

MO TAC Recommended Changes to the 2008 MAP-A Technical Report Draft

At the August 2009 meeting, after reviewing and discussing the Draft 2008 MAP-A Technical Report, the Missouri TAC made several suggestions for improvement. DESE and ARC incorporated those changes into the 2008 document and carried them forward into the 2009 Draft MAP-A Technical Report presented for review in December 2009.

The table below lists the TAC-suggested changes and where these suggestions were addressed in the 2009 report.

TAC-Recommended Changes	Location in MAP-A 2009 Technical Report Draft
Add a section in the body of the report on the performance standard setting process and results	See the overview of the mathematics and communication arts standard-setting process beginning on page 3. An overview of the science standard-setting process may be found on page 5.
Add a table which reports the percent of students tested using MAP-A versus the total number of students in the state at that grade level	See Table 12, page 28.
Provide a one-page overview up front of how the MAP-A is designed and works	See <i>Introduction to the MAP-A Process</i> , pages 7-9.
Include a table that shows the relationship between the API's that were assessed versus the API's in the domain of API's. This table should be included in the section of the report on content validity. It will indicate the extent to which teachers select API's across the total domain of API's or instead, focus on assessing certain API's and not others.	See Tables 20 and 21, pages 36 and 37.
Provide a better description of the history of the development of the MAP-A	See pages 2-6. Detailed information regarding the development processes may be found in Appendices A and B.
For table A, listing data irregularities and scoring rules, indicate the frequency of these data irregularities.	See the revised table, now Table 10, beginning on page 22.
Add a paragraph or two on the scoring process, making clear that there are two readers and when there is disagreement, a third reader is called in to resolve the disagreement. The exact nature of scoring and determining a student's score must be known in order to think about the ways in which to estimate reliability.	See page 40 and 41 for information on resolution reads and agreement rates.

<p>Revise table 14 and other similar tables because of small sample sizes. In short, when the number of students in a particular category is below 10, results should not be reported, but rather, asterisk with a footnote saying, “data not reportable because of low sample size.” This should be done for the entire row of entries in the table when any entry in that row is below 10.</p>	<p>See Tables 13-19, beginning on page 28.</p>
<p>For the tables where the percent of students at each proficiency level are being reported (e.g. table 11), create a column that reports the percent that are proficient or better.</p>	<p>See Tables 13-19, beginning on page 28.</p>
<p>On page 29 of the report, at the bottom of the page under point 1, delete, “and a normal distribution” since the method does not require a normal distribution. In point 2, drop the word “underestimates” since this suggests that the reliability of the test is underestimated and it is not.</p>	<p>See changes made to this section, which is now on pages 35 and 36.</p>