

# Supplemental Memorandum

**To:** STATE BOARD MEMBERS

**Date:** February 2003

**From:** Susan M. Bennett

**Re:** ITEM # 8

**Subject** Recommendations from the Superintendent's Advisory Committee for the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) pursuant to the review and approval process for additional locally-adopted pre-post tests of achievement to serve as indicators in the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM).

Please remove the original Agenda Item #8 and replace with the new Agenda Item #8, included as Attachment I. (Note: Information Subpart, *Review guidelines for the administration and reporting of locally-adopted pre-post tests of achievement as indicators in the ASAM*, included in the original Agenda Item #8, is being removed from this item. This Subpart will be resubmitted as information in the future.)

Attachment I: New Agenda Item #8 (Page 1)

Attachment II: Report to the California State Board of Education on the Alternative Schools Accountability Model Pre-post Test Indicator Second Review Process (Pages 1-4)



**SUPPLEMENTAL ITEM #8 - ATTACHMENT I  
CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

ITEM # 8

FEBRUARY 2003 AGENDA

SUBJECT	X	ACTION
Consider recommendations from the Superintendent’s Advisory Committee for the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) on additional locally-adopted pre-post tests of achievement to serve as indicators in the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM).		INFORMATION
		PUBLIC HEARING

**Recommendation:**

Approve additional locally-adopted pre-post tests of achievement to serve as indicators in the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM), based on recommendations of the Superintendent’s Advisory Committee for the Public Schools Accountability Act.

**Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action**

At its December 2002 meeting, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved four locally-adopted assessment instruments for use as additional indicators of achievement in the ASAM. SBE also directed the California Department of Education (CDE) and its contractor, WestEd, to contact the publishers of instruments rated at Level 2 (Potentially Approvable) and Level 2a (Promising but with Insufficient Data) to request additional information. WestEd received such information from several publishers and reconvened members of the original standards and technical review panels to evaluate the new data consistent with the original review process.

The Superintendent’s Advisory Committee for the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) met on January 23, 2003 and considered the results of the second review. Based on that review, **the Committee recommends that the SBE approve four instruments, and reject three instruments (see Attachment II, page 4, for specific instruments).**

**Summary of Key Issue(s)**

None

**Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)**

None

**Attachment(s)**

None

**Report to the California State Board of Education  
on the Alternative Schools Accountability Model Pre-post Test Indicator  
Second Review Process**

**I. Background for the Alternative Schools Accountability Model Instrument Review**

The Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999, SB 1X, Chapter 3, Statutes of 1999 [Article 2, Section 52052 (g)], required that by... *July 1, 2000 the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with the approval of the State Board of Education, shall develop an alternative accountability system for schools with fewer than 100 pupils, and for schools under the jurisdiction of a county board of education or a county superintendent of schools, community day schools, and alternative schools, including continuation high schools and independent study schools.*

Following the timeline and procedures approved by the State Board of Education (SBE), the California Department of Education (CDE) developed and implemented an Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) for alternative schools serving high-risk students. Currently, schools participating in the ASAM have selected two performance indicators from a list approved by the State Board of Education. First-year accountability results for ASAM schools will be based on the two performance indicators, as well as on academic performance as measured by STAR results. The Superintendent's Advisory Committee for the Public School Accountability Act (PSAA) proposed that schools in the ASAM be allowed to use a locally-adopted pre-post test to measure English/language arts and/or mathematics achievement as an additional indicator of performance.

CDE contracted with WestEd, the educational laboratory for the region including California and the U.S. Department of Education-designated Assessment and Accountability Specialist Laboratory, to develop and implement a plan to identify potential assessment instruments: (1) appropriate for the various student populations enrolled in ASAM schools; and (2) with sufficient technical characteristics to support school-level accountability decisions. WestEd met extensively with CDE staff and the PSAA Alternative Accountability Subcommittee to develop a plan that was technically sound, feasible, and consistent with the intent of the PSAA.

In June 2002, CDE and WestEd drafted and sent out a request for assessment instruments to all school districts and county offices of education with schools participating in the ASAM, as well as test publishers throughout the country. The letter described the ASAM and requested nominations or submissions of assessment instruments considered appropriate measures for tracking the progress of ASAM students. The submission form requested that publishers provide evidence of the instruments' merit in four areas: (1) alignment to California's content standards, (2) appropriateness for ASAM student populations, (3) technical adequacy (reliability and validity of the instrument), and (4) evidence that the test is free from bias based on race, gender, or ethnicity.

WestEd subsequently received submissions for 33 instruments and conducted a preliminary internal review to ensure that submission requirements had been met and that evidence had been provided relating to the four areas described above. Where evidence was missing, they then contacted the publishers, giving them an additional opportunity to submit supporting materials. This preliminary review was followed by external reviews by standards alignment and psychometric (technical) specialists. While the original proposed ASAM model focused on using approved instruments in a pre-post manner, the review was expanded to potentially allow other models for determining the value-added impact of ASAM schools.

WestEd presented the combined results of these reviews to the PSAA Advisory Committee, which then forwarded their recommendations to the SBE for information in November and for action in December 2002.

## **II. Second Instrument Review**

The SBE approved four locally-adopted assessment instruments for use as additional indicators of achievement in the ASAM in December 2002. The SBE also directed the CDE and its contractor, WestEd, to contact the publishers of instruments rated at Level 2 (Potentially Approvable) and Level 2a (Promising but with Insufficient Data) in the first review process to request additional information. These Level 2 and 2a instruments were deemed promising, but required more information in order to complete the standards alignment and technical review processes. Publishers of six of the Level 2a instruments submitted additional information and three new publishers also submitted instruments for inclusion in the second review. WestEd applied the same standards alignment and technical adequacy review processes that had been used for the first round of assessment evaluations as described below.

### **Standards Alignment Review**

Specialists in the California English/Language Arts and Mathematics content standards (most with direct experience with the ASAM population) convened to review the instruments submitted. Instruments were evaluated based on their alignment to the appropriate content standards, as well as the appropriateness of the instrument to the various ASAM student populations. Each instrument was reviewed by a minimum of two panel members. Instruments that were consistently rated very low in their alignment to the California content standards were removed from consideration; all others proceeded to the subsequent technical review phase.

### **Technical Review**

For the next phase of the review, technical experts conducted the formal review of each instrument's psychometric adequacy. Each instrument was reviewed by a minimum of two panel members. Participants evaluated and rated the instruments' (1) norming processes, especially related to alternative populations, as well as (2) evidence submitted on the reliability, validity, and lack of bias for each assessment.

**Bias Review**

Several steps were taken in the review process to ensure any approved instruments were bias free. First, the WestEd internal review highlighted any evidence provided by the publishers that bias-identification procedures (either statistical or committee-based) were undertaken during instrument development. Second, Standards Alignment Review Panel members reviewed the actual test items to determine appropriateness for the various high-risk student populations. Third, the Technical Review Panel examined the validity of all bias-related evidence provided. Finally, several publishers indicated that their instruments had previously been approved by the California Legal and Social Compliance process.

**Table 1**  
**Combined Ratings of the Second ASAM Standards Alignment and**  
**Technical Review - January, 2003<sup>1</sup>**

**STANDARDS ALIGNMENT**

		High	Moderate	Low
<b>T E C H N I C A L</b>	<b>High</b>	Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measure of Academic Progress (L1)		
	<b>Moderate</b>	Lightspan Reading/Math EduTest * (L1)	EdVision/Scantron Performance Series * (L1)  PLATO System * (L1)	Stanford Diagnostic Reading * (L3)  Stanford Diagnostic Math * (L3)
	<b>Low</b>			New Century Education System* (L3)  Vanderbuilt Oral Reading Test (L3)  Pro-Ed Language Arts Instruments (L3)

*\*Instruments previously rated a Level 2a (requiring more information).*

<sup>1</sup> Tests identified as L1 assess the following content areas and grade levels:  
 Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measure of Academic Progress - Language Arts/Math, grades 2-12,  
 Lightspan Reading/Math EduTest – Language Arts/Math, grades 2-8,  
 EdVision/Scantron Performance Series – Language Arts/Math, grades 2-12,  
 PLATO System – Language Arts/Math at grades K-12.

### **III. Results of Second Review**

The categorization of instruments shown in Table I reflects the combined ratings of the standards alignment and review panels.

As Table 1 indicates, one instrument received high ratings on both the standards alignment and technical criteria. The same decision rules that were applied following the first instrument review have been applied here. Levels 1, 2, 2a, and 3 are defined as follows:

*Level 1 (Provisionally Approvable)*: Instruments receiving at least a moderate rating on both content and technical criteria may be approvable for continued use subject to the development of formal administration and reporting regulations. Four instruments are in this category.

*Level 2 (Potentially Approvable) and Level 2a (Promising but with Insufficient Data)*: While the instruments appear to possess alignment to the California content standards and contain several desirable features, insufficient evidence was presented to make a reliable judgment. No instruments were categorized at these levels.

*Level 3 (Unapprovable)*: Instruments falling below moderate in either category with no counterbalancing high rating on standards alignment should be considered unapprovable. (The review panels believed that no instrument with insufficient standards alignment should be approved because the instruments were submitted as intact.)

### **IV. Recommendations**

The second instrument review process has identified additional locally-adopted instruments for potential use as additional indicators of achievement at ASAM schools. The PSAA Advisory Committee recommends the following:

- ***State Board Approval of Level 1 instruments.*** Four instruments that received a moderate or higher rating in both the standards alignment and technical reviews should be approved for use as an additional ASAM indicator subject to the development and State Board approval of formal administration and reporting requirements. Schools can examine the instruments for use with the populations they serve.
  
- ***Rejection of Level 3 instruments.***