

# **DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS FOR BUILDING OUT (NCLB) STATE ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS**

**Stanley Rabinowitz, Ph.D.**

**Presentation at the 2003 Edward F. Reidy, Jr., Interactive Lecture Series  
October 9-10, 2003, Nashua, NH**

# **PRESENTATION SET OF QUESTIONS**

---

- 1. What changes has NCLB brought to statewide assessment programs?**
- 2. What are the consequences of these changes?**  
**intended and unintended**  
**positive and negative**
- 3. What should states be thinking about now that attention has shifted from building the NCLB accountability plan?**

# MEETING NCLB REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

---

**The NCLB requirement that state assessment results be returned prior to the beginning of the following school year has had a significant effect on state assessment programs:**

- **Time of testing**
  - earlier in the spring**
  - fall testing**
- **Item formats**
  - fewer C/R items**
  - NRT driven**
- **Reporting errors**
  - “fear factor”**
  - review of all q/c procedures**
- **Lobby for change**

# VERTICAL VS. PSEUDO-VERTICAL SCALES

---

- **NCLB does not require vertical scales**
- **Are the necessities for building a vertical scale worth the outcome?**
- **May be able to still obtain vertical-scale type information without a formal vertical scale *if* certain design and development options are implemented:**

**Developmental alignment of content standards—grade-to-grade breadth and depth**

**Test blueprints fully reflective of content alignment**

**Standard setting concurrently and coherently across grades**

**Value state's performance levels/labels**

# STANDARD SETTING

---

- **Grade by grade vs. Interpolation: Is there a “gold standard?”**

public confidence

extensive resources

multiple methods

validity studies

- **Is the 10 – 90% range a standards phenomenon?**

populations, programs

accountability system

Why is your state where it is—intended or unintended?

# ALIGNMENT ISSUES

---

- **Items to standards**
- **Items to assessments**
- **Items to external referents (e.g., national standards)**
- **Assessments to external referents (e.g., NAEP, NRTs)**
- **Augmented NRTs**

# INCLUSION ISSUES

---

- **95% rule**
- **Special Education students**
  - alternate assessment eligibility**
  - universal design: is it truly universally favorable?**
- **ELL students**
- **What about “advanced” students?**

# RELATED ACCOUNTABILITY ISSUES

---

- **Values**

**do your assessment and accountability systems align?**

**are you assessing coherently?**

- **State / Local accountability systems**

**dual vs. side by side**

**additional indicators**

**increase technical quality of decisions**

**reward different types of achievement (growth, participation)**

**present vs. future ready**

- **Are the “right” schools identified?**