Alternate Maryland School Assessment

2003-2004 Technical Manual

Prepared for the Maryland State Department of Education
by Pearson Educational Measurement
12.03.04

Table of Contents

List of Appendices

Purpose

This publication is designed to provide information to Maryland testing coordinators, educators, parents, and interested citizens about the development, implementation, scoring, and technical attributes of the portfolio-based Alternate Maryland School Assessment, otherwise known as the ALT-MSA.

The purpose of this document is to provide information about the ALT-MSA that will help schools and educators use the assessment and interpret the results. It is hoped that the information presented in this manual will enable schools and educators to make informed assessment-based decisions in order to improve instruction, which will lead to enhanced teaching and improved student learning.

In addition, this technical report outlines the purpose of the ALT-MSA so that parents, educators, and students have a clear understanding of why their participation in the assessment program is so important. This understanding is a critical component of any testing program. If the stakeholders do not understand the underlying purpose of the assessment they may be reluctant to give it their full attention and support.

One of the main goals of any assessment system is improved learning through informed instruction. This is a challenging goal and one that will require the commitment and dedication of all those involved: state agency personnel, local administrators, teachers and students.

1.0 Historical Overview

1.1 Overview of the Alternate Assessment

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 1997, as well as The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), mandate that states provide an alternate assessment when implementing statewide accountability systems. To qualify as a "true" alternate assessment, the assessment must be aligned to the State's content standards, must report student achievement according to established proficiency levels with the same frequency and level of detail as the State's regular assessment, and must serve the same purpose as the assessment for which it is an alternate (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2003).

The Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA) is an assessment designed for students with disabilities who are unable to participate in the regular Maryland School Assessment, even when accommodations are provided. The ALT-MSA is a way for all students with disabilities to take part in and benefit from a structured assessment system.

Background

Since 1995, students with disabilities who could not participate in the general education assessment participated in the Independence Mastery Assessment Program (IMAP). IMAP

- served as the alternate assessment for the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program, MSPAP, and was intended as a program evaluation;
- assessed students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 11; and
- assessed program performance by assessing students in personal management, as well as community, recreation/leisure, career/vocational, and communication/ decision making/interpersonal skills.

New federal mandates in the revised Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as NCLB 2001, prompted a revision of the general education assessment (MSPAP) as well as the IMAP by requiring that

- students receive an individual score in reading and mathematics and, by 2007, science; and
- students be assessed in grades 3-8 and a high school grade.

As a result of these new mandates both the general education assessment (MSPAP) and the IMAP were revised. The revised version of the MSPAP, the Maryland School Assessment (MSA), is administered to students in Grades 3-8 and 10 and tests students' attainment of grade-level objectives in reading and mathematics. The revised version of the IMAP, the Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA) is administered in grades 3–8 and 10 and assesses attainment of individually selected objectives in reading and mathematics at the student's instructional level.

Some milestones in the development of Maryland's alternate assessment program are outlined below.

Chronology of Alternate Assessment Development in Maryland

1994	IMAP domains and indicators were developed.
1994-1995	First administration of the IMAP.
1997	Amendments to the IDEA required all children be included in statewide testing and accountability systems.
2001-2002	IMAP modified to include reading, mathematics, and writing.
Spring 2003	Design and development of the ALT-MSA.
Summer 2003	Standard setting for the reading and mathematics portions of the IMAP.
2003-2004	First administration of the ALT-MSA.
Summer 2004	ALT-MSA standards validation.

The new ALT-MSA differs from the previously administered IMAP in several important ways, as shown in the table below.

Comparing the ALT-MSA and the IMAP

	ALT-MSA 2003-2004	IMAP 2002-2003 Accountability Assessment Items	IMAP 2002-2003 Non-Accountability Assessment Items
Purpose	Intended to assess student attainment of individually selected objectives in mathematics and reading at the student's instructional level to support the requirements of NCLB.	Intended to assess student attainment of individually selected objectives in mathematics and reading at the student's instructional level to support the requirements of NCLB.	Assessed performance in writing, communication/ decision making/ interpersonal, personal management, community, recreation/leisure, career/vocational.
Grades Tested	3-8, 10, and 11*	3, 5, 8, 11	3, 5, 8, 11
Reporting	Student scores included in statewide results for reading and mathematics	Student scores included in statewide results for reading and mathematics	Scores not included in statewide accountability results
Score Use	Accountability, inform instruction, program evaluation	Accountability, inform instruction	Inform instruction

*****(Note: In order to transition to a measurement in grade 10 from grade 11 in previous years, ALT-MSA was administered in grades 3–8, 10, and 11 in 2003-2004 only. Results for students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 counted toward NCLB Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in that year. For 2004-2005 and beyond, results from grades 3–8 and 10 will be included in AYP and students in grade 11 will no longer be assessed.)

	ALT-MSA 2003-2004	IMAP 2002-2003 Accountability Assessment Items	IMAP 2002-2003 Non Accountability Assessment Items
Assessment Specifications	• Assess reading and mathematics objectives based on Maryland content standards. • Test examiner identifies reading and mathematics objectives based on student's instructional level. • Pre-assessment to determine baseline skills. • Authentic task/setting criteria (2 mastery objectives must be authentic and demonstrated in an authentic setting). • Detailed specifications for the design of assessment tasks (mastery objectives). • Assessment objectives customized to match the abilities of the student, incorporating appropriate prompts and supports to enable student participation. • Review of mastery objectives to ensure adequacy and alignment.	• Assessed reading and mathematics objectives based on Maryland content standards. • Test examiner identified reading and mathematics objectives based on student's instructional level. • For each objective, selected artifacts were collected at baseline, mid year, and end of year to demonstrate student growth. • Some assessment tasks developed locally according to MSDE guidelines and others designed by MSDE for administration statewide.	• Individualized writing and communication/ decision making/ interpersonal objectives were selected by test examiners. • Students participated in 2 grade-specific performance tasks that assessed personal management, community, recreation/leisure, and career/vocational.
Scoring	• Dichotomous scoring of each task as displaying mastery or non-mastery. • Calculation of mastery percentages in reading and mathematics that reflect the proportion of mastery objectives mastered. • Mastery scores used to assign students to performance levels.	• A growth score was assigned based on student achievement and use of supports. • Students assigned to performance levels based on their demonstrated growth.	• Writing and communication/ decision making/ interpersonal were scored based on growth model. • Performance tasks score based on number of steps in each task the student performed.

Purpose of the Assessment

The ALT-MSA is designed to

- ensure that all students have an opportunity to reap the instructional and informational benefits afforded by an assessment program;
- ensure that all students are included in the statewide accountability system;
- allow for all students to participate in a standards-based curriculum;
- provide a means for charting student performance from year to year relative to the state content standards;
- provide teacher/schools/districts with information to inform instruction and support program evaluation;
- support inferences regarding the extent to which a student has mastered a specific objective; and
- hold schools and districts accountable for improved instruction and student learning.

Participation in the ALT-MSA

Alternate assessments like the ALT-MSA are designed to measure the performance of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to participate in the general education assessment used by districts and states (even with accommodations) as determined by the individual student's IEP team. Participants in the ALT-MSA comprise approximately 1% of the total tested student population. It is mandatory that students with disabilities participate in either the MSA or ALT-MSA. Each student's IEP team decides which assessment is appropriate for an individual student.

Students with disabilities must participate in the MSA if they

- participate in the grade-level general education curriculum with accommodations, supplemental aids and services, or assistive technologies, as determined by the IEP team;
- meet the graduation requirements for a Maryland High School Diploma with accommodations, supplemental aids and services, or assistive technologies, as determined by the IEP team.

Students with disabilities participate in the ALT-MSA if they

- learn extended Maryland Content Standards in reading and mathematics, or the observable, measurable student responses outlined in the Reading and Mathematics access skills;
- participate in a Fundamental Life Skills curriculum that includes instruction in functional academics, personal management, community, recreation/leisure, career/vocational, and communication/decision making/interpersonal skills.

In 2003-2004, eligible students participated in the ALT-MSA in Grades 3-8, 10, and 11. In subsequent years, students will participate in grades 3-8 and 10. To determine the grade level of a student in an un-graded program for the purpose of accountability in the state assessment program, the following MSDE procedure is used:

> Grade equals the number of years the student has been in school after kindergarten (including the current year) adjusted by subtracting the number of times he/she was not promoted and/or adding the number of times he/she was accelerated.

The number of students that participated in the current administration of the ALT-MSA is provided in Appendix A, Table 1 by gender, ethnicity, grade, and socioeconomic status.

Organizations and Groups Involved

A number of groups and organizations are involved with the ALT-MSA. Each of the major contributors listed below serves a specific function, and their collaborative efforts contribute significantly to the program's success.

Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

The Division of Accountability and Assessment and the Division of Special Education/ Early Intervention Services of MSDE have the joint responsibility of implementing the requirements in Maryland for statewide testing of students with disabilities. Together they oversee the development of test administration manuals, accountability and interpretive reports, and instructional videotapes, planning, scheduling, implementation, scoring, and reporting of all ALT-MSA activities and supervise MSDE's current contract with Pearson Educational Measurement. In addition, MSDE staff conducts quality-control activities for every aspect of the development and administration of the assessment program and monitors the security provisions of the scoring process.

Pearson Educational Measurement (PEM)

PEM has been the MSDE's primary contractor for the ALT-MSA assessment program since November 2003. Each school year, approximately 5,600 ALT-MSA student tests are administered. PEM distributes test materials to approximately 1,000 schools in Maryland and is responsible for the security of all student materials. In addition, PEM produces ancillary testing materials including test administration manuals, interpretive guides, online ordering and pretest file uploading instructions, packing lists, return shipping materials and instructions, freight bills and pre-identification labels, student and summary reports. PEM also conducts the handscoring of all student assessment tasks for the ALT-MSA and distributes a set of standard reports for various audiences within the state.

PEM collaborates with the MSDE on all facets of the ALT-MSA, including rangefinding, training scorers, daily and cumulative performance scoring reports, and the format of final student and state summary reports. In addition, PEM recruits and hires scoring personnel, trains group leaders, coordinates the shipping and handling of student papers, maintains security, and transmits scoring data to the PEM-Iowa City scoring center.

Because of the diverse nature of the services required, PEM employs a subcontractor to perform some of the tasks that require specialized expertise. Currently PEM's subcontractor in this regard is the Inclusive Large-Scale Standards and Assessment group (ILSSA) at the University of Kentucky.

Inclusive Large-Scale Standards and Assessment group (ILSSA)

ILSSA-group provides technical and content expertise in the design and implementation of alternate assessments. For the ALT-MSA Program, ILSSA develops training materials, conducts studies, reviews mastery objectives, and provides expertise in assessing students with significant cognitive disabilities.

ILSSA has been working in the area of alternate assessment since 1991 when the Commonwealth of Kentucky required all students to be counted in their assessment and accountability system. Since then, ILSSA staff has provided technical and consultative assistance on alternate assessment in some 24 states and other entities. In addition, ILSSA staff has authored a number of technical and research documents related to alternate assessment and published *Alternate Assessments: Measuring Outcomes and Supports* (Kleinert & Kearns, 2001). ILSSA staff members have extensive first hand knowledge in teaching students with disabilities and in assessing those same students.

Advisory Committee

The ALT-MSA advisory committee is comprised of MSDE staff, local school system central office staff, non-public special placement school staff, as well as representatives of institutes of higher education, teachers, parents, and important stakeholder groups. The advisory committee provides invaluable input by representing the teachers and students most influenced by the ALT-MSA. They consult and make recommendations on all aspects of the ALT-MSA test design and administration and annually review the Test Administration and Coordination Manual to ensure that it is clear, concise, and user-friendly.

1.2 Test Design and Blueprint

The ALT-MSA was developed in close collaboration with experts in reading and mathematics content, psychometrics, and portfolio assessment for students receiving special education; consultants with a national perspective; stakeholder advisory committee members; special educators; and parents of students who participate in the ALT-MSA.

Review of the Standards

Before making design recommendations for the ALT-MSA, the MSDE and the Advisory Committee reviewed the existing Maryland Content Standards. Committee members worked in small groups to examine the Maryland reading and mathematics standards that are typically the focus of instruction for students who participate in the ALT-MSA. They also reviewed several examples of extended standards, or access skills, used by other states in their alternate assessments. Access skills represent foundational skills for all learning and were incorporated into ALT-MSA in the context of reading and mathematics content standards and instruction.

Test Design

In consideration of the best design for the ALT-MSA, the Advisory Committee reviewed alternate assessments from a variety of different states to examine the following characteristics: test format (e.g., portfolio, checklist, and performance tasks), assessment components, scoring procedures employed, and perspectives regarding the alignment of

the alternate assessment to a student's IEP. Throughout this process contributors were reminded that their main goal was to develop an assessment instrument aligned with federal mandates and current best practice in instruction and assessment. A general overview of the current design of the ALT-MSA follows:

- The ALT-MSA assesses and reports student mastery of reading and mathematics objectives from the Maryland content standards (or appropriate access skills) that are selected by the student's test examiner team. The test examiner team constructs a portfolio of evidence that demonstrates that the individual student attained the target mastery objectives that were written to align with the selected reading and mathematics or access skills objectives. Scorers review the portfolios to determine if the submitted evidence substantiates that the mastery objectives have been attained.

- A cycle of assessment and instruction is intrinsic to ALT-MSA. Early in the school year the test examiner team conducts a pre-assessment to determine what skills the student currently possesses in reading and mathematics. A student's instructional and assessment program is based on the results of this pre-assessment. If it is determined that the reading and mathematics content standard objectives are not yet able to be attained by the student, the test examiner team conducts a second pre-assessment for access skills. Test examiners determine which (if any) of the observable, measurable student responses outlined in the access skills the student currently possesses.

- Based on (1) the pre-assessment and (2) the content standards, indicators, and objectives specified for ALT-MSA, the team selects the reading and mathematics content standard or access skills objectives that the student can be expected to attain with at least 80% accuracy by the beginning of March of the following year. The objectives selected by the team should include current reading and mathematics objectives in the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP). Test examiners then collaborate to develop one mastery objective, or assessment task, for each selected objective.

- Students must receive instruction in the selected reading and mathematics content standard or access skills objectives. A student is assessed when the test examiner determines that he or she can demonstrate the skill with at least 80% accuracy. Evidence of mastery is collected by the test examiner when the student has mastered an objective. Evidence of mastery may be collected at any time during the test window, which spans from the beginning of October to the beginning of March. The portfolio is a collection of student work and other documentation that demonstrates that the student has attained the mastery objectives. Thoughtful early planning, organization, and shared ownership of the ALT-MSA among the student's teachers and related service providers results in a portfolio that conveys student learning reflecting an integrated instructional program provided by a collaborative instructional team.

- Since the ALT-MSA is a record of a student's work, portfolio development involves the student as much as possible. Students work with test examiners to complete the student information letter, chart their learning, and select artifacts that demonstrate mastery.

- Active parent/guardian involvement supports the student in learning the selected reading and mathematics objectives. Students' opportunities to learn are broadened when parents are full participants in their child's education. Families provide additional opportunities to practice what is learned in school at home and in community settings. These opportunities increase the likelihood that skills learned in the school community will be generalized to activities in the home and other community settings.

Test Blueprint

Each submitted portfolio must contain the following:

- Table of Contents

- List of test examiners for the student

- Documentation of the student's IEP goals and objectives and daily schedule

- A signed copy of a parental review form documenting the reading and mathematics content standards or access skills to be assessed with the ALT-MSA

- A signed copy of a parental review form that indicates review of the final ALT-MSA portfolio

- Two Pre-assessment Forms
  - Reading Pre-assessment--Outlines the selected grade-level content standard indicators and objectives included in the reading pre-assessment and whether they have been mastered (M) or are currently included in the student's instructional program (i.e., in progress IP).
  - Mathematics Pre-assessment--Outlines the selected grade level content standard indicators and objectives included in the mathematics pre-assessment and whether they have been mastered (M) or are currently included in the student's instructional program (i.e., in progress IP).

- Reading Artifact Entry Form and 12 artifacts
  - Test examiners select at least one indicator and two objectives from each of the content standards or areas listed below for assessment. One artifact is submitted for each objective selected.

1.0 General Reading Processes ▪ Phonemic Awareness or Phonics (select an indicator and two objectives) ▪ Vocabulary (select an indicator and two objectives) ▪ General reading comprehension (select an indicator and two objectives)

2.0 Comprehension of Informational Text (select an indicator and two objectives)

3.0 Comprehension of Literary Text (select an indicator and two objectives)

- One objective from content standard 2 and one objective from content standard 3 is selected for demonstration in one additional setting other than the classroom. Each of these objectives require the submission of two artifacts: one for each setting.

- Mathematics Artifact Entry Form and 12 artifacts
  - Test examiners select at least one indicator and two objectives from each of the content standards or areas listed below for assessment. One artifact is submitted for each objective selected.

1.0 Algebra, Patterns, And/Or Functions
- Patterns and Functions--Select one indicator and two objectives from Patterns and Functions or Expression, Equations, and Inequalities.

2.0 Knowledge of Geometry
- Plane Geometric Figures or Transformations--Select an indicator and two objectives from Plane Geometric Figures or Transformations.

3.0 Knowledge of Measurement
- Measurement Scales or Measurement--Select an indicator and two objectives from Measurement Scales or Measurement.

4.0 Knowledge of Statistics
- Data Analysis--Select an indicator and two objectives from Data Analysis.

6.0 Knowledge of Number Relationships or Computation
- Select an indicator and two objectives from Number/Number and Place Value, Fraction, Money, or Number Computation.

7.0 Process of Mathematics
- Communication
  To show student mastery of this indicator, this must be integrated with the other indicators in each of the assessed content standards.

  - One objective from content standard 3 and one objective from content standard 6 is selected for demonstration in one additional setting other than the classroom. Each of these objectives require the submission of two artifacts: one for each setting.

If it is determined during pre-assessment that a student will be unable to attain the pre-K-8 reading and mathematics content standards and objectives, an additional pre-assessment is conducted for reading and mathematics access skills objectives. Based on this pre-assessment the test examiner team selects a set of access skills for the ALT-MSA to be assessed in the context of reading and mathematics. Access skills are prerequisite skills

for the content standard indicators and objectives. Therefore, performance on access skills provides insight on progress toward the content standards.

In addition to the components outlined in the first six bullets above, portfolios for students assessed on access skills objectives must contain:

- Reading Access Skills Artifact Entry Form and 12 artifacts
  - Test examiners select five access skills and ten objectives (two from each access skill) from those listed below for assessment in the context of reading.

Access Skill 1: Demonstrate observable responses to a variety of relevant stimuli
- Objective a Keep eyes open for a designated period of time
- Objective b Demonstrate alertness that is influenced by external events
- Objective c Respond to kinesthetic, tactile, auditory, and visual stimuli
- Objective d Demonstrate understanding of cause and effect (e.g., use a switch operated device, use graphics or signs)
- Objective e Respond to environmental and social stimuli
- Objective f Reach and grasp object

Access Skill 2: Demonstrate understanding that symbols are a representation of concrete objects or experiences
- Objective a Match like objects
- Objective b Match object to photograph or picture of like object
- Objective c Match pictures of similar representations of same object
- Objective d Match object to symbol or sign
- Objective e Match object or picture to activity

Access Skill 3: Respond to basic vocabulary
- Objective a Respond to spoken words or manual signs
- Objective b Respond to symbols (e.g, graphics, symbols of family members/friends)

Access Skill 4: Recognize personal identifiers
- Objective a Recognize own picture
- Objective b Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of family members, friends, or pets
- Objective c Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of professional personnel and service providers

Access Skill 5: Attend to stimulus
- Objective a Focus eye gaze in direction of stimuli (speaker, person signing)
- Objective b Attend to speaker for duration of activity
- Objective c Listen to a story in a group
- Objective d Listen to a story with a peer

Access Skill 6: Makes choices
- Objective a Indicates choice of printed materials (magazine, book, newspaper)
- Objective b Indicates choice of literature from different media (books on tape, videotape, DVD, computer, storyboards)
- Objective c Indicates choice of type of literature (poems, finger stories, rap songs, short stories)

- Artifacts demonstrating evidence of use in multiple settings are required for two of the selected reading access skills.

- Mathematics Access Skills Artifact Entry Form and 12 artifacts
  - Test examiners select five access skills and ten objectives (two for each access skill) from those listed below for assessment in the context of mathematics.

Access Skill 1: Demonstrate observable responses to a variety of relevant stimuli
- Objective a Keep eyes open for a designated period of time
- Objective b Demonstrate alertness that is influenced by external events
- Objective c Respond to kinesthetic, tactile, auditory, and visual stimuli
- Objective d Demonstrate understanding of cause and effect (e.g., use a switch operated device, use graphics or signs)
- Objective e Respond to environmental and social stimuli
- Objective f Reach and grasp object

Access Skill 2: Demonstrate understanding that symbols are a representation of concrete objects or experiences
- Objective a Match like objects
- Objective b Match object to photograph or picture of like object
- Objective c Match pictures of similar representations of same object
- Objective d Match object to symbol or sign
- Objective e Match object or picture to activity

Access Skill 3: Respond to basic vocabulary
- Objective a Respond to spoken words or manual signs
- Objective b Respond to symbols (e.g., graphics or symbol systems such as PCS, sign, or picture-exchange system)

Access Skill 4: Recognize personal identifiers
- Objective a Recognize own picture
- Objective b Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of family members, friends, or pets
- Objective c Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of professional personnel and service providers

Access Skill 5: Attend to stimulus
- Objective a Focus eye gaze in direction of stimuli (speaker, person signing)
- Objective b Attend to speaker for duration of activity

Access Skill 6: Makes choices
- Objective a Indicates choice

  - Artifacts demonstrating evidence of use in multiple settings are required for two of the selected mathematics access skills.

2.0 Portfolio Assessment Construction & Administration

2.1 Timeline

The Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA) test construction and administration timeline for the current administration is located in Appendix B.

2.2 Contributors

A number of Local Education Agency and school staff members contribute their time and expertise to ensure the success of the ALT-MSA program. A list of these contributors and an overview of their roles and responsibilities relative to the ALT-MSA test construction and administration process are provided below. In addition to students in the public schools, students who are in special placements in non-public settings but supported by public funding also participate in the ALT-MSA. (These special-placement schools are commonly referred to in Maryland as "LEA 24 Schools.")

Local Accountability Coordinator

- Identifies students participating in ALT-MSA by grade level, submits pre- and posttest files
- Conducts local ALT-MSA training for Principals, School Test Coordinators, and Test Examiners
- Provides every test examiner a complete ALT-MSA Administration Manual, which may not be changed in any manner
- Orders portfolio materials

Principal

- Attends training on ALT-MSA
- Establishes the test examiner team for each student and monitors the portfolio development process
- Ensures compliance with test procedures
- Secures resources needed for ALT-MSA
- Reviews Test Examiner Documents, signs, and forwards to LAC

School Testing Coordinator

- Attends training provided by LAC
- Signs Nondisclosure Agreement form and returns to LAC
- Provides training to Test Examiners
- Collaborates with Principal to implement ALT-MSA
- Ensures that Test Examiners sign Nondisclosure Agreement and keeps the signed forms for three years
- Orders test materials through the LAC
- Inventories the ALT-MSA test materials upon arrival at school and distributes them to test examiners
- Notifies Principal and LAC of any irregularity in test procedures
- Ensures orderly collection and packing of test materials

- Works with Test Examiners to ensure that all eligible students participate in ALT-MSA
- Prepares portfolios for pick up at school by MSDE courier

Test Examiners

- Attends training provided by LAC or School Test Coordinator
- Signs Nondisclosure Agreement form
- Obtains test materials from the School Testing Coordinator and verifies correct quantities
- Notifies Principal and School Testing Coordinator of any test irregularities
- Works with test examiner team to plan and develop the ALT-MSA Portfolios according to stated timelines

Instructional Assistants (Under the supervision of the test examiners)

- Copies documents to be included in portfolios
- Provides appropriate support to student during assessment
- Videotapes and audiotapes student demonstration of mastery objectives
- Observes and records data of student demonstration of mastery objectives

Student

Students participate in the development of their portfolios. It is their assessment of mastery in reading and mathematics skills. The principles of self-determination are critical for students who participate in the ALT-MSA.

Parents/Guardians

Active parent/guardian participation in student learning reinforces the school instructional program. Parents/guardians are invited to review, provide suggestions, ask questions, and consider how the objectives can be applied at home and in the community. Parents are asked to sign and return the cover form and submit examples of their child's demonstration of the mastery objectives.

ALT-MSA Facilitator

- Attends in-depth training provided by MSDE
- Collaborates with the LAC to plan and implement in-depth training for principals, school test coordinators, and test examiners. Multiple training sessions may need to be provided
- Contacts appropriate MSDE staff for answers to questions
- Participates in the state review of the mastery objectives

2.3 ALT-MSA Development and Administration

ALT-MSA Portfolio Planning and Development

Several tasks and activities are conducted each fall prior to administration of the ALT-MSA to ensure that all stakeholders are well trained, informed, and dedicated to the ALT-MSA assessment effort. These activities help to ensure the validity of ALT-MSA assessment results and, to the extent possible, standardize the assessment development

and administration process. The steps in the ALT-MSA planning and development process are outlined below.

1. Attend Training

Principals and school test coordinators attend in-depth training sessions about the ALT-MSA and become thoroughly familiar with the procedures for the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio.

2. Provide Training

The principal and school test coordinator provide in-depth training to school staff. Any staff member who teaches or is in some way involved in the instruction of a student participating in the ALT-MSA attends this training. A student's teachers, related service providers, and instructional assistants may be considered members of his/her assessment team.

3. Meet with Test Examiners

The principal or designee, school test coordinator, teachers, related service providers, and instructional assistants who teach students who participate in ALT-MSA meet to identify the test examiner team for each student. It is important to include each student's teachers, related service providers, and instructional assistants in the test examiner team. The decisions made by this team determine the content of the student's ALT-MSA Portfolio and components of his/her reading and mathematics instructional programs. Students have more and better opportunities to learn and generalize their learning when selected skills are taught across a student's schedule and in different settings by all the student's teachers, related service providers, and instructional assistants.

4. Meet in Test Examiner Teams

(a) Plan the Pre-assessment

Early each school year, test examiner teams plan and conduct pre-assessments for each student to participate in the ALT-MSA. Students are pre-assessed to determine what indicators and objectives within selected reading and mathematics content standards they have mastered.

To formulate the content for a pre-assessment, the team first reviews the Maryland reading and mathematics content standards. These are available on http://mdk12.org/data/progress/developing/m4w2/pr2/monitoring_templates.html

Next, the test examiner team considers the information they already have about the student's skills by reviewing current formal and informal test results for reading and mathematics.

Then the test examiner team selects and downloads the indicators and objectives of the grade levels for reading and mathematics in which the student is currently being instructed. Since students who are eligible for participation in the ALT-MSA are not learning grade-level indicators and objectives, the pre-assessment typically begins at a grade level considerably lower than the student's chronological age indicates. On these lists of objectives, "M" and the date are recorded next to the objectives that have been mastered by the student. "IP" and the date are recorded next to objectives that are in progress and currently part of the student's instructional program.

Based on the pre-assessment, if it is determined that the student is not yet able to attain the reading and mathematics content standards objectives, the test examiner team conducts a second pre-assessment for access skills. Access skills are underlying skills students need to attain indicators for content standards and functional life skills. For the 2003-2004 ALT-MSA access skills were taught and assessed in the context of reading and mathematics.

(b) Conduct the Pre-assessment

Next, test examiners informally assess appropriate objectives at the selected grade level to determine if other objectives in reading and mathematics have been attained. Next to mastered objectives, "M" and the date of the pre-assessment is recorded. If objectives are part of the student's current instructional program "IP" (in progress) and the date is recorded. If the pre-assessment is constructed using access skills, similar procedures are followed.

The information gleaned from pre-assessment guides the selection of the objectives for the ALT-MSA Portfolio.

(c) Select Indicators and Objectives for the ALT-MSA

Based on the results of the pre-assessment, the test examiner team selects at least one indicator and two objectives from each of five designated content standards within a subject area (or two objectives from each of five access skills). Objectives that the student has not yet mastered are selected by the team to be assessed for the ALT-MSA. Selected indicators and objectives are recorded on the appropriate ALT-MSA test documents.

(d) Write Mastery Objectives

Using the objectives selected and recorded on the ALT-MSA test documents, test examiners write a clear statement of expected mastery for each objective. To be measurable, mastery objectives must include:

- the conditions for performing the skill;
- the observable, measurable response the student is to make; and
- the level of mastery expected (Browder, 2001).

For the ALT-MSA, the criterion for a judgment of "mastered" is 80%.

Mastery objectives are not a repetition of the state objectives. Mastery objectives include (a) the supports the student needs and the stimulus the student will respond to (conditions), and (b) the specific, observable behavior the student is expected to demonstrate in response to the conditions. The student's response must be observable (able to be seen or heard) to be measurable, and be demonstrated with (c) an 80% level of mastery.

5. Review by Principal and Send to LAC

After the ALT-MSA test documents are completed by the test examiner team and reviewed and signed by the principal or designee, a copy is sent to the Local Accountability Coordinator. The LAC then forwards the documents to the MSDE.

6. Review of Mastery Objectives

Each mastery objective submitted for a student is reviewed by the MSDE to ensure it meets the requirements outlined in the TACM, including: alignment to the selected content standard (or access skill), clear specification of performance conditions (e.g., prompts needed), and measurability. To satisfy measurability requirements the mastery objective must elicit an observable/measurable student response. That is, the scorer must be able to see or hear the student response to the stimulus and the response must be able to be converted to a percent of accuracy.

Reviewers use a yellow checklist to examine each mastery objective and indicate areas of concern (i.e., Appendix C). When necessary, hand-written comments or suggestions are also provided. When the review is complete the checklist is sent to the test examiner team so that mastery objectives can be revised as needed. Test examiners include this checklist with the final submitted portfolio.

7. Parent/Guardian Review

The ALT-MSA test documents for reading and mathematics content standards or access skills are shared with the student's parents/guardians. Parents/guardians are invited to review, provide suggestions, ask questions, and consider how they could reinforce the skills to be assessed at home and in the community. They are requested to sign the cover sheet and return it to the school.

8. Provide Instruction and Assess the Objectives

Teachers and test examiners plan for how each objective should be taught and assessed. During this process test examiners consult with general education teachers for ideas about how they teach and assess similar objectives. The general education teachers can provide a curricular context for teaching and assessing the objective. This helps test examiners teach the objectives and select the type of artifacts to be submitted as evidence of mastery.

All students tend to learn new skills more readily when they are taught in an authentic or real-life context. Linking the instruction of reading and mathematics content standards or access skills to other taught or targeted outcome areas will more likely result in student mastery of the reading and mathematics content standard or access skills objectives. Other content areas such as science, social studies, art, music, health, and physical education, and the areas of community, recreation/leisure, career/vocational, and personal management provide students and teachers the real-life, authentic context that will promote learning of reading and mathematics.

All aspects of the ALT-MSA are conducted within the context of the ongoing daily instructional program. The ALT-MSA is a focus for team meetings. Test examiners are not expected or encouraged to take any component of ALT-MSA portfolio development away from the school. The ALT-MSA portfolio is constructed within the context of daily instruction while involving the student, test examiner team members, and the parent/guardian.

Acceptable Evidence of Mastery

For each mastery objective, evidence that indicates the student has mastered the objective is included in the portfolio**.** For four of the objectives, two in reading and two in mathematics, an artifact that shows the student demonstrating the skill in at least one additional setting other than the classroom is also required.

The different types or categories of artifacts that may be submitted as evidence of mastery are described below. Every artifact must be dated with the month, date, and year and the mastery objective must be stated. If artifacts are not dated, or the mastery objective is not stated they will not be scored and the student will receive "not mastered" for the objective.

- **Student Work**
  Student work artifacts are artifacts generated or completed by the student that clearly reflect attainment of the mastery objective and provide direct evidence that the student has mastered the objective. Test examiners are cautioned about submitting worksheets such as an activity sheet from an external source, like a workbook, textbook, or periodical, on which a student is required to recall and repeat information, select a pre-determined response, or provide limited or brief responses (e.g., circle a selection, identify a statement as true/false, fill in a blank). While commercially produced materials may be useful during instruction for the purpose of student practice, it is unlikely that they will completely align with the individualized mastery objectives written by the test examiners for a specific student.

- **Audiotape**
  When appropriate, test examiners may provide audiotaped evidence of the student demonstrating the mastery objective. The student must introduce him/herself (or the test examiner may introduce him/her) and the objective being assessed and the date must be stated. If the objective is not stated, the test item on the audiotape is not scored. Audiotapes are scored by rating the

student as "mastered" or "not mastered" based on demonstration of the skill in relation to the mastery objective for the assessed objective.

- **Data Charts**
  Artifacts that display evidence of instruction over time and document student demonstration of the mastery objective are called data charts. The student name, the objective being assessed and the date must be displayed on each data chart. Data charts are scored by rating the student as "mastered" or "not mastered" based on the recorded demonstration of the skill in relation to the components of the mastery objective for the assessed objective.

- **Videotape**
  A videotape is a required artifact for the ALT-MSA. Each student must be videotaped demonstrating mastery of at least two objectives, one from a reading content standard or access skill and one from a mathematics content standard or access skill. The videotape is the artifact for these two objectives. Additional objectives may also be videotaped and submitted as evidence of mastery. Videotaped demonstrations of mastery objectives should last no longer than 5-10 minutes for each objective.

  For videotaped artifacts, students must introduced themselves (or a test examiner may introduce them) and the objective being assessed and the date must be stated. Videotape artifacts are scored by rating the student as "mastered" or "not mastered" based on demonstration of the skill in relation to the mastery objective.

  Parents/guardians are informed that (1) videotapes are required for the ALT-MSA, (2) only scorers who have signed Nondisclosure Agreements will view the videotapes, and (3) the videotapes are secured and destroyed after scoring.

  If a parent/guardian states in writing that they will not allow their child to be videotaped, the following procedures must be followed:

  1. Three professional staff members must observe the student demonstrate the selected reading and mathematics mastery objectives. One observer may be the student's primary teacher, another observer may be a member of the professional instructional team who is providing direct service to the student or another teacher, and the third observer must be a district representative not working in the particular school.

  2. Each observer records a detailed observation of the entire student performance of the target mastery objectives. All observers must review their written observations for accuracy and completeness to be certain that all observed components of the written mastery objective are included in their observations. Observers print and sign their names at the end of the recorded observations. The student's name,

grade, school, and mastery objective must be included at the beginning of the observation.

Artifacts that are not scored as evidence of mastery are:

- photographs;
- a narrative description of the student demonstrating the mastery objective; and
- any artifact that does not contain all the components of a written objective as described in this manual.

Students are scored as "not mastered" for the objective if these artifacts are all that is submitted for the given objective.

Eligible Test Examiners

Eligible Test Examiners for the ALT-MSA administration must be state-certified professional school staff and related service providers. Under the supervision of the test examiners, special education instructional assistants who typically provide instruction and support to the assessed student may copy documents to be included in portfolios, provide appropriate support to a student during an assessment, videotape and audiotape student demonstration of mastery objectives, and observe and record data of student demonstration of mastery objectives.

Regular and/or certified staff who are not eligible as Test Examiners include:

- noncertified instructional assistants and aides who are not regular employees of the school district (e.g., student teachers, parents who serve as regular volunteers); and
- state certified teachers who are not regular employees of the school system and who are not on a substitute list.

2.4 Portfolio Organization

The ALT-MSA Portfolio contents are organized into four sections. Samples of all forms that must be included in the ALT-MSA Portfolio can be found in the Test Administration and Coordination Manual (TACM). They are also provided in Appendix D.

Section 1: Student Information
This section includes the list of test examiners for the student. The student writes a letter about his/her learning program and the daily schedule used. If the suggested format is not appropriate for a specific student, the test examiner or student may devise another format that provides similar information. The student should have access to appropriate supports. For the scorers, this serves as a foundation to understand the student's learning strengths, needs, necessary supports, and instructional program.

Section 2: Parent/Guardian Participation
A test examiner sends a copy of the ALT-MSA Test Documents for Reading and Mathematics or access skills with the cover form to the parents/guardians. Parents/guardians are invited to review, provide suggestions, and consider how they

could reinforce these skills at home and in the community. Parents/guardians are requested to sign the cover form and return it to school.

Parents/guardians are invited to submit examples of their child's demonstration of the mastery objectives. These should be included in the portfolio. Parents/guardians are also asked to review the portfolio before it is submitted for scoring. The test examiner will document the occurrence of this review.

Section 3: Student Mastery of Reading Indicators and Objectives or Access Skills Objectives in the Context of Reading

The first page of this section is the pre-assessment of the selected grade level(s) for the reading content standards, or the access skills, followed by the ALT-MSA Test Document for Reading. The pages that follow this document are the artifacts that are evidence of attainment of the mastery objectives, including a videotape of the student demonstrating mastery of at least one reading objective. For each selected objective within a reading content standard, or access skill, at least one artifact must be included. To be scored, each component of the mastery objective must be clearly evident in the artifact submitted. The objective that is being assessed must be stated on the artifact. Every artifact must be dated (month/day/year), and a page number must be placed on the artifact that corresponds to the same page number in the Table of Contents. More than one artifact for each mastery objective may be submitted. Scorers do not score artifacts that do not clearly correspond to the ALT-MSA Test Examiner Document.

The appropriate columns on the Artifact Entry Form for reading must be completed.

If a written mastery objective is adjusted during the course of instruction, the test examiner must document this on the appropriate Test Document and write a new mastery objective that aligns with the reading objective.

Section 4: Student Mastery of Mathematics Indicators and Objectives or Access Skills Objectives in the Context of Mathematics

The first page of this section is the pre-assessment of the selected grade level(s) for the Mathematics Content Standards, or access skills, followed by the ALT-MSA Test Document for mathematics content standards or access skills. The pages that follow this document are the artifacts that are evidence of attainment of the mastery objectives. This includes the videotape of the student demonstrating mastery of at least one mathematics objective. For each selected objective within a mathematics content standard, or access skill, at least one artifact must be included. To be scored, each component of the mastery objective must be clearly evident in the artifact submitted. The objective that is being assessed must be stated on the artifact. Every artifact must be dated (month/day/year), and a page number must be placed on the artifact that corresponds to the same page number in the Table of Contents. More than one artifact for each mastery objective may be submitted. Scorers do not score artifacts that do not clearly correspond to the ALT-MSA Test Examiner Document.

The appropriate columns on the Artifact Entry Form for mathematics must be completed.

If a written mastery objective is adjusted during the course of instruction, the test examiner must document this and write a new mastery objective that aligns with the mathematics objective.

3.0 Scoring and Reporting

3.1 Scoring

The role of scorers is to judge whether the evidence submitted for each mastery objective, the artifact, demonstrates that the student has attained the conditions required for mastery of that objective. The following sections outline the procedures implemented by Pearson Educational Measurement's (PEM) Performance Scoring Center (PSC) to ensure the reliability and accuracy of the scoring process and results.

Recruitment of Scorers and Scoring Supervisors

Highly qualified scorers are essential to achieving and maintaining a high degree of consistency and reliability in scoring students' responses. The careful selection of professional scorers to evaluate student portfolios is therefore essential to scoring the ALT-MSA. In the selection of candidates for scoring the Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA), priority is given to individuals with degrees in special education in addition to those with previous experience in performance scoring. At a minimum, all scorers have a four-year college degree and must complete the formal application process including an interview. Such prescreening of candidates ensures selection of only the highest caliber of scorers. Regardless of previous experience or education, however, all selected scorers are required to meet the project's qualification standards (acceptable scores on qualifying set) and are subject to continual monitoring (i.e., backreading and validity) for quality and accuracy.

Scoring supervisors are chosen from the larger pool of scorers based on demonstrated expertise with the ALT-MSA scoring process, organizational abilities and training skills. Individuals chosen to perform these assignments possess leadership abilities and positive interpersonal communication skills. Supervisors also possess the essential capability of helping scorers to understand the particular scoring requirements of the ALT-MSA. A list of all those involved in the ALT-MSA scoring effort and their roles is provided in Appendix E.

Recruitment for the ALT-MSA begins approximately six weeks before the onset of scorer training.

Rangefinding

Rangefinding is the process by which a wide range of portfolios are reviewed by a committee of experts for the purpose of selecting exemplars to use in the training, monitoring, and qualification of scorers and for establishing/revising the scoring guidelines. For the ALT-MSA a sample of approximately 120 portfolios are chosen by MSDE for rangefinding:

- 50 portfolios from grades 3, 4, and 5
- 50 from grades 6, 7, 8
- 20 from grade 10

To the extent possible, these portfolios represent the range of abilities and characteristics in the population tested as well as a range of artifact types. The goal is to provide the

rangefinding committee with a sample of portfolios that is diverse enough to highlight any issues that may be encountered during scoring and therefore should be addressed in training. The rangefinding portfolio selection process for the current administration is outlined in Appendix F.

Prior to the rangefinding meeting, participating PSC staff members familiarize themselves with the rangefinding portfolios, and review the training materials and scoring decisions from the previous year's scoring. They then meet with the MSDE to further review and discuss these portfolios and plan the order of portfolio presentation. The rangefinding agenda is finalized at this time.

At the start of the rangefinding meeting, the committee members, in conjunction with the MSDE and the PSC staff, begin work by reviewing the scoring rules and decisions from the previous year. This helps to ensure a common understanding of standards and promote consistency of scoring from year to year. Next, the rangefinding committee is introduced to their tasks: 1) reviewing and scoring the rangefinding portfolios to be used in the training of scorers, and 2) determining the scoring guidelines.

Throughout the meeting, PSC staff members maintain notes and records consensus scores, teacher comments, and discussions of portfolios. Teacher comments and discussion are used by staff to aid in scorer training. At the end of each day MSDE and PSC staff members debrief to discuss the committee work and any scoring issues from the day. In addition, the agenda for the next day is discussed and adjusted as needed.

At the end of the rangefinding meeting PEM provides the MSDE with the official rangefinding record, which includes consensus scores and teacher's comments. Both the MSDE and a PEM staff member sign this record to certify that the scores have been recorded accurately. The PEM Scoring Director will later add information on the placement of each portfolio in the training and qualifying sets.

Immediately following the rangefinding meeting, the MSDE and the PSC conduct a post-rangefinding session to prepare the scoring guide, training sets (i.e., anchor sets and practice sets), qualifying sets, and a validity set. The scoring guide, training sets, and qualifying sets are submitted to MSDE for approval and sign off before scoring supervisor training begins.

Training

Training begins with the distribution and review of the Scorer Participant Guide. The Scorer Participant Guide introduces potential scorers to the schedule, provides an overview of the training and scoring process, explains general PSC training, scoring and quality-control procedures, and gives specific information about Pearson Educational Measurement and the Alternate Maryland School Assessment.

The Training Process

Scorers are trained to score all grade levels in both reading and mathematics content areas. The ALT-MSA scoring rules are presented in context with student portfolios. First, an anchor set of portfolios, consisting of all training issues, is introduced to scorers.

Then, a set of practice portfolios is used to give the scorers the opportunity to practice scoring. Finally, a set of qualifying portfolios is administered to the scorers to determine if they have fully grasped the scoring criteria and rules.

Introduction

During the introduction, hard copies of all training sets are provided to the scorers for review and discussion. Scorers are encouraged to take notes throughout the training process. Scorers are also provided with

- an overview of relevant vocabulary specific to special education and the alternate assessment;
- an introduction to the Maryland State Content Standards in both reading and mathematics and an explanation as to how these standards guide the assessed objectives;
- an explanation of portfolio contents and organization;
- the criteria for acceptable evidence of mastery;
- an in-depth review and discussion of the scoring rules and guidelines; and
- an overview of the list of positive practices.

Anchor Portfolio Set and Scoring Guide

After the general introduction, the scoring director introduces the anchor portfolios in conjunction with the content standards and scoring rules. The Anchor Set is a combination of portfolios that are exemplary and portfolios with common scoring issues. Each anchor portfolio demonstrates a clear, straightforward presentation of mastery or non-mastery of the objectives. The Scoring Director discusses the uniqueness of each portfolio, highlighting critical information that demonstrates exactly why an objective is considered mastered or not. Eight anchor portfolios train scorers to understand the criteria for scoring and provide references for use during live scoring.

Practice Portfolio Sets

As part of training, scorers practice scoring on sets of practice portfolios. Through two practice sets of five portfolios each, scorers hone their skills to understand the scoring guidelines, content standards, and evidence of mastery. Scorers score the practice sets independently using the anchor set, the content standards, and the scoring rules as guidelines. Scoring the practice portfolios is not as clear as the anchor portfolios. Practice portfolios contain questionable objectives and artifacts that may not be straightforward. During practice, questions and interaction are encouraged so scorers may further internalize the scoring guidelines. The Scoring Director reviews the scorers' practice portfolios and provides the correct scores. Practice is an essential part of the training procedure.

Qualifying Portfolio Sets

After practice and review, scorers take a qualifying set of three portfolios. Again independently, the scorer uses all training materials to score the qualifying set. Each qualifying set consists of three complete portfolios. For a scorer to begin live scoring 80% perfect agreement is required on one of two qualifying sets. After each qualifying set, a review of the scores takes place in order for scorers to understand their errors. If a

scorer does not qualify on the first set, the scoring director reviews that scorer's errors with him/her before administering a second qualifying set of three portfolios. Scorers not meeting the established guidelines by the end of the training session are dismissed. The percentage of scorers that qualified to score the current administration and the average qualification score (i.e., percent agreement) is provided in Appendix A, Table 2.

Once scorers have qualified, the scoring director trains the portfolio flow, including how to first and then second score and the alert process. Scorers are then divided into teams based on performance on the qualifying sets, prior experience, and specific areas of expertise. Teams are constructed to be as similar as possible given these variables. A scoring supervisor is assigned to each team and, at this point, scorers begin live scoring.

Training of Scoring Supervisors

Scoring supervisors receive the same content and scoring training as scorers, in addition to extra training on supervisory duties. Each supervisor receives extensive training on the material circulation. A select group of scoring supervisors also receives additional training on resolution scoring.

Distribution of Portfolios to Scoring Teams

Upon arrival at the scoring site material handlers unload and check in student portfolios. Boxes arrive in numbered batches. Material handlers check each portfolio in on a shipping list and then file it in a secure warehouse according to batch number until scoring.

At scoring time, material handlers deliver a batch of approximately 24 portfolios to the scoring supervisor of a team. The supervisor signs off receipt of the batch on the Warehouse Batch Tracking Log. Scorers sign out an individual portfolio on a Batch Tracking Log that remains with each batch. They then return completed portfolios to an area designated "first score complete." Material handlers collect the portfolios and return them to the warehouse to be refiled. When all of the portfolios associated with a batch have been returned to the warehouse, the batch is delivered to a different scoring team for second scoring. No team reviews the same batch of portfolios twice.

For the 2003-2004 administration, grade and order of receipt determined the order in which portfolios were scored. A sample of the portfolios from grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 was required to accommodate standard setting, therefore scoring priority was given to these grades. Upon receipt and check-in at the scoring site, portfolios from these grades were immediately batched and distributed for scoring.

Scoring Procedure

The ALT-MSA Scoring Process is defined in Appendix G. This document chronologically defines the steps a reader should follow to review a portfolio and score the associated artifacts. It also delineates the scoring rubric and provides examples of mastery objectives/artifacts that would receive a condition code rather than a score.

Each artifact within a portfolio is scored at least two times. Portfolio artifacts for which the first and second scores do not agree are sent to resolution. Resolution readings are

identified by the supervisors and performed by the Scoring Director, Assistant Scoring Director, PSC Project Manager, Scoring Supervisors, or designated agent (experienced scorers). The Scoring Director supervises all individuals performing resolution readings.

Some mastery objectives may not be scorable according to MSDE criteria. If a scorer believes that a mastery objective is not scorable, for whatever reason (i.e., alignment issues, artifact not dated or name missing, or as determined by current administration scoring rules), the scorer brings the portfolio to his/her supervisor for review. If the supervisor is uncertain how to score the objective, the Scoring Director is consulted. If a score or condition code cannot be determined based on established scoring rules, the MSDE is consulted. Any scoring decisions or policy rulings are documented by the Scoring Director.

After the appropriate score or condition code is determined by supervisory staff, the score or code is recorded on both the first and second scoring monitor by the scoring supervisor. (The scoring monitor is the scannable document that allows each student's scores to be captured electronically.) This ensures that a second scorer will not be bringing the same issue to the attention of supervisors and the Scoring Director after it has already been reviewed by supervisory staff.

Quality Control

Backreading

Backreading is a source of information on scoring accuracy. Backreading is one of several methods used to ensure reader accuracy whereby a scoring supervisor reviews a random sampling of scores assigned by readers on their team to assess accuracy. Backreading is trained during scoring supervisor training, is initiated at the beginning of scoring, and continues throughout scoring. It is a PEM standardized ISO procedure used to monitor scorers, to help eliminate drift by alerting scorers to their mistakes at the team level, and anchoring them back to the training materials and scoring rules. Backreading results are documented and recorded by supervisors on backreading tally forms.

Each day every team reviews the training sets and scoring rules. Reviewing the training materials keeps all scorers and scoring supervisors grounded in the guidelines established during training. If a scorer is absent for two days or more, he/she reviews all training materials and scoring rules with a supervisor, updating the scorer on any missed scoring decisions. The scorer also takes a validity portfolio to ensure he/she is still scoring accurately.

Validity Sets

Validity portfolios are portfolios whose "true scores" have already been determined by the Scoring Director and the MSDE. These portfolios are interspersed among the portfolios to be scored to allow individual scorer accuracy to be assessed throughout the scoring process. The average percent agreement between readers' scores and the "true scores" for these validity sets is provided in Table 3 of Appendix A for the current administration.

Validity reports and other reports generated by the Electronic Paper Scoring System (ePS) are described below.

Reports Generated and Used by PSC Staff to Monitor Scorers and Scoring Accuracy and Control Scorer Drift

In 2003 - 2004 the PSC staff reviewed and distributed reports daily to evaluate reliability and other scorer statistics. However, the length and complexity of the reports made it difficult to determine overarching issues on the project. These reports were originally designed for a regular assessment and proved to be inefficient for the ALT-MSA. As a result, the scoring performance reports for future years are being enhanced to provide summary information at the portfolio and mastery objective level. These enhanced summary reports will also provide team statistics so that these can be compared to the scoring room, as a whole. These will allow MSDE and the PSC to effectively work together to determine scoring issues and reduce the number of resolutions.

- Score reliability reports:

  The inter-rater reliability reports document how often two scorers agree when scoring the same response.

  The Scoring Director reviews reliability reports daily to ensure that all items being scored are within the acceptable reliability parameters. If an item's reliability falls significantly below an acceptable level, an action plan is created. If a scorer's reliability falls significantly below the room average, the Scoring Director reanchors them using the relevant training materials and scoring rules established during the initial training.

- Frequency distribution reports:

  The frequency distribution reports document the percentage of scores given that falls into each score point and condition code category.

  The Scoring Director reviews the frequency distribution reports. If a scorer is scoring too high or too low compared to the rest of the group, retraining may occur.

- Validity reports:

  Validity reports can be a useful monitoring tool. Validity reports document how often a scorer agrees with the "true score" given to preselected validity responses.

  The Scoring Director reviews the validity reports to identify struggling scorers and determine whether there is any room drift or a particular type of item or issue causing problems. A struggling scorer is a scorer below the validity requirement and/or significantly below the room average. When identified, the Scoring Director and scoring supervisors monitor and provide remediation to struggling scorers. Room drift occurs when a group of scorers consistently score an

objective or item incorrectly on validity. If there is strong evidence of room drift, project management may consider retraining or calibration of that particular objective or item.

All reports are monitored by the Scoring Director and Project Managers throughout the scoring process. The reports are also discussed with the MSDE on a regular, ongoing basis. Based on these reports, backreading, and trends found in resolution scoring, it may be necessary to retrain on a particular item or create a calibration set. If needed, calibration sets are created by PSC staff and approved by MSDE staff. Calibration is a form of training that creates consensus and accuracy within the scoring pool (both scorers and supervisors). A calibration set focuses on one problem or issue. Calibration papers or portfolios are focused with a single, clear purpose. A list of the steps taken by the PSC to ensure scorer accuracy and correct for scoring drift is provided in Appendix H.

Security at the Scoring Site

Providing an environment that promotes the security of test items, student responses, data, and employees is of utmost concern to PEM. We employ the following standard safeguards for security at all of our sites:

- Controlled access to the facility.
- Materials leave the facility during the project only with the permission of the customer (Maryland State Department of Education).
- Scoring personnel sign a nondisclosure and confidentiality form in which they agree not to use or divulge any information concerning tests, scoring guides, or individual student responses.
- All staff display PEM identification badges at all times while in the scoring facility.
- No recording or photographic equipment is allowed in the scoring area without the consent of the customer (MSDE).
- No cell phones of any kind are allowed in the scoring area.
- All contact with the press is handled through the customer (MSDE).

3.2 Standard Setting

Proficiency levels were established for the Independence Mastery Assessment Program (IMAP) in Summer of 2003. IMAP was the predecessor assessment to the ALT-MSA. This process involved Maryland educators applying a portfolio paper sorting method to the 2002-2003 assessment results. In order to ensure uniform performance standards between IMAP and ALT-MSA, a process of linear transformation was used to translate the IMAP growth score proficiency level cut points to the ALT-MSA mastery percentage proficiency level cut points. This process resulted in two performance standards on the mastery percentage scale that define the basic, proficient, and advanced proficiency levels described below.

***Basic**: Students at this level demonstrate 0% to 50% mastery of the skills tested in reading and mathematics.*

***Proficient**: Students at this level demonstrate 60% to 80% mastery of the skills tested in reading and mathematics.*

***Advanced**: Students at this level demonstrate 90% or greater mastery of the skills tested in reading and mathematics.*

3.3 Reports

A variety of reports are described and listed in this section. Samples of some of these reports can be found in Appendix I of this document.

Description and Interpretation of Scores

The following scores are calculated and reported to students, schools, and/or districts that participate in the ALT-MSA.

Mastery Objective Score

Each student who participates in the ALT-MSA is assessed on 20 unique mastery objectives: 10 for each subject area. A mastery objective is a clear statement of the specific response a student must provide (and the conditions under which it must be provided) in order to demonstrate mastery of a particular objective. For each mastery objective assessed, an appropriate artifact is submitted in the student's ALT-MSA portfolio for scoring. The artifact is scored as either exhibiting mastery or non-mastery of the associated objective. If mastery status cannot be determined the student is assigned a not-scorable condition code for that mastery objective (see Appendix G).

Students must select two objectives from each subject area for demonstration in one additional setting other than the classroom. For the selected objectives, students submit two artifacts; one corresponding to each setting in which evidence was collected. In order for a student to achieve a score of mastery on a "multiple setting" objective, *both* of the artifacts submitted for that objective must be scored as "mastered." If one of the artifacts is scored as "not mastered," a score of 0 (not mastered) is assigned to that objective.

By themselves mastery objective scores provide only an indication of whether or not the artifact submitted for a given mastery objective met the requirements for mastery. Unless a condition code is provided, no further information can be gleaned from this score. Specific information regarding how and why mastery was (or was not) obtained must be determined from the submitted artifact and its level of accuracy (i.e., the value compared to the 80% mastery criterion).

Given the purpose of the ALT-MSA, and therefore the manner in which mastery objectives are developed and assessed, one must be careful not to generalize mastery objective scores beyond the specifics of the task assessed. Although mastery objectives are developed to map back to the Maryland State Content Standards, success on a specific mastery objective may not generalize to a similar task measuring the same underlying objective. In order to make generalizations regarding a student's knowledge and skills with respect to an underlying objective further evidence of success is typically required.

Average mastery objective scores for the current administration can be found in Appendix A, Tables 4 and 5 for Reading and Mathematics, respectively. These averages are provided by content standard and therefore do not include students assessed on access skills. For each content standard the value provided indicates the percentage of all artifacts associated with that content standard that were scored as "mastered." For example, if the average mastery objective score associated with the Phonics/Phonemic Awareness standard were 0.85, this would indicate that 85% of the submitted mastery objectives associated with this content standard were scored "mastered."

Mastery Percentage Score

Within each subject area the proportion of mastery objectives scored as "mastered" (i.e., that have an artifact that meets the criteria outlined for mastery) is the mastery percentage score for that subject. Mastery percentage scores are used to categorize students into one of three different proficiency levels: Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. Each proficiency level identifies a particular range of mastery percentage scores that corresponds to a level of academic achievement. (See section 3.2 of this document for a description of standard-setting process and the resulting proficiency level definitions.) The ultimate goal of NCLB is for all students to reach the Proficient or Advanced level.

The ALT-MSA is intended to assess each student on a set of skills and objectives that are appropriate, yet challenging. As a result, the specific set of mastery objectives assessed is different for each student. This would seem to suggest that a given student's mastery percentage should not be compared to that of another student or the state/system/school average. To an extent this is true. It is quite possible that the set of mastery objectives developed for a given student could be much easier than the set developed for a different student, after taking into account their respective levels of functioning. If, however, each student is assessed on a set of tasks developed to be at the *appropriate level of difficulty*, as the developers of the ALT-MSA intended, mastery percentage comparisons may be appropriate. The goal is for all students to be held to the same standards relative to a set of challenging and appropriate objectives. Therefore, the work or ability required by a student to achieve a 60% mastery percentage (the score needed to be deemed proficient) should be approximately the same for all students regardless of the specific tasks assessed.

Appendix A, Tables 6 and 7 provide mastery percentage frequency distributions in reading and mathematics for the current administration. Average mastery percentage scores are provided in Table 8. In addition, the percentage of students classified in each proficiency level given these mastery percentages can be found in Appendix A, Tables 9-11 and 12-14 for reading and mathematics, respectively. The tables provide counts and percentages for the total group tested, as well as broken out by socioeconomic status (i.e., free/reduced lunch) and ethnicity.

Evidence and Indicators of Positive Practice

After scorers have examined the artifacts submitted with a portfolio for mastery, they review the portfolio as a whole for the presence of certain indicators of best instructional practice for students with significant disabilities.

- Student was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio.
- Parent was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio.
- The mastery objectives indicate that the student has the opportunity to apply reading and mathematics content standards or access skills to authentic, real-life problems or situations, or other content areas.
- The student's reading and mathematics content standard or access skill objectives reflect age-appropriate materials and tasks.

For each of these indicators a score of zero is assigned if the indicator was not present in the student's portfolio and a score of one is awarded if it was. The percentage of portfolios exhibiting evidence of each of the positive practice indicators is presented in Appendix A, Table 15.

Positive practice data is *not* incorporated into student scores for use in the Maryland Accountability System. The positive practice indicators are intended only to highlight areas for future improvement and to support the link between assessment and instruction. *Please keep in mind that lack of evidence of certain indicators of best practice within a portfolio does not mean that best practice was not followed. It may simply be the case that such indicators are not outwardly apparent or identifiable in the submitted portfolio materials.*

Reports

All districts receive the following standard reports:

Accountability Reports

Home Report
The ALT-MSA home report provides information about an individual's overall performance on the mathematics and reading objectives assessed in the current administration. These reports provide the student's mastery percentage score and corresponding proficiency level for each subject area. The average mastery percentage score for the student's school and district and the state overall is also reported.

Label
A label is produced for each student who participates in the ALT-MSA. The label includes the student's name, gender, ethnicity, LEA, and school name, as well as his/her mathematics and reading proficiency level.

Non-Accountability Reports

Report to Principals
The Principal's report provides a general description of the ALT-MSA program, including the process used to score portfolios and the means by which proficiency level cut-scores were established. This report also provides principals with guidelines for using ALT-MSA scores to support instructional planning and overall program evaluation.

The Principal's report includes a section with student portfolio feedback. This section provides information about a student's performance relative to each mastery objective

assessed. For each mastery objective within a subject area the report indicates whether it was mastered, not mastered, or not scorable. For those mastery objectives deemed not scorable the condition code assigned is provided and defined.

The student portfolio feedback section also presents the assigned score for each of the indicators of positive instructional practice, displaying 0% if the indicator was not present in the student's portfolio and 100% if it was.

School/System/State Summary Report

The format of the school, system, and state summary reports is identical. These reports differ only in the population of students used to calculate the reported results. The summary report provides a general description of the ALT-MSA program, a description of the scoring process, and some guidelines for the use and interpretation of assessment results. In addition to this informative text, two data driven sub-reports are also produced. The first report presents the number and percentage of student portfolios (in the school, system, or state) showing evidence of each of the "Indicators of Important Components of the Instructional Program." The second provides the percentage of submitted artifacts (in the school, system, or state) for mathematics and reading considered mastered, not mastered, and not scorable by grade level.

4.0 Reliability and Validity

4.1 Reliability

Reliability is quantification of the consistency of results from a measurement. The ability to measure consistently is a necessary prerequisite to making appropriate score interpretations (i.e., showing evidence of valid use of the results). For the portfolio-based Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA), reliability relates primarily to the consistency with which the specified scoring process can be employed by scorers.

Pearson Educational Measurement (PEM) uses several procedures to help ensure that all ALT-MSA portfolios are scored reliably.

- Training procedures and materials are standardized for all participating scorers. This is true not only within an administration year, but to the extent possible, across administrations.

- The scoring process and scoring rules are clearly documented so there is no ambiguity as to how scoring issues should be handled.

- Validity and reliability reports are reviewed on a regular basis to identify scorer drift, outliers, and general scoring misconceptions (as defined by the portfolios in the validity set). In 2003-2004, the reports were used to inform scorers of their validity and reliability scores. The scoring director analyzed the reports, informed the supervisor of any concerns and the scoring supervisor in turn reviewed pertinent reports with the scorer. Supervisors monitored these scorers by backreading more frequently and checking their reliability and validity rates.

Reader Agreement

Because every portfolio is read at least twice by different readers, agreement between the readers is a common measure of reliability. These data are monitored on a daily basis by PEM during the scoring process. Daily reader agreement reports show the percent perfect agreement of each reader against all other readers.

Tables 16-18 in Appendix A summarize reader agreement for each subject area by content standard and overall for the current test administration. Reader agreement rate is expressed in terms of perfect agreement (i.e., the percentage of cases in which the first reader's score equals the second reader's score).

High inter-reader agreement implies that the scoring process and scoring rules are being applied consistently across readers.

In 2003-2004, the backreading procedure was performed before monitors were scanned into the system. This process included a review of the scored monitor and the portfolio in order to determine scorer accuracy. This process was used to backread single monitors. The procedure also included comparing first and second score monitors in order to increase the number of monitors backread by supervisors each day and provide

immediate attention to any scoring inconsistencies. When an inconsistency was discovered, the scoring supervisor used it as a teachable moment to inform the scorer of the mistake. This allowed the scorer with the opportunity to change their score in order to provide the student with an accurate score. In 2003 – 2004 this process may have resulted in artificially inflated reliability rates. In future years, the backreading and resolution process will be conducted independently to provide more accurate and actionable reader statistics.

4.2 Validity

As previously stated, assessment results must show evidence of reliability for the purpose for which they were intended before they can show evidence of validity. Validity relates to the appropriateness or strength of the assessment results for making specific interpretations about what students know and can do. As documented in Standard 1.1 of the Standards for Educational and Psychological Measurement (1999), validity evidence should be collected for every intended interpretation and use of the scores resulting from a measurement instrument.

The purpose of the ALT-MSA is multifold, as outlined in the first chapter of this document. First and foremost, the assessment is intended to comply with federal mandates, to inform ongoing instruction and to help teachers plan instruction for the following year. A student's ALT-MSA results and portfolio should help teachers determine his/her level of functioning at the time of the assessment, indicate specific skills acquired and those requiring continued instruction, and identify supports and assistive technologies previously employed. This information can be used to inform the review and revision of a student's IEP and support the construction of a well-structured plan for instruction and assessment in the upcoming year. In addition, by reviewing previously submitted portfolios in conjunction with historical data, teachers can get an indication of a student's rate of progress relative to certain subject and content standard areas.

Second, the ALT-MSA is intended to hold teachers/schools/districts accountable for implementing standards-based curriculum and using assessment results to improve student learning. The annual ALT-MSA development and administration process helps to ensure that teachers/schools/districts are focused on the development, instruction, and assessment of challenging performance goals that are aligned with the state content standards.

Finally, ALT-MSA results should inform and support program evaluation at the classroom, school, and district level. This includes identification of both resources that may further support instruction, and topics for professional development of staff.

Intrinsic Rational Validity Evidence

Intrinsic rational validity is evidence that exists as an artifact of the test development process. The evidence is intrinsic, because it is built into the test. It is rational because it is derived from rational inferences about the kind of tasks that will best meet the measurement goals of the assessment (Ebel, 1983).

To a large extent, the process that was implemented by the MSDE to develop and design the ALT-MSA is, in and of itself, evidence for the use of ALT-MSA test results in supporting the goals defined above. The MSDE took great care to ensure the right people were involved in all aspects of developing and implementing the ALT-MSA program. Advisory specialists in alternate assessment met at length on many occasions to determine what the assessment should look like given the assessment mandates and intent. In addition, the state implemented a structured process to support the identification of desired assessment components and designs. This process included an Advisory Committee review of the alternate standards and assessments for many states across the nation. Such a comprehensive review helped to ensure ALT-MSA results would be viewed as useful and important to teachers and parents alike.

Content- and Curricular-Related Validity Evidence

Content-related validity evidence addresses the extent to which the assessment tasks adequately align to the material or standards intended as the focus of assessment. Several features of the annual ALT-MSA development process provide evidence that the results measure the intended content standard or access skills objectives. For one, it is clearly specified in teacher training and the Test Administration and Coordination Manual that mastery objectives must be aligned to state content standards or access skills objectives. The goal of the assessment to measure skills aligned to the state standards is highlighted as often as possible.

In addition, content experts from the MSDE review every mastery objective to ensure alignment to, and appropriate representation of, the underlying objective identified by the test examiner. These experts provide feedback to test examiners regarding how the mastery objective can be improved and whether alignment is an issue.

Face Validity

Face validity addresses the question of whether or not the assessment appears to measure what it supposed to measure. This is an extremely important component of any assessment program. If parents, teachers, or community members do not perceive a test as relevant or do not understand its purpose, they are less likely to give it their attention and support. The extent to which a test possesses face validity is typically gauged by the response of stakeholders to using test results to inform instruction and monitor accountability. One way to obtain this information is through a well-crafted survey administered to parents, teachers, and other stakeholder groups of interest.

The MSDE asks teachers, test coordinators and school administrators to complete a survey about the ALT-MSA development and administration process. The survey includes Likert-type statements (i.e., agree, strongly agree, etc. . .) and open-ended questions intended to (in part) provide some insight to how the ALT-MSA is perceived. This information is used by the MSDE to gauge test acceptance and determine what can be done to improve it in the future.

Consequential Validity Evidence

When establishing evidence to support the appropriateness of a test relative to a set of assessment goals, it is important to evaluate both the intended and unintended

consequences of the assessment process and results (Messick, 1993). This is especially the case for a portfolio-based assessment such as the ALT-MSA where the assessment development and administration process can be relatively complex and labor-intensive.

In addition to providing information about how the ALT-MSA is perceived by stakeholders, survey results may assist the MSDE in making inferences about the consequences of the ALT-MSA (both positive and negative). For example, one of the open-ended questions posed to teachers and test coordinators in the survey is: "Next year as test coordinator/teacher I plan to have . . ." If, in reviewing responses to this question, we find a significant number teachers state that they "plan to develop assessment tasks that better reflect their student's IEP," the MSDE has some evidence that the assessment process is influencing instruction. In this case the process is working as intended by increasing the alignment between the assessment tasks and the student's IEP. In a similar manner, survey responses may shed light on some unintended, negative consequences of the ALT-MSA that can be addressed before the next administration.

Criterion-Related Validity Evidence

Although the primary evidence for the validity of the ALT-MSA lies in the process used by the MSDE to develop and design the assessment, it is also informative to collect criterion-related validity evidence. The term criterion-related validity refers to the degree to which a test correlates with one or more outcome criteria. The key is the degree of relationship between the assessment items or tasks and the outcome criteria. To help ensure a good relationship between the assessment and the criterion, the criterion should be relevant to the assessment and it should also be reliable.

For each student portfolio submitted for scoring, readers review the contents for evidence of "important components of an instructional program" or positive practices (see Section 3.3). Students receive a score of 1 on a positive practice if there is evidence of that practice in their portfolio and a score of 0 if there is not. It is suggested that scores on the ALT-MSA will be strengthened if these components are present in the student's instructional program. Consequently, a positive relationship between student mastery percentage and positive practice scores is expected. Table 19 in Appendix A provides the correlation between student mastery percentage scores and positive practice scores for the current administration. A correlation reflects agreement between relative standing on one variable and relative standing on the other. A significant correlation means that the correlation coefficient is statistically different from zero. For the ALT-MSA, positive correlations suggest that the presence of a positive practice indicator is related to higher mastery percentage scores.

When reviewing this data it is important to note that *only one of the at least two* scorers scoring any given portfolio assigns positive practice scores. Reader agreement scores for positive practice indicators are not available. Therefore, the reliability or consistency with which scorers can assign these scores is unknown. Similarly it is important to remember that positive practice scores indicate the extent to which indicators of positive practice are *observable* in the submitted portfolio. It is quite possible that best practice was followed, but the *indicators are not outwardly apparent or identifiable in the*

submitted portfolio materials. These factors suggest the correlations be interpreted with caution until the reliability and validity of the positive practice scores can be verified.

The extent to which the issues described above are influencing the resulting correlations is currently unknown. However, if they are having an effect it is likely that the values reported in Table 19 are attenuated. This should be taken into account when comparing the degree of the correlations relative to expectations

References

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

Browder, D.M. (2001). *Curriculum and assessment for students with moderate and severe disabilities*. New York: Guilford Press.

Ebel, R. L., (1983). The practical validation of tests of ability. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 2, 7-10.

Kleinert, H. F., & Kearns, J. F. (2001). *Alternate Assessments: Measuring Outcomes and Supports for Students with Disabilities*. Baltimore, Maryland: Brooke Publishing.

Messick, S. (1993). Validity. In R.L. Linn (ed.), *Educational Measurement*, (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Appendix A - Tables

Table 1. Participation by Grade, Gender, Ethnicity, and SES
(N = 5,649)

Grade	Frequency	Percent
3	503	8.90
4	623	11.03
5	706	12.50
6	774	13.70
7	767	13.58
8	793	14.04
10	765	13.54
11	718	12.71

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	3,566	63.13
Female	2,083	36.87

Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
American Indian	19	0.34
Asian American	180	3.19
Black	2,625	46.47
White	2,577	45.62
Hispanic	248	4.39

Free/Reduced Lunch	Frequency	Percent
NO--does not participate	3,008	53.25
YES--does participate	2,641	46.75

Table 2. Scorer Qualification Results
(N = 70)

	Percentage Meeting Qualification Criterion (80% agreement)	Average Qualification Score (percent agreement)	Std.	Min.	Max.
Scorers/Scoring Supervisors	100	92.30	5.37	80	100

Table 3. Summary of Performance on Validity Sets
(N=203)

Average Percent Agreement On Validity Portfolios	Std.	Min.	Max.
93.30	5.51	65.90	100

**Note: N refers to total number of validity portfolios reviewed over all readers.

Table 4. Percentage of Mastery Objectives Scored "Mastered" by Reading Content Standard
(N = 9,428)

Content Standard	Mean
Phonemic Awareness/Phonics	0.76
Vocabulary	0.77
Comprehension	0.74
Comprehension of Informational Text	0.65
Comprehension of Literary Text	0.62

**Note: N refers to the number of artifacts associated with each content standard.

***Note: This table includes only those students who were assessed on content standards.

Table 5. Percentage of Mastery Objectives Scored "Mastered" by Mathematics Content Standard

(N = 9,422)

Content Standard	Mean
Algebra/Patterns/Functions	0.77
Geometry	0.76
Measurement	0.64
Statistics	0.59
Number Relationships/Computation	0.64

**Note: N refers to the number of artifacts associated with each content standard.

***Note: This table includes only those students who were assessed on content standards.

Table 6. Reading Mastery Percentages for All Students Tested (N=5,649)

Proficiency Level	Reading Mastery Score	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Basic	0	505	8.94	505	8.94
	10	195	3.45	700	12.39
	20	190	3.36	890	15.76
	30	178	3.15	1,068	18.91
	40	221	3.91	1,289	22.82
	50	253	4.48	1,542	27.30
Proficient	60	332	5.88	1,874	33.17
	70	412	7.29	2,286	40.47
	80	733	12.98	3,019	53.44
Advanced	90	857	15.17	3,876	68.61
	100	1,773	31.39	5,649	100.00

Table 7. Mathematics Mastery Percentages for All Students Tested

(N = 5,649)

Proficiency Level	Mathematics Mastery Score	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Basic	**0**	533	9.44	533	9.44
	10	215	3.81	748	13.24
	20	187	3.31	935	16.55
	30	202	3.58	1,137	20.13
	40	228	4.04	1,365	24.16
	50	328	5.81	1,693	29.97
Proficient	**60**	405	7.17	2,098	37.14
	70	526	9.31	2,624	46.45
	80	758	13.42	3,382	59.87
Advanced	**90**	788	13.95	4,170	73.82
	100	1,479	26.18	5,649	100.00

Table 8. Average Reading and Mathematics Mastery Percentage Scores for All Students Tested
(N = 5,649)

			Reading Mastery Percentage Score		Mathematics Mastery Percentage Score	
		N	Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.
Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaskan Native	19	87.37	17.27	76.32	22.41
	Asian/Pacific Islander	180	67.56	35.05	60.33	34.41
	African American	2,625	66.58	34.81	63.94	34.34
	White	2,577	73.47	31.25	70.54	31.61
	Hispanic	248	66.45	34.22	65.00	32.82
Free/Reduced Lunch	NO	3,008	69.50	33.12	65.96	33.31
	YES	2,641	70.18	33.61	68.02	33.02
Total Group		**5,649**	**69.82**	**33.35**	**66.92**	**33.19**

Table 9. Reading Proficiency Level Frequencies

(N = 5,649)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Basic	1,542	27.30	1,542	27.30
Proficient	1,477	26.15	3,019	53.44
Advanced	2,630	46.56	5,649	100.00

Table 10. Reading Proficiency Level Frequencies by Free/Reduced Lunch Designation (Percentages) (N = 5,649)

Participating in Free/Reduced Lunch	Proficiency Level			Total
	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	
NO--Not Participating	831 (27.63)	809 (26.89)	1,368 (45.48)	3,008
YES--Participating	711 (26.92)	668 (25.29)	1,262 (47.78)	2,641

Table 11. Reading Proficiency Level Frequencies by Ethnicity (Percentages) (N = 5,649)

Ethnicity	Proficiency Level			Total
	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	
American Indian	1 (5.26)	6 (31.58)	12 (63.16)	19
Asian American	53 (29.44)	46 (25.56)	81 (45.00)	180
Black	822 (31.31)	677 (25.79)	1,126 (42.90)	2,625
White	587 (22.78)	680 (26.39)	1,310 (50.83)	2,577
Hispanic	79 (31.85)	68 (27.42)	101 (40.73)	248

Table 12. Mathematics Proficiency Level Frequencies
(N = 5,649)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Basic	1,693	29.97	1,693	29.97
Proficient	1,689	29.90	3,382	59.87
Advanced	2,267	40.13	5,649	100.00

Table 13. Mathematics Proficiency Level Frequencies by Free/Reduced Lunch Designation (Percentages)
(N = 5,649)

Participating in Free/Reduced Lunch	Proficiency Level			Total
	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	
NO--Not Participating	946 (31.45)	887 (29.49)	1,175 (39.06)	3,008
YES--Participating	747 (28.28)	802 (30.37)	1,092 (41.35)	2,641

Table 14. Mathematics Proficiency Level Frequencies by Ethnicity (Percentages)
(N = 5,649)

Ethnicity	Proficiency Level			Total
	Basic	Proficient	Advanced	
American Indian	3 (15.79)	7 (36.84)	9 (47.37)	19
Asian American	71 (39.44)	47 (26.11)	62 (34.44)	180
Black	888 (33.83)	764 (29.10)	973 (37.07)	2,625
White	652 (25.30)	789 (30.62)	1,136 (44.08)	2,577
Hispanic	79 (31.85)	82 (33.06)	87 (35.08)	248

Table 15. Percentage of Portfolios Showing Evidence of Positive Practice
(N = 5,649)

Positive Practice	Percentage Showing Evidence
Positive Practice #1-Student Involvement	0.91
Positive Practice #2-Parent Involvement	0.89
Positive Practice #3-Mastery Objectives relate to authentic problems	0.90
Positive Practice #4-Age-appropriate Mastery Objectives	0.88

Table 16. Percent Perfect Reader Agreement by Reading Content Standard
(N = 9,428)

Reading Content Standard	Mean
Phonemic Awareness/Phonics	0.98
Vocabulary	0.98
Comprehension	0.98
Comprehension of Informational Text	0.98
Comprehension of Literary Text	0.98

**Note: N refers to the number of artifacts associated with each content standard

***Note: This table includes only those students who were assessed on content standards.

Table 17. Percent Perfect Reader Agreement by Mathematics Content Standard
(N = 9,422)

Mathematics Content Standard	Mean
Algebra/Patterns/Functions	0.98
Geometry	0.98
Measurement	0.98
Statistics	0.98
Number Relationships/Computation	0.97

**Note: N refers to the number of artifacts associated with each content standard.

***Note: This table includes only those students who were assessed on content standards.

Table 18. Percent Perfect Reader Agreement Over All Students
(N = 67,788)

	Mean
Reading	0.98
Mathematics	0.97

**Note: N refers to the total number of artifacts associated with each content area.

Table 19. Correlation between Positive Practice Scores and Reading/Mathematics Mastery Scores
(N = 5,649)

Positive Practice	Correlation with Reading Mastery Score	Correlation with Mathematics Mastery Score
Positive Practice #1-Student Involvement	0.29	0.28
Positive Practice #2-Parent Involvement	0.34	0.32
Positive Practice #3-Mastery Objectives relate to authentic problems	0.31	0.30
Positive Practice #4-Age appropriate Mastery Objectives	0.24	0.22

**Note: All correlations are significant ($p<0.0001$)

Appendix B

ALT-MSA Timeline 2003-2004

Differences for LEA 24 Schools are in bold italics.

October 1, 2003 – March 5, 2004	2004 ALT-MSA Test Window
September 5, 2003	LACs and ALT-MSA Facilitators attend MSDE training on ALT-MSA administration
September 19 and 26, 2003	LEA 24/NonPublic Schools School Test Coordinators attend MSDE training on ALT-MSA administration
September 30	LACs and LEA 24 school test coordinators submit ALT-MSA Materials Request Form to MSDE (Appendix C)
September	LACs and ALT-MSA Facilitators provide training in ALT-MSA administration to principals, school test coordinators, and test examiners ***(School Test Coordinators)*** Principal, school test coordinator, and test examiners meet to • identify test examiners (teachers and related service providers) who will develop portfolios for each student • identify roles and responsibilities for test examiner team • develop an implementation schedule and monitoring plan to assure portfolio completion by March 5, 2004.
September-October 30	Student's test examiner team • conducts pre-assessment • selects reading and mathematics indicators and objectives or access skills that will be assessed • completes ALT-MSA Test Documents for reading and mathematics or access skills (Appendix A); writes mastery objectives for each state objective to be assessed, selects artifacts and test examiners for mastery objectives • Principal or designee will review mastery objectives to assure they are measurable and align with the state objectives to be assessed. Mastery objectives that do not have the mandatory components listed on p. 12 should be returned to test examiners for revision.

	• Test Examiner sends copy of ALT-MSA Test Documents for reading and mathematics or access skills to parent or guardian with cover form • Principal or designee sends **copies** of ALT-MSA Test Documents for reading and mathematics or access skills to LAC ***(School Test Coordinator)***
November 1, 2003	LAC ***(School Test Coordinator)*** sends ALT-MSA Test Documents for reading and mathematics or access skills (for every student participating in ALT-MSA) to Sharon Hall
November 2003	State review and feedback to LAC ***(School Test Coordinator)*** of mastery objectives on submitted ALT-MSA Test Documents
November 2003	LACs ***(School Test Coordinators)*** submit pretest file for students in grades 3-8, 10, 11 who will participate in ALT-MSA
March 5, 2004	School Test Coordinator collects all ALT-MSA portfolios and unused test materials and packs for pickup **from school**. Vendor will pick up ALT-MSA test materials from all **schools** by March 10, 2004.
April 2004	LAC ***(School Test Coordinator)*** submits posttest file to MSDE
March-April	ALT-MSA Portfolios are scored
May	Standard setting
June	Results arrive in schools

Appendix C

ALT –MSA Mastery Objective Review Form

Tested Content	Objective	Mastery Objective Alignment	Conditions		Observable, Measurable Student Response		Mastery Level (80 - 100 %)	
Reading Mastery Objectives	ok not ok (1)	Not aligned with Maryland Reading Objective (2)	Not Present (3)	Not Clear (4)	Not Present (5)	Not Clear (6)	Not Present (7)	Not Clear (8)
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
Mathematics Mastery Objectives	ok not ok (1)	Not aligned with Maryland Reading Objective (2)	Not Present (3)	Not Clear (4)	Not Present (5)	Not Clear (6)	Not Present (7)	Not Clear (8)
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								

Comments:

(1) OK- The mastery objective does not require revisions.

NOT OK- The mastery objective requires revisions

(2) √ = The mastery objective does not align with the selected reading/mathematics objective.

(3) √ = The conditions are not present

(4) √ = The conditons are not clear.

(5) √ = The observable, measurable student response is not present

(6) √ = The observable, measurable student resons is not clear

(7) √ = The mastery level is not present

(8) √ = The mastery objective level is not clear (#) of trials or items ≠ 80 - 1=%

Reviewed by: **Date**

Appendix D

REQUIRED ALT-MSA FORMS

The forms in Appendix E must be included in each student's ALT-MSA Portfolio. You may use these forms as a template, since it is likely that more space will be needed to complete the required information. The form for the student letter may be adapted so that the format, words or pictures are appropriate for the student.

Test examiners who have questions about completing these forms should first contact the school test coordinator and principal, or your county's local accountability coordinator and ALT-MSA facilitator.

For questions that are not answered, please contact Sharon Hall, 410-767-0792, or shall2@msde.state.md.us

Required ALT-MSA Form

The Table of Contents is the first item in the ALT-MSA Portfolio. Use it to guide the correct placement of all portfolio components. Place a page number in the column on the right that corresponds to the page number assigned to the documents and artifacts. Scorers will not search for a document or artifact.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

Required ALT-MSA Form	**Page in Portfolio**
Section 3	
____ Reading Pre-assessment Results	**____**
or	
____ Access Skills Pre-assessment Results	**____**
____ 2004 ALT-MSA Test Document-Reading	
or Access Skills	**____**
____ Artifacts for Reading Objectives or Access Skills Objectives.	
All artifacts and evidence must be dated -month/day/year.	
If not dated, they will not be scored.	
____ Phonemic Awareness or Phonics	
or Access Skills Objectives	
Objective 1	**____**
Objective 2	**____**
____ Vocabulary or Access Skills Objectives	
Objective 3	**____**
Objective 4	**____**
____ Reading Comprehension or Access Skills Objectives	
Objective 5	**____**
Objective 6	**____**
____ Comprehension of Informational Text	
or Access Skills Objectives	
Objective 7	**____**
Objective 8	**____**
Multiple Setting Artifact	**____**
____ Comprehension of Literary Text	
or Access Skills Objectives	
Objective 9	**____**
Objective 10	**____**
Multiple Setting Artifact	**____**
____ Artifact Entry Form: Reading	**____**

Table of Contents **Page in Portfolio**
Required ALT-MSA Form
Section 4

____ Mathematics Pre-assessment Results ____
or
____ Access Skills to Mathematics Pre-assessment Results ____
____ 2004 ALT-MSA Test Document-Mathematics
or Access Skills ____
____ Artifacts for Mathematics Objectives or Access Objectives. All artifacts and evidence must be dated-month/date/year. If not dated, they will not be scored. ____

____ Algebra, Patterns, or Functions/Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays or technology or Access Skills Objectives
Objective 1 ____
Objective 2 ____

____ Geometry / Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays or technology or Access Skills Objectives
Objective 3 ____
Objective 4 ____

____ Measurement / Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays or technology or Access Skills Objectives
Objective 5 ____
Objective 6 ____

Multiple Setting Artifact ____

____ Statistics / Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays or technology or Access Skills Objectives
Objective 7 ____
Objective 8 ____

____ Number Relationships or Computation/ Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays or technology or Access Skills Objectives
Objective 9 ____
Objective 10 ____

Multiple Setting Artifact ____

____ Artifact Entry Form: Mathematics ____

Section 1
Required ALT-MSA Form

Test Examiner Team

For

_____

The test examiners for this student will sign their name and indicate their position.

_____	_____
Signature	**Position**
_____	_____
Signature	**Position**
_____	_____
Signature	**Position**
_____	_____
Signature	**Position**
_____	_____
Signature	**Position**
_____	_____
Signature	**Position**

Section 1
Required ALT-MSA Form
Student Letter

Date_____

Dear Reviewer,

My name is_____.

I am in the _____grade at _____ School.

My teachers' names are

_____

_____

_____

_____

I use _____ to communicate.

I learn best when _____.

The cues/prompts/supports that help me learn are _____.

Please look at my schedule on the next page.

I use it _____.

I learn about reading at _____ with _____

_____. In

reading I can_____.

I will learn _____

I learn about math at _____with_____.

In math I can _____.

I will learn _____.

In this portfolio you will see my best work in reading and math.

Yours truly,

_____

Signature of Student

Section 2
Required ALT-MSA Form

Parent/Guardian Review
ALT-MSA Reading and Mathematics or Access Skills Objectives

The reading and mathematics objectives from the Maryland Content Standards, or the Access Skills in the context of Reading and Mathematics listed below, were selected by your student's teachers to be the focus of your student's ALT-MSA Portfolio. These objectives were selected based on what your student already knows and what s/he needs to learn. The mastery objectives are the specific skills on which your student will be assessed.

Please review these objectives and mastery objectives and let your son's/daughter's teachers know if you have suggestions or questions about the objectives. Your child's ALT-MSA Portfolio is one component of their instructional program. Their educational program also includes instruction in the IEP goals and objectives, functional academics, and skills in communication, decision making, interpersonal, career/vocational, community, recreation/leisure, and personal management.

____ I have reviewed the objectives selected for 2004 ALT-MSA
____ Suggestions and questions I have about the selected objectives

_____
_____
_____
_____

At home, we can
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____ _____
Parent/Guardian Signature Date

Section 2
Required ALT-MSA Form

Parent/Guardian Review of ALT-MSA Portfolio

You are encouraged to review your student's ALT-MSA Portfolio that was developed between October 1, 2003 and March 5, 2004. Evidence of your student's mastery of the reading and mathematics or access skills objectives is included in their ALT-MSA Portfolio.

Student's Name_____

____ I have reviewed the contents of my child's ALT-MSA Portfolio.

Comments I have for my son/daughter

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Comments I have for the teachers

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____ _____
Signature of Parent/Guardian Date

Section 2
Required ALT-MSA Form

PARENT/GUARDIAN CONTACTS: ALT-MSA PORTFOLIO

	Date
____ Sent home the ALT-MSA Test Documents and cover form.	_____
____ Responded to suggestions and questions received.	_____
____ Contacted to request return of signed cover form.	_____
___ Sent home invitation to review ALT-MSA Portfolio.	_____
____ Contacted to invite to review ALT-MSA Portfolio.	_____

Section 3
Required ALT-MSA Form

Pre-assessment: Reading

Use http://www.mdk12.org to select the grade level reading content standards objectives that will comprise the reading pre-assessment.

In this section include the grade level content standards, indicators, and objectives used for this student's ALT-MSA Reading Pre-assessment. Record "M" and the date next the objectives already mastered. Record "IP" (in progress) and the date next to the objectives that are currently included in the student's instructional program.

Section 3: Required ALT-MSA Form

Pre-assessment: Access Skills Objectives for Reading

Record "M" (mastered) for objective mastered and date of pre-assessment and "IP" (in progress) and date for objectives that are currently part of the student's instructional program.

Student Name: _____

Access Skill 1:	**Demonstrate observable responses to a variety of relevant stimuli**
❑ Objective a	Keep eyes open for a designated period of time
❑ Objective b	Demonstrate alertness that is influenced by external events
❑ Objective c	Respond to kinesthetic, tactile, auditory, and visual stimuli
❑ Objective d	Demonstrate understanding of cause and effect (e.g., use a switch operated device, use graphics or signs)
❑ Objective e	Respond to environmental and social stimuli
❑ Objective f	Reach and grasp object
Access Skill 2:	**Demonstrate understanding that symbols are a representation of concrete objects or experiences**
❑ Objective a	Match like objects
❑ Objective b	Match object to photograph or picture of like object
❑ Objective c	Match pictures of similar representations of same object
❑ Objective d	Match object to symbol or sign
❑ Objective e	Match object or picture to activity
Access Skill 3:	**Respond to basic vocabulary**
❑ Objective a	Respond to spoken words or manual signs
❑ Objective b	Respond to symbols (e.g., graphics or symbol systems such as PCS, sign, or picture exchange system)
Access Skill 4:	**Recognize personal identifiers**
❑ Objective a	Recognize own picture
❑ Objective b	Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of family members friends, or pets
❑ Objective c	Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of professional personnel and service providers
Access Skill 5:	**Attend to stimulus**
❑ Objective a	Focus eye gaze in direction of stimuli (speaker, person signing)
❑ Objective b	Attend to speaker for duration of activity
❑ Objective c	Listen to a story in a group
❑ Objective d	Listen to a story with a peer
Access Skill 6:	**Makes choices**
❑ Objective a	Indicates choice of printed materials (magazine, book, newspaper)
❑ Objective b	Indicates choice of literature from different media (books on tape, video tape, DVD, computer, story boards)
❑ Objective c	Indicates choice of type of literature (poems, finger stories, rap songs, short stories)

Section 3
Required ALT-MSA Form

Student Name_____

ALT-MSA TEST DOCUMENT: READING

Assessed Content Standards, Indicators and Objectives with Mastery Objectives

With the Test Examiner Team, for each content standard, record the selected indicator and objectives to be assessed. Write a measurable mastery objective for each selected objective. Indicate the type of evidence that will be collected and the test examiner who will obtain the evidence. Check when the evidence for the mastery objectives are obtained.

READING CONTENT STANDARDS		
1.0 General Reading Processes (Select Either Phonemic Awareness or Phonics)		
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 1** **Objective 2**		
Mastery objective **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated (M/D/Y)**
Mastery Objective 1		
Mastery Objective 2		
1.0 General Reading Processes: Vocabulary		
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 3** **Objective 4**		
Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 3		
Mastery Objective 4		
1.0 General Reading Processes: Comprehension		
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 5** **Objective 6**		
Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 5		
Mastery Objective 6		

Section 3
Required ALT-MSA Form

2.0 Comprehension of Informational Text			
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 7** **Objective 8**			
Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**	**Evidence of use in multiple settings Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 7			
Mastery Objective 8			
3.0 Comprehension of Literary Text			
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 9** **Objective 10**			
Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**	**Evidence of use in multiple settings Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 9			
Mastery Objective 10			

I have reviewed the mastery objectives for this student's ALT-MSA Portfolio.

_____ _____
Principal or Designee's Signature Date

Section 3
Required ALT-MSA Form

ALT-MSA TEST DOCUMENT: ACCESS SKILLS FOR READING

With the Test Examiner Team, select 5 access skills. For each access skill, select and record 2 objectives that will be assessed. Then, write a measurable mastery objective for each selected objective. Write the mastery objectives in the context of reading. Indicate the type of evidence that will be collected and the test examiner who will obtain the evidence. A videotape must be an artifact for at least one access skill objective assessed in the context of reading. Artifacts demonstrating evidence of use in multiple settings are required for two of the selected access skills. Check when the evidence for the mastery objectives is obtained.

ACCESS SKILLS: Reading

Access Skill 1: Demonstrate observable responses to a variety of relevant stimuli

____ Objective a Keep eyes open for a designated period of time
____ Objective b Demonstrate alertness that is influenced by external events
____ Objective c Respond to kinesthetic, tactile, auditory, and visual stimuli
____ Objective d Demonstrate understanding of cause and effect (e.g., use a switch operated device, use graphics or signs)
____ Objective e Respond to environmental and social stimuli
____ Objective f Reach and grasp object

Mastery Objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 1		
Mastery Objective 2		

Access Skill 2: Demonstrate understanding that symbols are a representation of concrete objects or experiences

____ Objective a Match like objects
____ Objective b Match object to photograph or picture of like object
____ Objective c Match pictures of similar representations of same object
____ Objective d Match object to symbol or sign
____ Objective e Match object or picture to activity

Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 3		
Mastery Objective 4		

Section 3
Required ALT-MSA Form

ACCESS SKILLS: Reading

Access Skill 3: Respond to basic vocabulary

____ Objective a Respond to spoken words or manual signs
____ Objective b Respond to symbols (e.g., graphics or symbol systems such as PCS, sign, or picture exchange system)

Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**	**Evidence of use in multiple settings Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 5			
Mastery Objective 6			

Access Skill 4: Recognize personal identifiers

____ Objective a Recognize own picture
____ Objective b Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of family members friends, or pets
____ Objective c Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of professional personnel and service providers

Mastery Objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 7		
Mastery Objective 8		

Section 3
Required ALT-MSA Form

ACCESS SKILLS: Reading

Access Skill 5: Attend to stimulus

____ Objective a Focus eye gaze in direction of stimuli (speaker, person signing)
____ Objective b Attend to speaker for duration of activity
____ Objective c Listen to a story in a group
____ Objective d Listen to a story with a peer

Mastery Objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**	**Evidence of use in multiple settings Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 9			
Mastery Objective 10			

Access Skill 6: Makes choices

____ Objective a Indicates choice of printed materials (magazine, book, newspaper)
____ Objective b Indicates choice of literature from different media (books on tape, video tape, DVD, computer, story boards)
____ Objective c Indicates choice of type of literature (poems, finger stories, rap songs, short stories)

Mastery Objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 11		
Mastery Objective 12		

I have reviewed the mastery objectives for this student's ALT-MSA Portfolio.

_____ _____
Principal or Designee's Signature Date

Section 3: Required ALT-MSA Form

Artifact Entry Form: Reading

Test examiners must provide the information requested in columns B and D. In the first column, circle the numbers of the 2 objectives that have an additional artifact that was collected in a setting other than the classroom, and complete columns B and D. Scorers will complete Columns A, C, and E. Test examiners should examine test documents and artifacts to assure alignment with items in Columns A, C, and E.

Mastery Objective Number	A Mastery Objective Aligned with Reading Objective? Y/N	B Conditions (Test Examiner Record the Support Provided to Student During Test*)	C Observable, Measurable Student Response (Artifact is evidence of observable and measurable student response and in multiple settings as appropriate)	D Level of Mastery Achieved (Test Examiner Record on Artifact and Chart the % Mastery Student Demonstrated)	E Objective Mastered? Y/N
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
7 OR 8**					
9 OR 10**					

* Supports Provided. Use following codes to report all supports provided during each assessment of the mastery objectives:
I-Independent, M-Model, VP-Verbal Prompt, PP-Partial Physical, FP-Full Physical

** Record data from Mastery Objectives required to be demonstrated in multiple settings in these rows.

NOTE: THIS PAGE WAS REVISED ON 10/31/2003

Section 4
Required ALT-MSA Form

Pre-assessment: Mathematics

Use http://www.mdk12.org to select the grade level mathematics content standards objectives that will comprise the mathematics pre-assessment. Include the grade level content standards, indicators, and objectives used for this student's ALT-MSA Mathematics Pre-assessment. Record "M" and the date next the objectives already mastered. Record "IP" (in progress) and the date next to the objectives that are currently included in the student's instructional program.

Section 4
Required ALT-MSA Form

Pre-assessment: Access Skills Objectives for Mathematics

Record "M" (mastered) for objective mastered and date of pre-assessment and "IP" (in progress) and date for objective currently part of the student's instructional program.

Student Name _____

Access Skill 1:	**Demonstrate observable responses to a variety of relevant stimuli**
❑ Objective a	Keep eyes open for a designated period of time
❑ Objective b	Demonstrate alertness that is influenced by external events
❑ Objective c	Respond to kinesthetic, tactile, auditory, and visual stimuli
❑ Objective d	Demonstrate understanding of cause and effect (e.g., use a switch operated device, use graphics or signs)
❑ Objective e	Respond to environmental and social stimuli
❑ Objective f	Reach and grasp object
Access Skill 2:	**Demonstrate understanding that symbols are a representation of concrete objects or experiences**
❑ Objective a	Match like objects
❑ Objective b	Match object to photograph or picture of like object
❑ Objective c	Match pictures of similar representations of same object
❑ Objective d	Match object to symbol or sign
❑ Objective e	Match object or picture to activity
Access Skill 3:	**Respond to basic vocabulary**
❑ Objective a	Respond to spoken words or manual signs
❑ Objective b	Respond to symbols (e.g., graphics or symbol systems such as PCS, sign, or picture exchange system)
Access Skill 4:	**Recognize personal identifiers**
❑ Objective a	Recognize own picture
❑ Objective b	Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of family members friends, or pets
❑ Objective c	Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of professional personnel and service providers
Access Skill 5:	**Attend to stimulus**
❑ Objective a	Focus eye gaze in direction of stimuli (speaker, person signing)
❑ Objective b	Attend to speaker for duration of activity
Access Skill 6:	**Makes choices**
❑ Objective a	Indicates choice

Section 4
Required ALT-MSA Form

ALT-MSA TEST DOCUMENT: MATHEMATICS
Assessed Content Standards, Indictors, and Objectives
With Mastery Objectives

With the Test Examiner Team, for each content standard, record the indicator and 2 objectives to be assessed. Write a measurable mastery objective for each selected objective. Indicate the type of evidence that will be collected and the test examiner who will obtain the evidence. Check when the evidence for the mastery objectives are obtained.

MATHEMATICS CONTENT STANDARDS			
1.0 Knowledge of Algebra, Patterns, or Functions **7.0 Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology (C.1)**			
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 1** **Objective 2**			
Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated (M/D/Y)**	
Mastery Objective 1			
Mastery Objective 2			
2.0 Geometry **7.0 Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology**			
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 3** **Objective 4**			
Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**	
Mastery Objective 3			
Mastery Objective 4			
3.0 Measurement **7.0 Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology**			
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 5** **Objective 6**			
Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**	**Evidence of use in multiple settings Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 5			
Mastery Objective 6			

Section 4
Required ALT-MSA Form

4.0 Statistics **7.0 Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology**			
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 7** **Objective 8**			
Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**		**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 7			
Mastery Objective 8			
6.0 Knowledge of Number Relationships or Computation **7.0 Presents mathematical ideas using words, symbols, visual displays, or technology**			
Indicator and Objectives to be Assessed: **Objective 9** **Objective 10**			
Mastery objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**	**Evidence of use in multiple settings Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 9			
Mastery Objective 10			

I have reviewed the mastery objectives for this student's ALT-MSA Portfolio.

_____ _____

Principal or Designee's Signature Date

Section 4
Required ALT-MSA Form

ALT-MSA TEST DOCUMENT: ACCESS SKILLS FOR MATHEMATICS

With the Test Examiner Team, select 5 access skills. For each access skill, select and record 2 objectives that will be assessed. Then, write a measurable mastery objective for each selected objective. Write the mastery objectives in the context of mathematics. Indicate the type of evidence that will be collected and the test examiner who will obtain the evidence. Videotape must be an artifact for at least one access skill objective assessed in the context of mathematics. Artifacts demonstrating evidence of use in multiple settings are required for two of the selected access skills. Check when the evidence for the mastery objectives is obtained.

ACCESS SKILLS: Mathematics

Access Skill 1: Demonstrate observable responses to a variety of relevant stimuli

____ Objective a Keep eyes open for a designated period of time
____ Objective b Demonstrate alertness that is influenced by external events
____ Objective c Respond to kinesthetic, tactile, auditory, and visual stimuli
____ Objective d Demonstrate understanding of cause and effect (e.g., use a switch operated device, use graphics or signs)
____ Objective e Respond to environmental and social stimuli
____ Objective f Reach and grasp object

Mastery Objectives (Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**	**Evidence of use in multiple settings Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 1			
Mastery Objective 2			

Access Skill 2: Demonstrate understanding that symbols are a representation of concrete objects or experiences

____ Objective a Match like objects
____ Objective b Match object to photograph or picture of like object
____ Objective c Match pictures of similar representations of same object
____ Objective d Match object to symbol or sign
____ Objective e Match object or picture to activity

Mastery Objectives (Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 3		
Mastery Objective 4		

Section 4
Required ALT-MSA Form

ACCESS SKILLS: Mathematics		
Access Skill 3: Respond to basic vocabulary ____ Objective a Respond to spoken words or manual signs ____ Objective b Respond to symbols (e.g., graphics or symbol systems such as PCS, sign, or picture exchange system)		
Mastery Objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery**	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 5		
Mastery Objective 6		
Access Skill 4: Recognize personal identifiers ____ Objective a Recognize own picture ____ Objective b Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of family members friends, or pets ____ Objective c Recognize pictures, graphics, or symbols of professional personnel and service providers		
Mastery Objectives **(Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)**	**Type of Evidence/** **Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 7		
Mastery Objective 8		

Section 4
Required ALT-MSA Form

ACCESS SKILLS: Mathematics

Access Skill 5: Attend to stimulus

____ Objective a Focus eye gaze in direction of stimuli (speaker, person signing)
____ Objective b Attend to speaker for duration of activity

Mastery Objectives (Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 9		
Mastery Objective 10		

Access Skill 6: Makes choices

____ Objective a Indicates choice

Mastery objectives (Include conditions and supports, observable, measurable student response, and level of mastery)	**Type of Evidence/ Test Examiner**	**Evidence of Mastery Dated M/D/Y**	**Evidence of use in multiple settings Dated M/D/Y**
Mastery Objective 11			
Mastery Objective 12			

I have reviewed the mastery objectives for this student's ALT-MSA Portfolio.

_____ _____
Principal or Designee's Signature Date

Section 4
Required ALT-MSA Form

Artifact Entry Form: Mathematics

Test examiners must provide the information requested in columns B and D. In the first column, circle the numbers of the 2 objectives that have an additional artifact that was collected in a setting other than the classroom, and complete columns B and D. Scorers will complete Columns A, C, and E. Test examiners should examine test documents and artifacts to assure alignment with items in Columns A, C, and E.

Mastery Objective Number	A Mastery Objective Aligned with Mathematics Objective? Y/N	B Conditions (Test Examiner Record the Support Provided to Student During Test*)	C Observable, Measurable Student Response (Artifact is evidence of observable and measurable student response and in multiple settings as appropriate)	D Level of Mastery Achieved (Test Examiner Record on Artifact and Chart the % Mastery Student Demonstrated)	E Objective Mastered? Y/N
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
5 OR 6**					
9 OR 10**					

* Supports Provided. Use following codes to report all supports provided during each assessment of the mastery objectives:
I-Independent, M-Model, VP-Verbal Prompt, PP-Partial Physical, FP-Full Physical

** Record data from Mastery Objectives required to be demonstrated in multiple settings in these rows.

Appendix E

Performance Scoring Center
Staff Roles and Responsibilities

Senior Project Management

Advisor to the project and will be available throughout the project for quality control issues, and training issues.

PSC Project Manager

- Attends rangefinding
- Attends weekly product line status meetings and customer meetings during scoring season
- Supervises Scoring Director
- Assists in training material preparation as needed
- Monitors training either on site or via phone/computer updates daily
- Monitors schedule and progress towards deadlines
- Monitors reliability reports on a daily basis
- Maintains communication with PSC production control
- Maintains communication with customer on scoring related issues

Scoring Center Manager

- Manages scoring center facilities
- Supports and supervises material handlers and warehouse activities
- Supports Scoring Directors and Project Staff as needed
- Supervises maintenance of video, scanning and computer equipment
- Maintains communication with PSC production control
- Prints and shares scorer statistical reports with the customer
- Supports the customer as needed

Scoring Director

- Attends rangefinding
- Facilitates rangefinding and assists in note taking as needed
- Attends weekly product line status meetings and customer meetings as needed
- Prepares training materials under the guidance of the customer and PSC Project Manager
- Writes annotations for training material
- Trains Scoring Supervisors and Scorers
- Supervises Scoring Supervisors
- Monitors and evaluates Scoring Supervisors performance
- Directs material handlers as needed to ensure efficient work flow

- Monitors reliability reports on a daily basis
- Maintains communication with scoring site personnel regarding site issues, personnel issues or material needs
- Maintains communication with product line regarding alerted portfolios and portfolios with processing issues

Scoring Supervisors

- Successfully completes training and meets qualification requirements
- Supervisors team of six to nine scorers
- Backreads team members
- Maintains backreading records on scorers, as well as attendance and other project documentation
- Monitors team members statistics and performance
- Assisted in other tasks as assigned by Scoring Director
- Scores accurately
- Score resolution readings as directed by Scoring Director
- Maintains communication with Scoring Director and consults Scoring Director as necessary

Scorers

- Successfully completes training and meets qualification requirements
- Accurately score portfolios
- Maintain acceptable reliability and validity scores
- Maintains communication with Supervisor and consults Supervisor as necessary

Appendix F

A PROCESS FOR PORTFOLIO SELECTION FOR RANGE FINDING

Select Portfolios that:

- Are easy to read-papers are in order, no extra papers

- Clearly meet scoring criteria for **MASTERED**
  - Artifacts reflect 80% mastery
  - Artifacts align with selected objectives
  - Artifacts reflect observable, measurable student response

- Clearly meet scoring criteria for **NOT MASTERED**
  - Artifacts reflect less than 80% mastery

- Clearly meet scoring criteria for **NOT SCORABLE**
  - Artifacts not dated
  - Artifacts missing
  - Artifact not primary evidence-instead a photograph or narrative

  - Objectives don't align with alt-msa test area or content standard
  - Artifacts not aligned with objectives
  - Artifact does not measure the objective

- **Demand close review** to decide how to score artifacts.
  - Artifact may not have a score recorded-either on the artifact or on the artifact entry form.
  - Artifacts are not labeled or is mislabeled with the objective that is being assessed.
  - Test documents are not included
  - Objectives may be a combination of content standard and access skills; numbering of test documents may not align with test documents or may conflict with each other (e.g., two #3's, etc.)
  - Multiple setting artifacts are included for all 4 objectives in reading and mathematics.
  - Test documents are incomplete. If missing the content standards or access skills, it will not be possible to examine for alignment
  - Unclear if the artifact reflects evidence of 80% mastery; unclear if the artifact is evidence of a measurable and observable student response.
  - Access skill artifacts may lack context of reading and/or mathematics

	SMALL LEA		MID-SIZE LEA		LARGE LEA	
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	**Clear**	**Close Review**	**Clear**	**Close Review**	**Clear**	**Close Review**
High functioning student (less supports)						
Low functioning students (intensive supports and/or use of access skills						
MIDDLE SCHOOL						
High functioning student (less supports)						
Low functioning students (intensive supports and/or use of access skills						
HIGH SCHOOL						
High functioning student (less supports)						
Low functioning students (intensive supports and/or use of access skills						
SPECIAL CENTER						
High functioning student (less supports)						
Low functioning students (intensive supports and/or use of access skills						

Appendix G

ALT-MSA 2004 Scoring Process
Approved by MSDE for Scorer training Spring 2004

1) Read the student letter and parent information to gain an understanding of the student and portfolio.

2) Check to see if a yellow review form is included in the portfolio in section 1. If review sheet is present, and if mastery objectives have been approved for alignment, **do not review** for alignment. If some mastery objectives were not okay for alignment, review test documents for alignment of only the objectives not approved.

Alignment Examples:

N- Content standard objective selected by test examiner does not align with ALT-MSA tested content standard.

Example:

Content Standard Objective: Collect and display data
Mastery Objective: Student will interview classmates to find out what movie they like and make a bar graph displaying the data.

Content Standard Objective: Display data on picture graphs
Mastery Objective: Given a teacher-made graph with pictures of weather conditions, student will identify the weather each school day and place picture on the graph.

L- Mastery objective does not align with the Maryland content standard objective selected by the test examiner team.

Examples of mastery objectives that do and do not align to the specified standard:

Content Standard Objective: Create a one-operation function table to solve a real world problem.
Mastery Objective: Given a short story using addition of whole numbers up to 100, student will write a number sentence that represents the answer to include a label (ex. 5 children) in 8 out of 10 problems.

Content Standard Objective: Apply knowledge of fractions, decimals, and place value.

Mastery Objective: Given a list of 10 pieces of data, student will organize, label, and display data in double bar graphs.

Content Standard Objective: Learn the meaning of new words while examining illustrations.
Mastery Objective: Given a blank auto engine illustration with (5) parts highlighted and a list of simple definitions, number each part with the correct definition.

Content Standard Objective: Identify and explain the elements of a story including the problem and solution.
Mastery Objective: Given a story relating to changing oil, identify and write the names of (5) parts and (2) tools used to complete the operation.

Content Standard Objective: Determine the value of a given set of mixed currency up to $.50.
Mastery Objective: Given a mixed set of coins (pennies, nickels, dimes) pick up the correct coin when asked.

3) Review reading and mathematics artifacts to determine if they are in fact evidence of mastery.

1 - Evidence of Mastery

- Accuracy stated on artifact or artifact entry form are the same
- Reported accuracy score is consistent with student work/artifacts presented
- Accuracy is 80% or higher

0 – No evidence of mastery

- Accuracy less than 80%
- Partial physical prompts or full physical prompts used but not written in the mastery objective
- Artifact does not reflect an observable, measurable student response related to the mastery objective

B - The artifact for the objective is not dated or the name is not on the artifact.

- First name of student is okay
- Date must be complete: month/date/year

T - An artifact is not included for a mastery objective or a mastery score cannot be determined.

X – The artifact for the objective does not measure the selected objective.

Example – see examples from training.

? – The artifact for the objective is a photograph or narrative description of the student demonstrating the mastery objective.

Example of Narrative

Content Standard Objective: Read and recognize nonfiction materials to gain knowledge.
Mastery Objective: Utilize articles and multimedia resources (such as movies) to gain content knowledge. Demonstrate this learning by answering comprehension questions related to these resources.

> The artifact submitted: "They haven't had specific worksheets related to the comprehension of nonfiction materials. Based upon teacher observation the student does show some understanding when utilizing multimedia resources, such as movies."

4) Record score on scoring monitor

- Indicate if video is present
- Indicate if Access skills are used or not

Score hierarchy:

First check:

T
N / L / X
?
B

Then score Mastered or Not Mastered

The Scoring Process: Positive Practices

SCORE "1" IF PRESENT

1) Student was involved: Evident in the student letter or other format that the students used to convey information about self, including signature; and student artifacts and work samples.

2) Parent involvement: Documentation that the parent has been invited to participate **in the portfolio process.**

3) Opportunity for student to apply reading, mathematics or access skills to authentic, real life problems or situation, or other content areas: Real life settings or real life tasks are used to perform mastery objectives.

4) Mastery objectives reflect age appropriate materials and tasks: The materials and tasks would be used and done by same-age peers.

Appendix H

Steps Taken to Monitor Scoring Accuracy and to Remedy Drift 2003-2004

- Daily review of scoring rules, training sets, scoring decisions and updates.
- Scoring Supervisors backread portfolios scored by readers on their team and inform the Scoring Director of any scoring trends or issues identified.
- During resolution scoring, trends and issues discovered are brought to the Scoring Director's attention.
- Calibration of scorers occurs when new scoring decisions are made.
- Calibration of scorers occurs when trends, issues, or drift is noticed.
- At daily Scoring Supervisors' meetings, trends and issues are discussed along with methods to correct them.
- Scoring Supervisors are given reports on a daily basis so they may inform scorers of their reliability, validity and rate.
- Scoring Supervisors address trends, issues or drift with individual scorers alerting them to their mistakes. When needed, supervisors or scoring director will work with scorer on an individual basis to help improve their accuracy.
- Scorers not meeting project requirements for reliability and validity after interventions are released from the project.

Appendix I

Sample Reports

MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Achievement Matters Most

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
2004 Reading and Mathematics: Grade 3
Home Report

01 Allegany County Schools
0401 South Penn Elementary

About the Alternate Maryland School Assessment Program (ALT-MSA) Home Report

In the 2003-2004 school year, your child took the Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA). ALT-MSA is the Maryland assessment in which students with significant cognitive disabilities participate if the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team determines that a student is participating in extended Maryland content standards in reading and mathematics (or access skills in the context of these standards) and cannot participate in the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) even with accommodations. ALT-MSA assesses and reports student attainment of individually written objectives based on the Maryland reading and mathematics content standards. These content standards are available online at http://mdk12.org. A portfolio is constructed for each student consisting of artifacts (such as student work samples) that document the student's mastery of the assessed reading and mathematics objectives.

This report reflects your child's degree of attainment of the reading and mathematics skills that your child's teachers selected to assess, using the supports your student typically needs during instruction. The charts below present (1) the percentage of objectives your child mastered in reading and mathematics, (2) your child's performance in one of three performance levels-Basic, Proficient, or Advanced, and (3) comparative performance of other students on the ALT-MSA at your child's school, in the school system, and in the state. Understanding your child's performance is best done in consultation with your child's teachers and the members of the IEP team. Additional information on school and school system performance is available online at http://mdreportcard.org.

ALT-MSA Performance Level Descriptions

Advanced: Students at this level demonstrate 90% or greater mastery of the tested skills in reading and mathematics.

Proficient: Students at this level demonstrate 51% to 89% mastery of the tested skills in reading and mathematics. The goal for all students is to reach the proficient or advanced level.

Basic: Students at this level demonstrate 0% to 50% mastery of the tested skills in reading and mathematics.

Your Child's ALT-MSA Mastery Percentages and Performance Levels

Reading

	Mastery Percentage	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
	80%			
South Penn Elementary	*			
Allegany County Schools	90%			
Maryland	70%			

Mathematics

	Mastery Percentage	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
	80%			
South Penn Elementary	*			
Allegany County Schools	86%			
Maryland	67%			

School/System/State ALT-MSA Performance

Reading

Percentage of Students at	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
South Penn Elementary	*	*	*
Allegany County Schools	0%	40%	60%
Maryland	28%	24%	48%

Mathematics

Percentage of Students at	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
South Penn Elementary	*	*	*
Allegany County Schools	0%	40%	60%
Maryland	31%	26%	43%

* Data not reported if number tested fewer than 5.

Publication Date: May 9, 200000002

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
2003-2004 Reading and Mathematics
Report to Principals

BACKGROUND

Students with significant cognitive disabilities participate in the Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA) if their IEP team determines they cannot participate in the Maryland School Assessment (MSA), even with accommodations. The ALT-MSA assesses student mastery of selected reading and mathematics objectives from the Maryland content standards or access skills in context of reading and mathematics. Each student's test examiner team selected the assessed objectives by using the results of a pre-assessment that determined the student's skills in the Maryland content standards or access skills within the context of reading and mathematics. The test examiner team constructed a portfolio containing artifacts that were evidence of mastery of the assessed objectives.

This report provides general information about the ALT-MSA and the process used to score the portfolios. In addition, individual student data and aggregated data are presented in attachments to support

(a) instructional planning for individual students,
(b) examination of current instructional practice within the school, and
(c) improvement of the portfolio development process based on non-scorable and not mastered objectives.

Although the student's reported ALT-MSA proficiency levels reflect achievement in Maryland's reading and mathematics content standards, these data should be used in conjunction with other measures of student performance, such as IEP progress report data, teacher observations, and other formal and informal assessments in making instructional decisions.

SCORING THE ALT-MSA PORTFOLIO

Prior to scoring, Maryland teachers who were involved in administering ALT-MSA participated in range finding. During range finding, they identified and scored the portfolios representing the range of performance across grades and contents. These scored portfolios became the basis of scoring guides, training materials, and practice scoring sets which were used to ensure consistency and reliability in portfolio scoring. During scoring, two readers independently scored every ALT-MSA portfolio. The readers first reviewed Sections 1 and 2 to learn about the student. Next, they scored the artifacts in Sections 3 and 4 using the scoring rubric. An objective was scored "mastered" if the artifact reflected that the student has attained at least 80% mastery of the objective. Mastered objectives count towards Proficiency. An objective was scored "not mastered" if the artifact did not reflect that the student had attained 80% mastery of the objective. "Not mastered" objectives do not count towards Proficiency.

An objective was "non-scorable" if it did not align with an ALT-MSA tested area as designated in the Test Administration and Coordination Manual (TACM), it did not align with the Maryland content standard objective selected by the test examiner team, the artifact for the objective was not dated with month, day, year; the artifact did not have the student's name on it, the artifact for the objective was not included in the portfolio, the artifact for the objective did not measure the selected objective, or the artifact for the objective was not primary evidence (e.g., if the artifact was a photograph or a narrative description of the student demonstrating the objective). Objectives that were non-scorable are by definition "not mastered" and do not count towards Proficiency.

SETTING PROFICIENCY LEVELS FOR ALT-MSA

Proficiency levels were established for the Independence Mastery Assessment Program (IMAP, the predecessor assessment to ALT-MSA). This process involved Maryland educators applying a portfolio paper-sorting method to the 2002-2003 assessment results. In order to ensure uniformity of performance standards between IMAP and ALT-MSA, a process of linear transformation was used to translate the IMAP growth score proficiency level cut points to the ALT-MSA mastery objective achievement level cut points.

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
2003-2004 Reading and Mathematics
ALT-MSA Report to Principals

EVIDENCE OF BEST INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

After the scorers examined the submitted artifacts for mastery, they reviewed the portfolio for indicators of best instructional practices for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The information provided based on this review was not part of the accountability system and did not impact a student's reading or mathematics score. This information is provided only to districts and principals for their use in guiding decisions about instructional practices, and it is intended to support the link between assessment and instruction. The ALT-MSA portfolio is only one source of evidence for these important instructional components. Scorers reviewed the portfolios for the following practices:

- ***Student Involvement.*** Student was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio
  - Student conveyed information in the student letter
- ***Parental Involvement.*** Parent was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio
  - Parent documentation is included in Section 2 of the portfolio
  - Parent submitted artifacts completed at home
- ***Skill Application.*** The mastery objectives indicate that the student had the opportunity to apply reading, math, or access skills to authentic, real life problems or situations, or other content areas
  - In the mastery objective, the conditions or the desired student response indicate that the student will demonstrate their reading and math or access skill knowledge and skill in a setting outside the classroom to perform a real-life task (cafeteria/restaurant to read menu, buy lunch; in library to select book, at the job site to perform work duties using written/picture symbol directions) using real life objects such as money to make purchase
- ***Age-appropriateness.*** The student's reading and mathematics or access skill objectives reflect age appropriate materials and tasks. The materials and tasks would be used and done by same-age peers

USING ALT-MSA SCORES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING

Use the three data sources (1) individual student reports, (2) aggregated reports, and (3) evidence of best instructional practices to discuss and plan instructional interventions with your staff. Although the student's reported ALT-MSA proficiency levels reflect achievement in Maryland's reading and mathematics content standards, these data should be used in conjuction with other measures of student performance, such as IEP progress report data, teacher observations, and other formal and informal assessments, in making instructional decisions. Refer to the state's website, http://mdk12.org for further guidance in understanding standards, assessments, and AYP; leading the school improvement process; analyzing and using data; and teaching and assessing the content standards.

Step 1: Examine ALT-MSA Student and School Data

- Identify areas of strength; the content standards that have been mastered in reading and mathematics.
- Identify areas of improvement; the content standards that are not mastered in reading and mathematics.
- Identify issues related to artifacts that were non-scorable and therefore were reported as not mastered.

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
2003-2004 Reading and Mathematics
ALT-MSA Report to Principals

Step 2: Use ALT-MSA Student and School Data to Examine and Plan Instruction for Students

- Plan the selection of reading and mathematics objectives for future instruction and assessment based on 2004 ALT-MSA results.
- Examine current instructional practice for alignment with reading and mathematics objectives. How can instruction in literacy and mathematics be connected with other areas of instruction such as art, music, physical education, therapies, and community settings, both in-school and outside-school communities? Making these connections fosters authentic, real-life applications in reading and mathematics instruction.
- Identify the supports and assistive technologies provided to students and consider adjustments that may foster student learning.
- Examine whether students' current IEP goals and objectives support access to the grade level Maryland content standards.
- Record current levels of ALT-MSA performance on the next developed IEP to guide the selection of IEP goals and objectives that support access to grade level content standards.
- Identify practices to link daily instruction with assessment in reading and mathematics.
- Identify the content standards that need focused instruction.

Step 3: Evaluate School-based Implementation of Alternate Assessment

- Evaluate implementation of each component of the alternate assessment in your school
  - Did a test examiner team develop the portfolios or did only the classroom teacher develop the portfolios?
  - Did the school test coordinator perform their assigned roles and responsibilities?
  - Did staff request and receive technical support when needed?

Step 4: Use ALT-MSA Student and School Data to Identify Resources Needed to Support Instruction

- Identify instructional resources that will support instruction in reading and mathematics content standards, i.e. books, print materials, non-print materials, math manipulatives, and assistive technologies
- Identify strategies to structure time for test examiner team collaboration

Step 5: Use ALT-MSA Student and School Data to Identify Topics for Professional Development of Staff

Potential areas for staff development include the following:

- Teaching literacy and mathematics to students with significant cognitive disabilities
- Increasing knowledge and understanding of Maryland reading and mathematics content standards
- Collecting data and using it to make instructional decisions
- Developing the ALT-MSA Portfolio: rationale, practices to organize the development of the portfolio, strategies to engage the student in the portfolio development process
- Writing mastery objectives relating to grade level content standards
- Collaborating within test examiner and instructional teams; involving all instructional staff in test examiner teams
- Aligning instruction with general education curriculum
- Applying principles of self-determination to instruction and assessment
- Connecting reading and mathematics instruction to other critical areas of instruction including art, music, physical education, career/vocational, community, personal, management, and recreation/leisure

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
State Summary Report
2003-2004 Reading

Reading							
						Artifacts Not Scorable	
Grade	Number of Students Assessed	Percent Proficient or Advanced	Percent of Objectives Mastered	Percent of Objectives NOT Mastered	Percent of Objectives Non-scorable	Reason	Percentage Not Scorable by Reason
3	503	72%	70%	30%	15%	A-1	0%
						A-2	1%
						D	6%
						N	7%
						M	0%
						P	0%
4	622	73%	70%	30%	15%	A-1	0%
						A-2	1%
						D	7%
						N	6%
						M	0%
						P	0%
5	706	76%	73%	27%	14%	A-1	1%
						A-2	1%
						D	5%
						N	7%
						M	0%
						P	0%
6	774	72%	69%	31%	19%	A-1	1%
						A-2	1%
						D	6%
						N	12%
						M	0%
						P	0%
7	767	71%	69%	31%	19%	A-1	0%
						A-2	0%
						D	5%
						N	12%
						M	1%
						P	0%
8	793	76%	73%	27%	16%	A-1	1%
						A-2	1%
						D	4%
						N	10%
						M	0%
						P	0%
10	765	69%	66%	34%	22%	A-1	1%
						A-2	1%
						D	4%
						N	15%
						M	1%
						P	0%
11	718	72%	69%	31%	17%	A-1	1%
						A-2	1%
						D	4%
						N	11%
						M	1%
						P	0%

* Data not reported if number tested is fewer than 5.

Maryland State Department of Education
Confidential, for School and School System Instructional Use Only

September 22, 2004 0000000

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
Report of Positive Practices
2003-2004 Administration

Note: The Positive Practices listed below were not part of the accountability scores generated from the ALT-MSA.

Positive Practices: Evidence and Indicators of Important Components of the Instructional Program	Number of Students' Portfolios	Percentage of Students' Portfolios
▪ ***Student Involvement.*** Student was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio - Student conveyed information in the student letter	5,120	91%
▪ ***Parental Involvement.*** Parent was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio - Parent documentation is included in Section 2 of the portfolio	5,045	89%
▪ ***Skill Application.*** The mastery objectives indicate that the student had the opportunity to apply reading, math, or access skills to authentic, real life problems or situations, or other content areas - In the mastery objective, the conditions or the desired student response indicates that the student will demonstrate their reading and math or access skill knowledge and skill in a setting outside the classroom to perform a real-life task (cafeteria/restaurant to read menu, buy lunch; in library to select book, at the job site to perform work duties using written/picture symbol directions) using real life objects such as money to make purchase	5,100	90%
▪ ***Age-appropriateness.*** The student's reading and mathematics or access skill objectives reflect age-appropriate materials and tasks. The materials and tasks would be used and done by same-age peers	4,959	88%

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
Report of Positive Practices
2003-2004 Administration

Note: The Positive Practices listed below were not part of the accountability scores generated from the ALT-MSA.

Positive Practices: Evidence and Indicators of Important Components of the Instructional Program	Number of Students' Portfolios	Percentage of Students' Portfolios
▪ ***Student Involvement.*** Student was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio - Student conveyed information in the student letter	5,120	91%
▪ ***Parental Involvement.*** Parent was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio - Parent documentation is included in Section 2 of the portfolio	5,045	89%
▪ ***Skill Application.*** The mastery objectives indicate that the student had the opportunity to apply reading, math, or access skills to authentic, real life problems or situations, or other content areas - In the mastery objective, the conditions or the desired student response indicates that the student will demonstrate their reading and math or access skill knowledge and skill in a setting outside the classroom to perform a real-life task (cafeteria/restaurant to read menu, buy lunch; in library to select book, at the job site to perform work duties using written/picture symbol directions) using real life objects such as money to make purchase	5,100	90%
▪ ***Age-appropriateness.*** The student's reading and mathematics or access skill objectives reflect age-appropriate materials and tasks. The materials and tasks would be used and done by same-age peers	4,959	88%

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
State Summary Report
2003-2004 Mathematics

Mathematics							
						Artifacts Not Scorable	
Grade	Number of Students Assessed	Percent Proficient or Advanced	Percent of Objectives Mastered	Percent of Objectives NOT Mastered	Percent of Objectives Non-scorable	Reason	Percentage Not Scorable by Reason
3	503	69%	67%	33%	18%	A-1	4%
						A-2	0%
						D	5%
						N	7%
						M	0%
						P	0%
4	622	71%	68%	32%	17%	A-1	4%
						A-2	1%
						D	6%
						N	6%
						M	0%
						P	0%
5	706	75%	70%	30%	16%	A-1	4%
						A-2	1%
						D	4%
						N	7%
						M	0%
						P	0%
6	774	67%	64%	36%	23%	A-1	4%
						A-2	1%
						D	5%
						N	12%
						M	0%
						P	0%
7	767	72%	68%	32%	21%	A-1	4%
						A-2	1%
						D	5%
						N	12%
						M	0%
						P	0%
8	793	72%	69%	31%	19%	A-1	4%
						A-2	1%
						D	3%
						N	11%
						M	0%
						P	0%
10	765	66%	63%	37%	25%	A-1	5%
						A-2	1%
						D	4%
						N	15%
						M	1%
						P	0%
11	718	69%	66%	34%	21%	A-1	5%
						A-2	1%
						D	4%
						N	10%
						M	1%
						P	0%

* Data not reported if number tested is fewer than 5.

Maryland State Department of Education
Confidential, for School and School System Instructional Use Only

September 22, 2004 0000000

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
Student Portfolio Summary Report
2003-2004 Reading and Mathematics

Student:
School: **Forbush School**
LEA: **Special Placement School**
Code: **24-0311**
Grade: **05**

Reading	Proficiency Level: Basic		
Objective	**Mastered**	**Not Mastered**	**Not Scorable**
1		X	
2			A-1
3		X	
4	X		
5		X	
6		X	
7		X	
8		X	
9		X	
10		X	
Summary	1	8	1

Mathematics	Proficiency Level: Basic		
Objective	**Mastered**	**Not Mastered**	**Not Scorable**
1	X		
2		X	
3		X	
4		X	
5		X	
6		X	
7			A-1
8		X	
9		X	
10		X	
Summary	1	8	1

Notes:
An objective is scored as **Mastered** if all of these components are evident:
1) It aligns with the selected reading or mathematics or access skill objective AND
2) The artifact is evidence of an observable and measurable student response directly related to the assessed objective AND
3) The artifact reflects that the student has attained at least 80% mastery of the objective

An objective is scored as **Not Mastered** if:
1) The artifact did not reflect an observable, measurable student response AND/OR
2) The artifact did not reflect that the student had attained 80% mastery of the assessed objective

A mastery objective is **Non-Scorable and therefore Not Mastered** if one or more of the following conditions occur:
A-1 The objective does not align with an ALT-MSA tested area as designated in the Test Administration Manual
A-2 The objective does not align with the Maryland content standard objective selected by the test examiner team
D The artifact for the objective was not dated with month, day, and year or the student's name was not on artifact
N The artifact for the objective was not included in the portfolio
M The artifact for the objective did not measure the selected objective
P The artifact submitted was not primary evidence; rather, a photograph or a narrative description

Maryland State Department of Education
Confidential, for School and School System Instructional Use Only
September 21, 2004 0007819

Alternate Maryland School Assessment (ALT-MSA)
Report of Positive Practices
2003-2004 Administration

Note: The Positive Practices listed below were not part of the accountability scores generated from the ALT-MSA.

Positive Practices: Evidence and Indicators of Important Components of the Instructional Program	Number of Students' Portfolios	Percentage of Students' Portfolios
• ***Student Involvement.*** Student was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio - Student conveyed information in the student letter	1	100%
• ***Parental Involvement.*** Parent was involved in the development of the ALT-MSA Portfolio - Parent documentation is included in Section 2 of the portfolio	1	100%
• ***Skill Application.*** The mastery objectives indicate that the student student had the opportunity to apply reading, math, or access skills to authentic, real life problems or situations, or other content areas - In the mastery objective, the conditions or the desired student response indicates that the student will demonstrate their reading and math or access skill knowledge and skill in a setting outside the classroom to perform a real-life task (cafeteria/restaurant to read menu, buy lunch; in library to select book, at the job site to perform work duties using written/picture symbol directions) using real life objects such as money to make purchase	1	100%
• ***Age-appropriateness.*** The student's reading and mathematics or access skill objectives reflect age appropriate materials and tasks. The materials and tasks would be used and done by same-age peers	1	100%

Maryland State Department of Education
Confidential, for School and School System Instructional Use Only