

Iowa State Board of Education

Executive Summary

September 12, 2019



Agenda Item: Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress

State Board Priorities: Eliminating Achievement Gaps

Implementing Iowa's Academic Standards

State Board Role/Authority: The State Board has identified a priority about the alignment of the new statewide assessment to the Iowa Academic Standards.

Presenter(s): Stephen Dunbar, Iowa Testing Programs
University of Iowa

Catherine Welch, Iowa Testing Programs
University of Iowa

Attachment(s): One

Recommendation: It is recommended that the State Board learn about the standard-setting process and adopt achievement levels for the Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress.

Background: The Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress was administered for the first time in 2019. This summer, many Iowa educators participated in the standards setting process. The Iowa Testing Programs is asking the State Board to adopt the new achievement levels.



Pearson

Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress (ISASP) Summer 2019 Standard Setting Meeting Executive Summary

September 2019

This report summarizes the process and results of setting performance levels for the Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress (ISASP) for grades 3-11 English language arts (ELA), grades 3-11 mathematics, and grades 5, 8, and 10 science. The Iowa Testing Program (ITP) from the University of Iowa and Pearson (assessment contractors) recommend the performance levels shown in Table 2 of this report for adoption by the Iowa State Board of Education.

Iowa Statewide Assessment of Student Progress Standard Setting Process and Results

Performance levels are used to classify and describe student performance on an assessment. In order to classify student performance into the different performance levels, the following components are generally required: 1) General Performance Level Descriptors, 2) Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs), and 3) cut scores. General performance level descriptors provide descriptions of what students at each performance level know and what they are able to do. PLDs illustrate the performance levels in terms that are specific to a grade and subject. Cut scores represent the lowest boundary of each performance level on the scale.

The process of recommending performance standards for the ISASP assessments was in line with national best practice for standard setting. Results and details of the process are presented in the following sections.

Policy Definitions

General Performance Level Descriptors for the ISASP assessments are shown in Table 1. The titles and descriptions of the performance levels were defined to be part of a cohesive assessment system.

Table 1. Policy level descriptors for ISASP

Performance Level	Policy Level Descriptors
Advanced	Students performing at the Advanced level demonstrate thorough competency over the knowledge, skills, and abilities that meet the requirements for their grade level associated with academic readiness for college and careers in the subject.
Proficient	Students performing at the Proficient level demonstrate adequate competency over the knowledge, skills, and abilities that meet the requirements for their grade level associated with academic readiness for college and careers in the subject area.
Not-Yet-Proficient	Students performing at the not-yet-proficient level have not yet demonstrated the knowledge and skills to be classified as Proficient.

Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs)

A multi-step iterative process was used in developing, reviewing, and approving the PLDs. Prior to the standard setting committee, a draft set of PLDs representing a gradual increase in expectations across the performance levels was created by ITP content staff. The initial draft PLDs were opened for public review and comment, to allow for Iowa educators to review the standards communicated in the PLDs. The comments provided during the open public review period were then reviewed by committees of education stakeholders from across Iowa and a revised draft of the PLDs were created. The revised draft of the PLDs were reviewed and finalized by ITP and Iowa Department of Education. Panelists who participated in the standard setting committees had the opportunity to provide suggestions and edits to the PLDs utilized during the standard setting meetings.

Cut Scores

The cut scores recommended for adoption for the ISASP assessments for ELA, mathematics, and science are shown in Table 2. This table shows the scale score ranges corresponding to each performance level. The cut scores for the performance levels are the lowest cut score within each range.

Table 2. Cut Score Ranges for ISASP Performance Levels

Subject	Grade	Performance Levels		
		Not-Yet-Proficient	Proficient	Advanced
English Language Arts	3	345 to 397	398 to 446	447 to 510
	4	350 to 413	414 to 477	478 to 540
	5	355 to 436	437 to 512	513 to 590
	6	360 to 455	456 to 540	541 to 640
	7	370 to 474	475 to 568	569 to 680
	8	385 to 493	494 to 593	594 to 720
	9	410 to 504	505 to 617	618 to 750
	10	435 to 529	530 to 641	642 to 780
	11	460 to 560	561 to 659	660 to 800
Mathematics	3	345 to 389	390 to 442	443 to 510
	4	350 to 408	409 to 475	476 to 540
	5	355 to 428	429 to 502	503 to 590
	6	360 to 449	450 to 531	532 to 640
	7	370 to 468	469 to 574	575 to 680
	8	385 to 489	490 to 605	606 to 720
	9	410 to 512	513 to 625	626 to 750
	10	435 to 536	537 to 653	654 to 780
	11	460 to 558	559 to 674	675 to 800
Science	5	355 to 451	452 to 541	542 to 590
	8	385 to 507	508 to 608	609 to 720
	10	435 to 544	545 to 655	656 to 780

Details pertaining to the general method for obtaining the recommended cut scores are provided below.

General Method

From July 22 to July 26, 2019, after the first year of operational administration, a standard

setting committee meeting was conducted to provide cut score recommendations for the ISASP assessments for ELA, mathematics, and science. The committees were comprised of individuals, including teachers and non-teacher educators. The 185 participants were selected for the standard setting committee to provide content and grade-level expertise during the committee meeting and be representative of the state teaching population, including geographic region, gender, ethnicity, educational experience, community size, and community socioeconomic status.

The Extended Modified (Yes/No) Angoff standard setting method was used at the standard setting meeting (Davis & Moyer, 2015; Plake, Ferdous, Impara, & Buckendahl, 2005). This is a content- and item-based method that leads participants through a standardized process in which they consider expectations of student performance, as defined by the borderline descriptions, and the individual items administered to students to recommend cut scores for each performance level. The standardized process was used by the committees for each grade and subject, which resulted in cut score recommendations.

The process started with participants experiencing the assessment for the respective grade of their review committee from the spring 2019 administration through an online testing environment similar to the one used to administer items. Based on their experience with the test items and a review of the borderline descriptions, participants reviewed each item on the test and answered the following question for each performance level:

“How many points would a student performing at the borderline of the [specific] performance level likely earn if they answered the question?”

The cut score recommendation for each individual participant was the expected raw score a student performing at the borderline of the respective performance level would likely earn, calculated as the sum of the individual item judgments. For the purposes of the standard setting, “likely” was defined as 2 out of 3 students at the borderline of the performance level. Each recommended cut score from the standard setting committee is the median of the recommendations from the individual participants in the committee.

An articulation committee composed of table leaders from each of the individual standard setting committees convened to consider the recommended cut scores from each grade level. There were separate articulation committees for ELA, mathematics, and science. Taking into consideration the recommended cut scores and the patterns of the performance standards across grades, this committee considered the recommendations and made adjustments to promote articulation and consistency across the assessment program for each subject.

References

Davis, L. L. & Moyer, E. L. (2015). PARCC performance level setting technical report. Available from Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), Washington, D.C.

Plake, B. S., Ferdous, A. A., Impara, J. C., & Buckendahl, C. W. (2005). *Setting Multiple Performance Standards Using the Yes/No Method: An Alternative Item Mapping Method*. Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education. Montreal, Canada.