

Standards & Assessment Development

Bryan Hemberg

Arlington, VA | December 4, 2018



THE CENTER ON
**STANDARDS &
ASSESSMENT
IMPLEMENTATION**

WestEd  CRESST

The Process



Standards Overview

- Standards are statements of what students should know and be able to do at each grade level and thus provide the framework for **classroom instruction** and **student learning**
- The degree to which there is **coherence** and **alignment** among the standards, curricular materials, and instructional strategies used is directly correlated to opportunities for student learning
- Standards provide the **foundation** for developing meaningful and effective assessment
- Having **consistent**, high expectations for **all students** is critical as a safeguard against some students being taught at a lower level or less rigorous content than other students



Current Standards Landscape

What standards are states using?

- English language arts
 - Common Core State Standards – 34 states & DC
 - State-developed Standards – 16 states
- Mathematics
 - Common Core State Standards – 33 states & DC
 - State-developed Standards – 17 states
- Science
 - Next Generation Science Standards – 20 states & DC
 - State-developed Standards - 30 states

Current Standards Landscape (cont.)

Common Core State Standards

- Per a November 2016 report by the Center on Standards, Alignment, Instruction, and Learning (C-SAIL), out of the 42 Common Core-aligned states and D.C., about 50%-66% have accepted the Common Core State Standards **verbatim**.
- Of the remaining 33%, most states have made only minor changes or additions to the standards while several states (NY, CO, PA) have made major changes.
- Major changes seem to be motivated by a desire for increased clarity and **attention to regional needs** or by a desire to maintain state or local control.

BIE - Current Standards Context

What standards are BIE schools using?

- English language arts
 - Common Core State Standards – 18 states
 - State-developed Standards – 5 states
- Mathematics
 - Common Core State Standards – 17 states
 - State-developed Standards - 6 states
- Science
 - Next Generation Science Standards – 7 states
 - State-developed Standards - 16 states



Questions to Consider

- How does having a uniform academic standards promote equity within an education system? Consider:
 - Academic achievement
 - Communication of grade-level expectations for all BIE students
 - Efficiencies of support and training to all BIE schools and teachers
 - Alignment to entry requirements for institutes of higher education
- How can a uniform set of standards meet regional needs? Consider:
 - Meeting regional needs of stakeholders and students
 - Meeting the needs of individual schools
 - Potential difficulty selecting a single “best” set of standards

Standards Review Process

- This process varies for each state, but **almost always** involves the following components:
 - Identification of a need (*why are we doing this?*)
 - Development of Guiding Principles (*what is guiding the work?*)
 - Development of a process (*how are we doing this?*)
 - Development of a timeline (*when are we doing this?*)
 - Recruitment of stakeholder committees (*who is doing this?*)
 - Engagement with the public (*how are we being inclusive?*)
 - Development of an implementation plan (*what are we going to do when the standards are completed? how long will it take? who will be involved in the work and what are their roles?*)

Standards Review Process – NH

- The foundation for New Hampshire's process are established Guiding Principles:
 - **Goals:** Are the proposed standards consistent with the goals of New Hampshire parents and students?
 - **Classroom Experience:** In view of the students, parents and educators, how well do the standards serve as guides for instruction and learning?
 - **Competency:** Do the standards serve as an effective guide to help students achieve academic proficiency and mastery of academic content?
 - **Clarity:** Are the standards written and presented so that they are easily accessible and understood by educators, parents and students?



Standards Review Process – NH (cont.)

- **Specific:** Are the standards sufficiently specific to convey the type and level of student performance expected?
- **Coherent:** Do the standards convey a cohesive vision of the content and progression for student learning?
- **Rigorous:** Are the standards high when compared against other nationally and internationally ranked standards?
- **Developmentally Appropriate:** Are the standards developmentally appropriate for each grade level, especially at the younger years in kindergarten through grade 2?
- **Measurable:** Are standards developmentally appropriate and is attainment measure able through assessment frameworks, including classroom, local and state assessment?



Standards Review Process – NH (cont.)

- The **14-month process** includes (for each content area) numerous activities:
 - Reviewing the Guiding Principles
 - Developing revision process protocols
 - Reviewing achievement data and standards research to determine required background materials
 - Developing a communication plan
 - Engaging stakeholders to gather feedback
 - Developing a Standards Revision Team application
 - Recruiting Standards Revision Team members



Standards Review Process – NH (cont.)

- The **actual review process** can then start, which includes:
 - Determining the aspiration that grounds the standards and what they should deliver for every student
 - Determining what components the standards should contain (review research)
 - Completing a thorough review of other state standards, national standards, international standards, and NAEP alignment studies
 - Completing an initial review of existing NH standards to identify concept/knowledge and skill gaps, grade-to-grade alignments and outdated content/concepts
 - Continuously review public feedback and make adjustments where believed necessary
 - Invite state and national experts in as necessary (and fiscally allowable) to assist in the work



Standards Review Process – NH (cont.)

- The Standards Revision Team develops **four drafts**, each building on the previous version and incorporating extensive feedback
- **Feedback is provided** by general public, students, parents, educators, post-secondary educators, business leaders, professional associations, Legislative Oversight Committee, etc.
- A **five-region listening tour** is conducted
- A **formal public hearing** is conducted
- A **separate** Review Committee is formed to conduct a review
- An **independent technical review** is conducted
- A review is conducted by the **State Board of Education**



State Standards Review Timeline



STANDARDS REVISION TIMELINE FOR ALL CONTENT AREAS*

*Subject to change

Content Areas (Assessed by Summative Statewide)

Content Area	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
English Language Arts			November	Aug/Sept	September 1		Spring			Spring	7 Fall							
Mathematics				November	Aug/Sept	September 1		Spring			Spring	7 Fall						
Science						September	Aug/Sept	September 1			Spring		Spring	7 Fall				

Content Areas (Not Assessed by Summative Statewide)

Fine Arts			June	Feb/Mar	March 1					Spring	7 Fall							
Health Education										Spring	Fall	Fall 1					Spring	7 Fall
Physical Education						Jan Aug/Sept	September 1					Spring	7 Fall					
Social Studies	September	December		September				Fall		7 Fall								
World Languages								Fall	Fall	Fall 1					Spring	7 Fall		

Career Education Content Areas *Effective 2020 CTE Standards revision moving to same cycle timeline.

Ag, Food, & Natural Resources						December	Fall	August 1		December	5 Fall							
Business, Mktg & Management							December	Fall	August 1	December	5 Fall							
Communication & Info Systems					December	Fall	August 1			December	5 Fall							
Health Sciences										December	Fall	August 1					Spring	5 Fall
Human Services & Education					December	Fall	August 1			December	5 Fall							
Skilled & Technical Sciences						December	Fall	August 1		December	5 Fall							

Start Date for Revision
 Targeted Completion/Approval by State Board
 Implemented In Schools
 SSA Summative Statewide Assessment
 Next Revision Begins
 1 Year One
 5 Year Five
 7 Year Seven

Once standards are approved by the State Board of Education, school districts have one year to adopt the standards or standards deemed equal to or more rigorous than the state-approved standards.

Updated on 08/09/2018

Standards are the Foundation

- States must be mindful of the **impact** that new standards or changes in standards may have on concurrent initiatives:
 - Professional development
 - Curriculum
 - Assessment
 - Communication
 - Technology
 - Early Childhood
 - Post-Secondary/Workforce readiness
 - Teacher preparation



Cost of Standards Review

- The costs incurred for standards development or review vary and depend on such things as the **chosen process** for development or review, the **degree of shift** from what was previously done, and the **level of support** provided to schools
- Some examples include:
 - The Arizona Department of Education requests \$1,099,000.00 **annually** to maintain with “minimal” support regarding review/alignment – no updates, no state-provided PD, no guidance documents – their standards. This money supports 10.5 FTE
 - Arkansas allocated \$2,500,000.00 and Idaho \$2,500,000.00 in 2017 to develop **Computer Science** standards, provide PD, and local grants

Questions to Consider

- What would a standards development or revision process likely look like for the BIE? Consider:
 - The benefits of developing new standards versus revising existing standards
 - How stakeholders would need to be involved for the effort to be acceptable
 - The amount of time and resources (staff, funding, etc.) required to undertake such an endeavor



Assessment Overview

- Annual assessments provide an objective measuring tool to determine student progress across classrooms, schools, and districts
- High-quality assessments:
 - Help expose gaps in performance between various student groups
 - Give schools and systems information they need to get better at educating all students
 - Can inform and improve teaching and learning



Current Assessment Landscape

What summative assessments (grades 3-8) are states using?

- English language arts & mathematics
 - PARCC – 6 states & DC
 - Smarter Balanced – 15 states
 - State-developed assessment – 29 states
- English language proficiency
 - ELPA21 – 10 states
 - WIDA Assets – 34 states & DC
 - State-developed assessment - 6 states
- Alternate assessments
 - DLM – 16 states
 - NCSC – 16 states & DC
 - State-developed assessments - 18 states

Current Assessment Landscape

What summative assessments (high school) are states using?

- English language arts & mathematics
 - ACT – 3 states
 - ACT Aspire – 2 states
 - ACT or SAT – 1 state
 - ACT Workkeys or SAT – 1 state
 - ACT & State-developed – 1 state
 - PARCC – 3 states
 - PARCC & SAT - DC
 - SAT – 8 states
 - Smarter Balanced – 7 states
 - State-developed – 24 states



Current Assessment Landscape (cont.)

- Consortia assessments continue to be **highly rated** by USED peer reviews. 12 of 13 consortia states substantially met criteria vs. 7 of 16 non-consortia states
- The majority of states are working with vendors to develop and implement state assessments
- Some states are moving to using ACT and SAT as their **high school accountability assessment**.
- Now 13 states total, despite concerns about whether how well these tests measure state academic standards
- Neither SAT or ACT has been fully approved in the peer review system



BIE - Current Assessment Context

What summative assessments (grade 3-8) are BIE schools using?

- English language arts & mathematics
 - PARCC – 1 state
 - Smarter Balanced – 9 states
 - State-developed assessment – 13 states
- English language proficiency
 - ELPA21 – 5 states
 - WIDA Assets – 16 states
 - State-developed assessment - 2 states
- Alternate assessments
 - DLM – 6 states
 - NCSC – 9 states
 - State-developed assessments - 8 states

BIE - Current Assessment Context

What summative assessments (high school) are states using?

- English language arts & mathematics
 - ACT – 1 state
 - ACT & State-developed – 1 state
 - ACT Aspire – 1 state
 - ACT or SAT – 1 state
 - ACT Workkeys or SAT – 1 state
 - PARCC – 1 state
 - SAT – 1 state
 - Smarter Balanced – 5 states
 - State-developed – 11 states



Questions to Consider

- How does having a uniform summative assessment system promote equity within a state education system? Consider:
 - Understanding overall BIE academic achievement
 - Communication of assessment performance for all BIE students
 - Efficiencies of support and training to all BIE schools and teachers
 - Comparing student performance
- How does a uniform summative assessment meet the regional needs of a system? Consider:
 - Meeting regional needs of stakeholders and students
 - Meeting needs of individual schools

Assessment Development Process

- Clarify the uses and purposes of the assessment
- Establish a timeline
 - The timeline of the operational administration dictates the timing and pace of development
- Develop assessment specifications based on:
 - Academic standards
 - Detailed specifications about the learning objectives that support the standards
 - The rules dictating requirements for test content, format, and accessibility for all students



Assessment Development Process (cont.)

- Develop and review assessment materials
 - Item specification guides
 - Scoring rubrics
 - Graphic design requirements
 - Verification of content and standard alignment
 - Score report requirements
- Conduct pilot testing
- Conduct usability studies
- Conduct bias and sensitivity reviews



Assessment Development Process (cont.)

- Conduct field testing
 - Determine item performance
 - Item representation of content
 - Item accessibility
- Produce final assessment materials
 - Final test versions
 - Score reports
 - Administration manuals
 - Interpretation guides
- Administer, score, and report
- Ongoing evaluation of assessment performance



Assessment Development Process (cont.)

- How long does it take?
 - The amount of time varies and depends on approach
- The process outlined on the previous slides could be done:
 - In 12 months at a **high cost** with **high levels of risk**
 - In 24 months at a **relatively lower cost** with **low levels of risk**

Assessment Development Costs

- There are many required resources and numerous costs to developing and supporting an assessment, which is why states typically pay a vendor to undertake this process with them
- In 2015, the average per-student cost for a state-developed ELA/literacy and mathematics assessments was about \$27



Assessment Development Costs

- California is allocating \$21.4 million to develop a computer-based version of the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).
- The ELPAC assesses whether students from non-English speaking households require special support to learn English.
- With the \$21.4 million, the state will contract with a vendor, who in turn is to convert the assessment from pencil and paper to computer based.

Assessment Development Costs

- For Iowa's statewide tests - which will be available in both paper-and-pencil and computer-based formats – are expected to cost \$31 million over a period of five and a half years, Hupp said
- An initial contract is expected to run for 20 months, with an annual renewal option for four years. The initial contract will cost \$8 million
- Iowa's previous assessment costs about \$8.50 per student for paper-and-pencil and \$15 per student for computer-based



Assessment Development Costs

- California allocated \$5.9 million to develop an Alternative ELPAC for Students With Disabilities.
- Some students with severe cognitive disabilities cannot be accurately assessed using the recently developed ELPAC. Under existing state law, these students' Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams are tasked with identifying appropriate alternative assessments on a case-by-case basis.
- With the \$5.9 million, the state will contract with a vendor to develop a single, statewide alternative assessment that would replace the case-by-case method of selecting alternatives.



Questions?



For more information, please contact:

Bryan Hemberg

bhember@wested.org

Deb Sigman

dsigman@wested.org

www.csai-online.org



THE CENTER ON
**STANDARDS &
ASSESSMENT
IMPLEMENTATION**

WestEd  CRESST

BIE-Level Student Demographics

Entity	Total # Of Students in Academic Program	Total # of American Indian Students	Total # Of Residential Only	Total # of English Learners	Total # of Economica lly Disadvanta ged	Total # Students w/ Disabilities
BIE 15-16	45,095	45,095	6,275	8,664	45,095	8,271
BIE 16-17	45,231	45,231	6,342	7,814	45,231	8,422
BIE 17-18	45,149	45,149	6,168	7,296	45,149	6,191



BIE School-Level Student Demographics (17-18)

Demographic	Total Students	Total Schools	N30	N20	N15	N10
American Indian	45,149	174	-	-	-	-
English Learner	7,296	174	41	30	26	19
Economically Disadvantaged	45,149	174	-	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	6,191	174	98	59	42	24



BIE School-Level Student Demographics (17-18)

School “Type A” (>500 students, n = 22)

- English Learners – range is 0 to 549 students
- Economically Disadvantaged – all match student counts
- Students with Disabilities – range from 64 to 189 students

School “Type B” (100-499 students, n = 125)

- English Learners – range is 0 to 301 students
- Economically Disadvantaged – all match student counts
- Students with Disabilities – range from 0 to 104 students

School “Type C” (13-99 students, n = 38)

- English Learners – range is 0 to 50 students
- Economically Disadvantaged – all match student counts
- Students with Disabilities – range from 0 to 42 students



BIE School-Level Student Demographics (17-18)

- English Learners
 - N = 10 (excludes 19 schools)
 - N = 20 (excludes 30 schools)
- Economically Disadvantaged
 - N = 10 (excludes 0 schools)
 - N = 20 (excludes 2 schools)
- Students with Disabilities
 - N = 10 (excludes 24 schools)
 - N = 20 (excludes 59 schools)

