: INS.1 Communicate observations and/or events using words, symbols, pictures, objects, and/or actions (e.g., to describe the weather as sunny, cloudy, rainy, windy, to draw a landscape, mountain, river, trees, rocks, soil, water).		
Content Strand: Science - LO	Big Idea: There is a fundamental unity underlying the diversity of all living organisms, survival.	Concept: Organisms have basic needs for survival.
Content API: LO1.1 Explore living things (e.g., animals, plants, people).		
Task/Activity: (Write a brief description of the task/activity, its connection to both APIs, and how it demonstrates application.) Two healthy roses were brought to the classroom. One rose was put in a closet and one rose was put in the sun. Both plants were watered. The plants were shown to the students on a weekly basis. The teacher wrote the students in their journals about the changes in the plants and the students responded. The responses were discussed during our daily journal time.		
Evaluation of Student's Performance:		
Describe and evaluate the student's actual accuracy performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Accuracy.	Describe and evaluate the student's actual independence performance. Describe how the percentages were determined for Level of Independence.	
Logan's level of accuracy performance was based on how accurate her observations were. The students had to write at least 2 sentences. The sentences had to have at least one way the plant in the closet was being affected.	Logan's level of independence was based on how many times she had to be prompted to remain on task. She started out with 10 points. Each time she had to be prompted she would lose 2 points.	
Level of Accuracy 100%	Level of Independence 60%	

Remember

- ❑ Mathematics and Communication Arts entries have activities that must connect to 1 API.
- ❑ Science entries have activities that must connect to 2 APIs.
- ❑ Always record number of data points in both collection periods.
- ❑ Enter comment codes.
- ❑ Activities that include leisure time, recess, free time, games, and journal writing are almost always application.

Questions



Appendix I: Sample Reports

2011 MAP-A Paper Reporting

Report packages sent to districts included the mathematics and communication arts reports for students who reside and/or attend in the district. Each packet contained the following items:

Letter to District Testing Coordinator	
District Report	1 copy per district
(For the Missouri Schools for Severely Disabled, the State Schools Building Report, the State Schools Report, and the State Schools District Report were included in lieu of a District Report.)	
Mathematics Reports	
Individual Student Report-Parent	1 copy per student
Individual Student Report-Teacher	1 copy per student
Student Record Label	1 copy per student
Communication Arts Reports	
Individual Student Report-Parent	1 copy per student
Individual Student Report-Teacher	1 copy per student
Student Record Label	1 copy per student
Science Reports	
Individual Student Report-Parent	1 copy per student
Individual Student Report-Teacher	2 copy per student
Student Record Label	1 copy per student
Packing Slip	
Roster	

 <p>Missouri DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION</p>	<p>MAP-A Mathematics Achievement Level: Basic</p>																		
	<p>Advanced: Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.</p> <p>Proficient: Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrates application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.</p> <p>Basic: Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.</p> <p>Below Basic: Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.</p> <p>Level not Determined (LND): Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.</p>																		
<p>MAP-A 2011 <i>Missouri Assessment Program - Alternate</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Student Report Mathematics (Parent Copy)</p>																		
	<p>Name: Paul MOSIS: 0123456789 Grade: 10 Birthdate: 4/29/1995</p>																		
<p>School of Residence: Pretendburgh High School Fakeville, R-1 123456</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Strand 1</p>																		
	<p>API description</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>NO.1.12.: Identify a 2-digit number.</td> <td>Level of Accuracy</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Level of Independence</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Connection to Standards</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table> <p>NO.3.2.a.: Nonverbally demonstrates combining and separating problems. Add 1 item to another item.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Level of Accuracy</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Level of Independence</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Connection to Standards</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>		NO.1.12.: Identify a 2-digit number.	Level of Accuracy	4		Level of Independence	4		Connection to Standards	1		Level of Accuracy	3		Level of Independence	2		Connection to Standards
NO.1.12.: Identify a 2-digit number.	Level of Accuracy	4																	
	Level of Independence	4																	
	Connection to Standards	1																	
	Level of Accuracy	3																	
	Level of Independence	2																	
	Connection to Standards	1																	
<p>School of Attendance: Pretendburgh High School Fakeville R-1 123456</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Strand 2</p>																		
	<p>ME.3.2.c.: Know the values of coins. Identify the value of a dime as 10 pennies.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Level of Accuracy</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Level of Independence</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Connection to Standards</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table> <p>ME.2.1.f.: Develop concept of time. Identify or predict what comes next in a daily schedule.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Level of Accuracy</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Level of Independence</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Connection to Standards</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>			Level of Accuracy	4		Level of Independence	3		Connection to Standards	1		Level of Accuracy	3		Level of Independence	2		Connection to Standards
	Level of Accuracy	4																	
	Level of Independence	3																	
	Connection to Standards	1																	
	Level of Accuracy	3																	
	Level of Independence	2																	
	Connection to Standards	1																	

This is a parent's copy of a MAP-A Individual Student Report of achievement in a single content area or subject. The following information may be found on this report.

- Content area assessed (Mathematics, Communication Arts, or Science)
- Student's MAP-A achievement level
- Achievement level descriptors (Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Level Not Determined)
- Descriptions of the APIs (Alternate Performance Indicators) or API pairs assessed
- Level of Accuracy, Level of Independence, and Connection to Standards scores for each entry

MAP-A Background

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004 requires that students with disabilities participate in the general education curriculum with supplementary aids and supports when necessary. IDEA 2004 further requires that students with disabilities be included in all state- and district-wide assessment programs with appropriate accommodations or alternate assessments when necessary, as determined by their Individualized Education Program (IEP) team. In addition, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 requires that all students participate in state assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science and that DESE report student performance to the public.

In Missouri, students with significant cognitive disabilities participate in the MAP-Alternate (MAP-A), ensuring that each student has the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills in the Missouri Show-Me Standards.

The MAP-A is a performance-based assessment in which teachers collect data and student work. The collected evidence provides documentation of the student's accuracy and independence and ensures that there is a connection between the Show-Me Standards and instruction.

The MAP-A is

- required by federal law;
- designed only for students with significant cognitive disabilities who meet grade-level and participation criteria;
- reflective of input from an IEP team, which may include teachers, physical therapists, speech therapists, occupational therapists, paraprofessionals, job coaches, parents or guardians, and the student, if appropriate;
- administered at the same grade levels as students participating in Missouri's general assessment; and
- scored using the MAP-A Scoring Rubric; raw scores are then converted to reported achievement levels.

Assessment Blueprint

The MAP-A assesses student learning directly connected to the Show-Me Standards, through the Alternate Grade-Level Expectations (AGLEs) for students who are MAP-A eligible. The MAP-A assesses student work in each of two strands in Communication Arts and Mathematics and four strands in Science, as shown in the table below.

Content Area	Required Grades	Strand
Mathematics	3-8, & 10	Numbers and Operations
	3-5	Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric and Spatial Relationships
Communication Arts	6-8	Data and Probability
	10	Measurement
	3-8, & 11	Reading
	3-5	Writing Composition
Science	6-8, & 11	Writing Process
	5, 8, & 11	Scientific Inquiry
	5, 8, & 11	Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity
	5	Characteristics and Interactions of Living Organisms
Science	5	Changes in Ecosystems and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environments
	8	Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy
	8	Properties and Principles of Force and Motion
	11	Processes and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere)
	11	Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It

Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs) component concepts of the strands outlined in the table above, are assessed for each strand. The four specific APIs assessed in this student's MAP-A are listed on the reverse side of this report.

Scoring

The MAP-A is assessed over three criteria, or scoring dimensions:

- Level of Accuracy – 4 points possible per entry
- Level of Independence – 4 points possible per entry
- Connection to the Standards – 3 points possible per entry

The entries that make up the MAP-A are assigned a raw score for each of the scoring dimensions. Eleven points are possible for each entry. The raw scores for each API or API pair assessed are reported on the reverse side of this report. Raw scores are totaled and then converted to the overall achievement level reported for the subject area. For more information, see the *Guide to Interpreting MAP-A Results*.

 <p>MAP-A 2011 <i>Missouri Assessment Program - Alternate</i></p>	MAP-A Mathematics Achievement Level: Basic	
	<p>Advanced: Student has a strong understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be closely connected to the strands and demonstrate strong application. Student likely requires minimal verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.</p> <p>Proficient: Student has a sound understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be connected to the strands and demonstrate application. Student likely requires some verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge of these concepts.</p> <p>Basic: Student has a fundamental understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be somewhat connected to the strands. Student likely requires frequent verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.</p> <p>Below Basic: Student has a minimal understanding of the concepts contained in the grade-appropriate APIs within the strands of Numbers and Operations and Measurement. Student work may be loosely connected to the strands. Student likely requires extensive verbal, visual and/or physical task-specific assistance in order to demonstrate knowledge and/or application of these concepts.</p> <p>Level not Determined (LND): Insufficient evidence was reported to assign raw scores to this student's MAP-A; therefore, no achievement level may be assigned.</p>	
<p>Student Report Mathematics (Teacher Copy)</p> <p>Name: Paul MOSIS: 0123456789 Grade: 10 Birthdate: 4/29/1995</p> <p>School of Residence: Pretendburgh High School Fakeville R-1 123456</p> <p>School of Attendance: Adair Co. High School Fakeville R-1 123456</p>	Strand 1	<p>API description</p> <p>NO.1.12: Identify a 2-digit number.</p> <p>NO.3.2.a: Nonverbally demonstrates combining and separating problems. Add 1 item to another item.</p> <p>ME.2.2.c: Know the values of coins. Identify the value of a dime as 10 pennies.</p> <p>ME.2.1.f: Develop concept of time. Identify or predict what comes next in a daily schedule.</p>
	Strand 2	<p>Level of Accuracy 4</p> <p>Level of Independence 4</p> <p>Connection to Standards 1</p> <p>Comments 14</p> <p>Level of Accuracy 3</p> <p>Level of Independence 2</p> <p>Connection to Standards 1</p> <p>Comments 14</p> <p>Level of Accuracy 4</p> <p>Level of Independence 3</p> <p>Connection to Standards 1</p> <p>Comments 14</p> <p>Level of Accuracy 3</p> <p>Level of Independence 2</p> <p>Connection to Standards 1</p> <p>Comments 14</p>
<small>See comment definitions on reverse side</small>		

This is a teacher's copy of a MAP-A Individual Student Report of achievement in a single content area or subject. The following information may be found on this report.

- Content area assessed (Mathematics, Communication Arts, or Science)
- Student's MAP-A achievement level
- Assessment level description (Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Level Not Determined)
- Description of the Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs) or API pairs assessed
- Level of Accuracy, Level of Independence, and Connection to Standards scores for each entry
- Scoring comment codes, if reported, for each entry

Background

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004 requires that students with disabilities participate in the general education curriculum with supplementary aides and supports when necessary. IDEA 2004 further requires that students with disabilities be included in all state- and district-wide assessment programs with appropriate accommodations or alternate assessments when necessary, as determined by their Individualized Education Program (IEP) team. In addition, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 requires that all students participate in state assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science and that DESE report student performance to the public. In Missouri, students with significant cognitive disabilities participate in the MAP-Alternate (MAP-A), ensuring that each student has the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills in the Missouri Show-Me Standards.

The MAP-A is a performance-based assessment in which teachers collect data and student work. The collected evidence provides documentation of the student's accuracy and independence and ensures that there is a connection between the Show-Me Standards and instruction.

The MAP-A is

- required by federal law,
- designed only for students with significant cognitive disabilities who meet grade-level and participation criteria,
- reflective of input from an IEP team, which may include teachers, physical therapists, speech therapists, occupational therapists, paraprofessionals, job coaches, parents or guardians, and the student, if appropriate,
- administered at the same grade levels as students participating in Missouri's general assessment, and
- scored using the MAP-A Scoring Rubric; raw scores are then converted to reported achievement levels.

Content Area	Required Grades	Strand
Mathematics	3-5, & 10	Numbers and Operations
	3-5	Algebraic Relationships and/or Geometric and Spatial Relationships
	6-8	Data and Probability
	10	Measurement
Communication Arts	3-4, & 11	Reading
	3-5	Writing, Composition
	6-8, & 11	Writing Process
	5, 8, & 11	Scientific Inquiry
Science	5, 8, & 11	Impact of Science, Technology, and Human Activity
	5	Characteristics and Interactions of Organisms with Their Environments
	8	Properties and Principles of Matter and Energy
	8	Properties and Principles of Force and Motion
11	Processes and Interactions of the Earth's Systems (Geosphere, Atmosphere, and Hydrosphere)	
11	Composition and Structure of the Universe and the Motion of the Objects Within It	

Assessment Blueprint

The MAP-A assesses student learning directly connected to the Show-Me Standards, through the Alternate Grade-Level Expectations (AGLEs) for students who are MAP-A eligible. The MAP-A assesses student work in each of two strands in Communication Arts and Mathematics and four strands in Science, as shown in the table above.

Alternate Performance Indicators (APIs), component concepts of the strands outlined in the table above, are assessed for each strand. The four specific APIs assessed in this student's MAP-A are listed on the reverse side of this report.

Scoring

The MAP-A is assessed over three criteria, or scoring dimensions:

- Level of Accuracy – 4 points possible per entry
- Level of Independence – 4 points possible per entry
- Connection to the Standards – 3 points possible per entry



The four entries that make up the MAP-A are assigned a score for each of the scoring dimensions. Eleven points are possible for each entry. The raw scores for each API or API pair assessed are reported on the reverse side of this report. Raw scores are totaled and then converted to the overall achievement level reported for the subject area.

Scoring Comment Codes

Irregularities encountered in MAP-A entries during scoring are noted with the codes in the table below. Up to three codes per entry may be reported.

Comment Code	Scoring Irregularity
01	No dates given on Entry/Data Summary Sheet and on Student Work Record.
02	Missing Entry/Data Summary Sheet.
03	A collection period does not have a minimum of three data points.
04	An entry does not include at least one Student Work Record per collection period.
05	A submitted Student Work Record for an entry does not connect to the API(s).
06	One out of two collection periods is incomplete.
07	No API(s) identified.
08	API(s) is/are not grade span appropriate.
09	A single API is used in more than one entry.
10	A single science content strand is used in more than one entry.
11	Missing entry.
12	API(s) is/are not consistent across the two collection periods.
13	Dates on the Entry/Data Summary Sheet and Student Work Record are not within the timeframes of the collection period.
14	One or more Student Work Records shows acquisition rather than application of the API(s).
15	Tangible student work submitted without a Student Work Record.
16	Student Work Record missing task/activity description.
17	Submitted percentages are miscalculated.
18	Calculations for Accuracy or Independence cannot be verified for a Student Work Record.

 MAP-A 2011 <i>Missouri Assessment Program - Alternate</i>		Individual Student Mathematics API History	
<p>Paul</p> <p>School of Residence: Pretendburgh High School Fakeville R-1 123456</p>		<p>MOSIS: 0123456789 MAP-A #: 597 Date of Birth: 4/29/1995 Grade: 10</p> <p>School of Attendance: Pretendburgh High School Fakeville R-1 123456</p>	
Mathematics			
Strand 1		Strand 2	
Year: 2010-2011 Grade: 10	Entry 1	Entry 2	Entry 1
Year: 2009-2010 Grade:	NO1.1.2: Identify a 2-digit number.	NO3.2.a: Nonverbally demonstrates combining and separating problems. Add 1 item to another item.	ME2.1.f: Develop concepts of time. Identify or predict what comes next in a daily schedule.
Year: 2008-2009 Grade: 8	No Data Available	No Data Available	No Data Available
Year: 2007-2008 Grade: 7	NO1.1.c: Represent and number small collections (1 to 4 items). Show 1 or 2 items (e.g., responds to a verbal request for 1 or 2 items by offering quantity or holding up 1 or 2 fingers).	NO8.3: Identify/recognize numerals 1 through 10 (e.g., point out a 5, given a choice of numerals).	DP2.1.a: Make decisions on how to classify data. Engage in sorting activities that focus on identified attributes of objects (e.g., sorting by color, play sorting games).
Year: 2006-2007 Grade: 6	NO1.1.a: Represent and number small collections (1 to 4 items). Recognize a small collection of 1 or 2 items (e.g., pointing to 1 or 2 items).	NO8.2: Discriminate between numerals and other printed symbols.	DP4.1.a: Describe and analyze data. Determine which category has the most.
Year: 2005-2006 Grade: 5	NO1.2.a: Use number words together to create the counting sequence by 1s. Start counting sequence with 1 (e.g., 1, 2, ...).	NO1.4: Explore quantity using manipulatives.	DP7.1.a: Apply basic concepts of probability. Attend to another person using a chance device (e.g., spinner, dice) and to a person recording outcomes of a chance device.
	NO1.4: Represent and number small collections (1 to 4 items). Show up to four items (e.g., responds to a verbal request for 4 items by offering quantity or holding up 4 fingers).	NO1.1.c: Recognize and extend a variety of patterns. Reproduce (by matching or being shown) a simple repeating pattern.	GS2.1.c: Compose (put together) 2-D shapes to make new shapes. Use shapes to cover an outline by trial and error (e.g., use pattern blocks to cover a pattern block puzzle shape).

		Mathematics											
		Elementary School Grade 3, 4, 5				Middle School Grade 6, 7, 8				High School Grade 10			
		District		State		District		State		District		State	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Advanced	2	100.00	1916	67.92	0		1515	57.74	0		414	54.69	
Proficient	0		716	25.38	0		837	31.90	0		230	30.38	
Basic	0		133	4.71	1	100.00	134	5.11	1	100.00	70	9.25	
Below Basic	0		29	1.03	0		106	4.04	0		12	1.59	
LND	0		27	0.96	0		32	1.22	0		31	4.10	
Total Count	2		2821		1		2624		1		757		
		Communication Arts											
		Elementary School Grade 3, 4, 5				Middle School Grade 6, 7, 8				High School Grade 11			
		District		State		District		State		District		State	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Advanced	1	50.00	1971	69.87	0		1462	55.72	0		383	54.17	
Proficient	1	50.00	703	24.92	1	100.00	750	28.58	0		133	18.81	
Basic	0		99	3.51	0		308	11.62	0		139	19.66	
Below Basic	0		21	0.74	0		76	2.90	0		31	4.38	
LND	0		27	0.96	0		31	1.18	0		21	2.97	
Total Count	2		2821		1		2624		0		707		
		Science											
		Elementary School Grade 5				Middle School Grade 8				High School Grade 11			
		District		State		District		State		District		State	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Advanced	1	100.00	504	51.69	0		355	43.61	0		331	46.82	
Proficient	0		127	13.03	0		147	18.06	0		95	13.44	
Basic	0		200	20.51	0		150	18.43	0		137	19.38	
Below Basic	0		135	13.85	0		139	17.08	0		121	17.11	
LND	0		9	0.92	0		23	2.83	0		23	3.25	
Total Count	1		975		0		814		0		707		
Fakeville R-I		Pretendburgh		Imposter County		123456							