

White Paper

mCLASS[®] Reading 3D[™]
Text Reading and Comprehension

Using the Common Core State
Standards for English Language Arts
to Revise Performance Standards

Amplify insight.

Introduction

The mCLASS®:Reading 3D™ program is a technology-based reading assessment that combines performance on brief indicators of foundational skills with performance on a running records measure called Text for Reading and Comprehension (TRC). Grounded in developmental reading research conducted by Marie Clay (1993, 2002), TRC uses texts from several different guided reading book sets to determine a student's instructional level, based on educator preference. Complexity of these texts are indicated by guided reading levels, or just reading levels, that generally follow the fundamental criteria outlined in the work of Fountas and Pinnell (2011): Genre/Form, Text Structure, Content, Themes and Ideas, Language and Literary Features, Sentence Complexity, Vocabulary, Words, Illustrations, Book and Print Features.

TRC serves as a screening and progress monitoring tool within the Response to Intervention (RtI) framework. As a screening measure, TRC categorizes students in a system that describes overall reading ability and indicates the need for further instructional intervention. In addition, TRC can progress monitor students' reading proficiency throughout the school year and help select student-appropriate texts.

Performance-standard setting, using content standards, is a critical component in the leveling of guided-reading book sets such as those used in mCLASS:Reading 3D. Historically, standard-setting is the process by which two or more categories of student performance are defined by a panel of experts. Setting standards for two categories generally results in a pass/fail determination, whereas standard-setting with more than two categories results in a richer classification of performance. Often referred to as "cut points," performance standards indicate the minimal level of performance for some skill, ability, or qualification. Content standards are the specific knowledge or skill expectations for a given age, grade level, or field of study (Cizek, Bunch, & Koons 2004).

This paper describes the methods and outcomes of two standard-setting workshops convened to set the performance standards ("cut points") on the mCLASS:Reading3D – Text Reading and Comprehension (TRC) assessment. Included are descriptions of the performance levels, the procedure used to set the performance standards, the goals of the workshop conducted to set the performance standards, the characteristics of panelists who participated in the workshops, and the final performance standards, including student impact information.

Setting Performance Standards for TRC

Editions of TRC

TRC is administered for screening purposes at benchmark assessment periods — beginning-, middle-, and end-of-year — and serves to progress monitor student performance in between those periods. While a wide range of materials are available for progress monitoring, classifications of student performance during benchmark assessment is limited to three sets of materials, known as the Rigby, STEP, and Mondo editions.

At the outset of this activity it became apparent that performance standards for the Rigby edition needed to be set separately from the performance standards for the STEP and Mondo editions, which could be set together. During the first workshop, panelists and Amplify Insight staff determined the type of materials and reading experience Rigby offered was sufficiently different from STEP and Mondo; STEP and Mondo, however, were found to be complementary and, therefore, considered together. This treatment of the STEP and Mondo materials also reflects current implementation and practice, as some educators use both sets of materials during benchmark administration periods.

The first workshop considered the Rigby edition and was convened in Brooklyn, New York, on April 21–22, 2012. The second workshop considered the STEP and Mondo editions and was convened in Brooklyn, New York, on March 23–24, 2013. The process was similar for both workshops and is only described once; where appropriate, separate results are provided.

Goals of the Standard Setting

As stated to the panelists, the goals of the workshops were to:

- Interpret the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts
- Recommend performance standards on the mCLASS:Reading3D Text Reading and Comprehension (TRC) assessment that correspond to Below Proficient, Proficient, and Above Proficient performance at each grade level (K–5) and time of year
- Consider the impact data to guide judgments about placement of cut points at proficiency levels
- Provide feedback about their experiences via an individually administered survey

Performance Level Descriptors and the CCSS for ELA

Performance-level descriptors are key elements in the process of setting performance standards, as they define the knowledge, skills, and abilities that students should possess at the various performance levels. The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English Language Arts (ELA) — also referred to as the Standards — were used as the performance-level standards to inform the standard-setting process.

The CCSS for ELA are a series of evidence-based, internationally benchmarked, rigorous, grade-specific K–12 education standards that stem from work conducted by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association (NGA). Given the increasing number of school districts that adopted CCSS as their primary measure of college and career readiness in a range of subjects, the need to align other frequently used educational assessments to these standards has grown. Previous performance standards for TRC did not conform to the expectations provided by the Standards, therefore, the CCSS for ELA were used as the performance level descriptors for the EOY expectations at each grade.

Panelists reviewed the CCSS for ELA and paraphrased elements of the Standards at the beginning of the workshop to draw attention to the most salient and applicable aspects when considering TRC materials and the assessment of oral reading accuracy and comprehension, in general. The notes compiled by panelists to facilitate discussion and consideration of the CCSS for ELA during the workshops are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Panelist Notes from CCSS Exercise

Grade	CCSS for ELA Strand	Participant Notes and Comments
Kindergarten	Literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With teacher prompting and support • Engage students with retell, illustrations, and group activities • Identify basic story elements (characters, setting, major events and illustration) and types of texts
	Informational – Key Ideas and Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prompting and support
	Informational – Craft and Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main topic • Retell • Describe connections between info in text
	Informational – Integration of Knowledge and Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illustrations/reasons • Basic similarities/differences • Two texts on same topic
	Foundational Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect oral language to written language • Learning to use print (global) • Alphabetic principle • Use phonological continuum for words with three phonemes (hearing and saying) • Count pronounce, blend, segment, add, substitute • Simple CVC • High frequency 1:1 letter/sound • Long and short vowels with common spellings • Text reading • Read with purpose and understanding in emergent-reader text
Grade 1	Literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retell and describe the central message, key details, and story elements • Explain differences in a wide range of text types • Compare and contrast adventures and experiences of characters
	Informational – Key Ideas and Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify • Retell and connect key details in a text (2)
	Informational – Craft and Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaning of words and phrases • Text features to locate facts and information • Distinguish between (and) infer from pictures/illustrations and words
	Informational – Integration of Knowledge and Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use illustrations and details to describe key ideas • Identify author's reasons • Similarities/differences between two texts
	Foundational Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move from global to specific in print concepts (sentence and conventions of sentence) • Language and print match • Move to four phonemes within a phonological continuum • Move to consonant blends, long vowel sounds • One to two syllables • More complex spelling • Sounding correctly with emphasis on inflectional endings • Digraphs, long vowels, silent e, vowel teams • On level, successive readings, metacognitive strategies of monitoring, re-read and self-correction

Grade	CCSS for ELA Strand	Participant Notes and Comments
Grade 2	Literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how story elements impact each other Infer feelings and points of view of characters, including when reading dialogue Demonstrate understanding of key details Compare and contrast two or more version of the same story from different cultures
	Informational – Key Ideas and Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate understanding Identify main topic (multi-paragraph text) and retell Describe connections between series of events, ideas, and concepts
	Informational – Craft and Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meaning of words and phrases Text features for key facts and information Main purpose/what the author wants
	Informational – Integration of Knowledge and Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific images contribute clarity Specific points of author Comparing important points from two texts
	Foundational Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long/short vowels Vowel teams Two syllable words with long vowels Prefix and suffixes Same as first (successive readings, metacognitive, making meaning, self-correction, re-reading)
Grade 3	Literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recount and describe explicit details from the text Distinguish literal from nonliteral language and their own point of view from narrator/characters Compare and contrast works from the same author Explain impact of illustrations
	Informational – Key Ideas and Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate understanding with explicit reference to text Determine main idea using key details Describe relationships, events, concepts, steps using time sequence and cause/effect
	Informational – Craft and Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meaning of domain specific words and phrases Locate information using text features and search tools Distinguish their own point of view from author’s
	Informational – Integration of Knowledge and Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand text using illustrations and words Logical connectors between sentences and paragraphs Compare and contrast important points between two texts
	Foundational Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Derivational and Latin suffixes Multi-syllable words Prose and poetry in successive reads Monitor for understanding and SC

Grade	CCSS for ELA Strand	Participant Notes and Comments
Grade 4	Informational – Key Ideas and Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain text explicitly and draw inferences • Summarize the text and explain how main idea is supported by key details • Use information in text to explain events, procedures, ideas, concepts
	Informational – Craft and Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaning of academic and domain specific vocabulary • Describe overall structure • Compare and contrast firsthand and secondhand account of event or topic and describe differences in focus
	Informational – Integration of Knowledge and Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpret, infer and explain how information contributes to understanding of the presented text • Explain how author uses reason and evidence • Integrate information from two texts (write or speak)
	Foundational Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluently read on-level prose and poetry within successive readings • Need texts with morphology and syllabification patterns • Monitor for understanding and SC
Grade 5	Informational – Key Ideas and Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quote accurately in explaining text • Explain how main ideas are supported by details • Summarize text
	Foundational Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluently read on-level prose and poetry within successive readings (same as Grade 4) • Texts need morphology and syllabification patterns • Monitor for understanding and SC

For each beginning-of-year (BOY), middle-of-year (MOY), and end-of-year (EOY) administration in Kindergarten through Grade 5, students may be assigned to one of four performance levels — Far Below Proficient, Below Proficient, Proficient, and Above Proficient. The CCSS for ELA, and panelists paraphrasing of the Standards, provide the minimal reading behaviors expected of students at the end of each grade, therefore, they provide the grade-level descriptors for the Proficient performance level in TRC. Additionally, performance level descriptors for Far Below, Below, and Above Proficient were simply defined in relation to the CCSS for ELA:

- Far Below Proficient describes students who demonstrate none of the reading behaviors expected by the CCSS for ELA
- Below Proficient students demonstrate some or few, but not all, of the expected reading behaviors
- Proficient students demonstrate, at a minimum, the reading behaviors expected according to the CCSS for ELA
- Above Proficient students demonstrate reading behaviors beyond the expectations set by CCSS for ELA at their grade level

No performance-level descriptors were created for the BOY or MOY administration periods since the CCSS for ELA is only applicable to the end of the year. Instead, panelists decided to interpolate the performance standards for these administration periods anchored on the performance standards at the end of the current and previous grade.

Panel Composition

Recruitment efforts targeted educators from a diverse geography who demonstrated expertise in guided-reading levels, the Common Core State Standards, and the Text Reading and Comprehension measure.

A panel of seven guided reading experts served as participants during the Rigby workshop. On average, participants reported 28 years of experience with a median of 25 years of experience. Of the seven participants, two were employed in higher education, two were district-level administrators, and three were educational consultants who specialized in reading and literacy.

Nine guided-reading experts served as participants during the STEP and Mondo workshop. Among the participants, there was an average of 21 years of experience and a median of 20 years of experience. Of the nine participants, two reported working in higher education, four were literacy experts, two were district-level administrators, and one reported working in professional services.

All participants were familiar with guided reading and the majority were familiar with Amplify Insight (formerly known as Wireless Generation) prior to the workshop. Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of the panelists who participated in recommending performance standards for TRC.

Table 2. Composition of the Standard Setting Workshops

Panelist Role	
Spring 2013	
Table 1	Table 2
Director of Professional Development and RtI	Literacy Consultant
Literacy Academic Content Liaison	District Literacy Coordinator
Professor	Assistant Professor
Senior Professional Services	Title I District Instructional Coach
	Literacy Specialist
Spring 2012	
Table 1	Table 2
Deputy Superintendent	Intervention Support Provider
Reading Consultant	Supervisor
Professor	Professor, Literacy Chair
Education Consultant	

The ID Matching Standard Setting Process

The Item Descriptor (ID) Matching standard setting procedure (Ferrara, Perie, & Johnson, 2008) was used during each of the workshops. The ID Matching method is a test-based standard-setting approach in which test items — or texts, as is the case in TRC — are arranged in order of increasing difficulty or complexity. Panelists matched each text to performance-level descriptors, based upon the content knowledge, skills, and cognitive processes required by the text. If panelists were unable to make a clear match between a text and performance-level descriptor, they placed the text in a “threshold region” for further discussion by participants, workshop facilitators, and/or analysts to determine the best performance-level descriptor. Finally, participants were presented with student impact data to further inform and refine their performance standard determinations. Student impact data consisted of student performance on TRC from the 2011–2012 national database, presented as percentage of students at or above the performance levels indicated by the median text level collected from panelists.

The ID Matching method was selected as it focuses on the assessment demands and not on the conceptualization of prototypical student performance. This method is especially appropriate for assessments that employ performance tasks and set performance standards for a number of large-scale alternative assessments of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (Cameto et al., 2009; Ferrara, Perie, & Johnson, 2008).

Standard-Setting Workshop Activities

Amplify Insight staff provided training and led the participants through two rounds of the ID Matching procedure to first set the Proficient performance standard at the EOY administration period in Kindergarten through Grade 5, then the Below Proficient and Above Proficient performance standards, and finally to set performance standards for BOY and MOY.

On the morning of the first day of each workshop, the entire group of panelists assembled and trained in the ID Matching method. On that afternoon and through the next day, panelists were assigned to two tables to facilitate group discussion in setting performance standards. On the afternoon of the second day, workshop participants recommended performance standards for TRC during two rounds of deliberation for each performance level, in each grade, and at each time of year, as follows:

- Set performance standards for EOY administration periods in all grades
 - Participants complete rounds 1 and 2 for Proficient
 - Participants complete rounds 1 and 2 for Below and Above Proficient

- Interpolate performance standards for BOY/MOY administration periods in all grades
 - Participants complete rounds 1 and 2 for Proficient
 - Participants complete rounds 1 and 2 for Below and Above Proficient

The process of setting performance standards was anchored to the Proficient performance level at the EOY for each grade given the previous description of the desire to reflect the expectations of CCSS in ELA. The workshops were also anchored at Grade 3 as performance standards were first set for that grade, proceeding down to Grades 2, 1, and Kindergarten then back up to Grades 4 and 5. This progression represents the salience of student performance classifications at Grade 3, where most students begin participation in large scale accountability assessment, and also represents the primary use of TRC as a screening and progress monitoring tool within a Response to Intervention (RtI) framework in Kindergarten through Grade 3.

The agendas shown in Table 3 provide the sequence of events for each of the two-day workshops.

Table 3. Standard Setting Workshop Agendas

Spring 2013

Day	Approx. Times	Primary Activity
1	8–9:30 a.m.	Breakfast, introduction, and overview of the workshop
	9:30–11:30 a.m.	Review CCSS and set grade level expectations
	11:45 a.m.–12:15 p.m.	Participant training and practice, Grade 3 EOY
	1–3 p.m.	Round 1: cut point placement EOY Proficient, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K
	3–5 p.m.	Round 2: agreement and impact data EOY Proficient, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K
2	8:30–9:30 a.m.	Round 1 and Round 2: cut point placement, agreement, impact data EOY Proficient Grade 4, Grade 5
	9:30–12 p.m.	Round 1 and Round 2: cut point placement, agreement, impact data EOY all levels, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5
	12:30–3:30 p.m.	Round 1 and Round 2: cut point placement, agreement, impact data MOY/BOY all levels, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5
	3:30–4 p.m.	Cut point review and moderation
	4–4:30 p.m.	Closing remarks, evaluation

Spring 2012

Day	Approx. Times	Primary Activity
1	9–10 a.m.	Introduction and overview of the workshop
	10 a.m.–12:30 p.m.	Review CCSS and set grade-level expectations
	1–3:30 p.m.	Round 1: cut point placement EOY Proficient, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5
		Round 2: agreement and impact data EOY Proficient, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5
3:30–5 p.m.	Round 1: cut point placement EOY all levels, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5	
	Round 2: agreement and impact data EOY all levels, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5	
2	9–11:30 a.m.	Brief review, Round 1: cut point placement MOY/BOY Proficient, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5
		Round 2: agreement and impact data MOY/BOY Proficient, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5
	12:30–2:30 p.m.	Round 1: cut point placement MOY/BOY all levels, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5
		Round 2: agreement and impact data MOY/BOY all levels, Grade 3, Grade 2, Grade 1, K, Grade 4, Grade 5
	2:30–3:30 p.m.	Cut point review and moderation
3:30–4 p.m.	Closing remarks, evaluation	

Panelist Training and Practice

Panelist training was conducted in two parts: 1) distribution of materials for review and brief web conference conducted one week prior to the workshop and 2) an hour-long group training and discussion at the onset of the weekend workshop. In the week prior to the workshops, panelists received pre-reading materials to ensure familiarity with the assessment content. Specifically, electronic copies of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English Language Arts (ELA) for Grades K–5 and the workshop agenda were provided, in addition to an overview of the TRC assessment, the previous performance standards, and all texts used during TRC administration.

During the second training, participants were introduced to the ID Matching method of standard setting and reviewed the cut point placement procedures. They also had an opportunity to practice placing the cut points with guidance and support from Amplify Insight staff.

Rounds 1 and 2

Panelists worked individually and with others at their table to answer the following question for each text level using the TRC materials:

Does this text possess the characteristics necessary to support the expected reading behaviors for the current performance level?

For example, all panelists would review all texts at level “M” and consider and discuss whether that text matched the requirements for Proficient at end of year in Grade 3 (3EOY). This process was conducted for all text levels.

To complete Round 1, panelists indicated whether texts matched the current performance level, matched an adjacent performance level, or they indicated that the text was in a threshold range between performance levels, meaning they were unsure about which performance-level descriptor most closely matched the characteristics of the text. Panelists recorded their judgments, which were then collected and used in subsequent analysis.

Round 2 began with a review of two types of feedback:

- Agreement data: Information on the agreement among panelists about the text levels in the threshold region or indicated as the performance standard was shared. Specifically, the median text level and range of text levels were calculated and provided back to panelists.

- Impact data. The distribution of student performance on TRC from the 2011–2012 national database was provided along with the percentage of students at or above the performance level as currently indicated by the median text level collected from panelists in round 1.

Panelists then began discussion on the agreement and impact data, to promote clarity and a shared understanding about the text characteristics and expectations provided by the performance level descriptors. The goal in discussing impact data was to provide information on the educational context and consequences of the performance standard.

Once discussion concluded, panelists were given another opportunity to review and revise their judgments based on the agreement and impact data. This information was then collected by Amplify Insight staff and used to calculate the final performance standard as the median text level indicated by panelists.

Moderation of the Performance Standards

Once performance standards were set for all grades, administration periods, and performance levels, the panelists were provided the opportunity to review the entire system of cut points and associated impact data. During this activity, panelists were encouraged to consider the learning progression of students from Kindergarten to Grade 5 to ensure that the performance standards represent both the expectations of student reading behaviors and meaningful interpretations for educators. Generally, few adjustments were made to the final system of performance standards, and this activity afforded panelists the opportunity to discuss their observations, interpretations of the CCSS for ELA, and consider the consequences of raising performance standards in general.

Panelist Recommended Performance Standards

Table 4 provides the performance standards recommended by panelists for each grade, administration period, and performance standard for the Rigby editions of TRC; Table 5 provides the performance standards recommended for the STEP and Mondo editions. Impact data for each of the editions is provided in Appendix A.

Performance standards set for the STEP edition required additional modification by panelists to account for text levels that are not present in the book set (i.e., A, D, F, H, and J). Specifically:

- The Below Proficient cut point for KMOY was adjusted to RB
- The Proficient cut points at KEOY and 1BOY were adjusted to C
- The Below Proficient cut point for 1MOY was adjusted to E
- The Proficient cut points for 1EOY and 2BOY were adjusted to I

Further, the STEP and Mondo editions did not contain texts able to support an Above Proficient performance level in 5EOY.

Subsequent to the workshops, final moderation of the performance standards was conducted based on further discussions with educators, experts, and assessment publishers. In specific, the recommended performance standard for Proficient at 3EOY and 4BOY under the STEP and Mondo editions of TRC (text level Q) was judged too difficult. Therefore, this performance standard was revised to text level P.

Table 4. Recommended Performance Standards, Rigby Editions

Grade	Administration Period	Below Proficient	Proficient	Above Proficient
K	BOY	PC	RB	C
K	MOY	RB	C	D
K	EOY	C	D	E
1	BOY	C	D	E
1	MOY	F	G	I
1	EOY	H	J	L
2	BOY	H	J	L
2	MOY	J	L	M
2	EOY	L	M	O
3	BOY	L	M	O
3	MOY	M	O	P
3	EOY	N	P	R
4	BOY	N	P	R
4	MOY	P	R	T
4	EOY	R	S	U
5	BOY	R	S	U
5	MOY	S	T	V
5	EOY	T	U	V

Table 5. Recommended Performance Standards, STEP and Mondo Editions

Grade	Administration Period	Below Proficient	Proficient	Above Proficient
K	BOY	PC	RB	B
	MOY	A-	B	C
	EOY	B	D-	E
1	BOY	B	D-	E
	MOY	D+	G	I
	EOY	G	J-	L
2	BOY	G	J-	L
	MOY	I	L	N
	EOY	K	N	O
3	BOY	K	N	O
	MOY	M	O	Q
	EOY	N	Q/P	R
4	BOY	N	Q/P	R
	MOY	P	S	T
	EOY	Q	T	V
5	BOY	Q	T	V
	MOY	S	U	W
	EOY	T	V	*

Note: “-” indicates that the cut point was lowered for the STEP edition; “+” indicates that the cut point was raised for the STEP edition; “*” indicates that performance standard could not be set.

Evaluation of the Standard Setting Process

Panelists could give evaluative feedback about the process and outcomes of the standard setting workshop through discussion and a standardized evaluation form. The standardized evaluation form included both closed- and open-ended response items. A copy of the evaluation form used for both workshops is presented in Appendix B.

Questions posed in the survey regarding overall experience display in Table 6 below. Following both workshops, participant responses mostly indicated satisfaction with the ID Matching method standard-setting procedure and with their experiences as participants. All participants selected “Strongly Agree” when asked whether they understood the purpose of the workshop, whether instructions and presentations provided by Amplify Insight staff were clear, whether Amplify Insight staff knew the material, and regarding whether the group was allowed to make recommendations and decisions. With one exception across the two workshops, all participants agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop employed fair and unbiased methods, that the method used during the workshop resulted in valid performance standards, and that the training and discussion of Grade Level Expectations (provided by the CCSS for ELA) provided information necessary to set cut points¹.

Table 6. Participant Ratings of Overall Experience

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
1. I understood the purpose of this workshop.	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2. The method I used during this workshop resulted in setting valid performance levels.	71.4%	67.0%	14.3%	33.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
3. The method I used during this workshop was fair and unbiased.	71.4%	78.0%	14.3%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

N= 7 (2012), N = 9 (2013)

¹ In the 2012 workshop, one participant strongly disagreed that the method used during the workshop resulted in valid methods, and also disagreed that the training and discussion of Grade Level Expectations provided the information necessary to set cut points. This participant, however, still provided meaningful judgments and contributed to discussion during the workshop.

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
4. The training on the cut point placement process gave me the information I needed to complete my assignment.	71.4%	100.0%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5. The discussion on the Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) gave me the information I needed to complete my assignment.	57.1%	78.0%	28.6%	22.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6. The agreement data provided me with important information I needed to complete my assignment.	100.0%	89.0%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7. The impact data provided me with important information I needed to complete my assignment.	100.0%	78.0%	0.0%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8. Instructions provided by Amplify staff were clear.	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9. The presentations made by Amplify were clear and helpful.	N/A	100.0%	N/A	0.0%	N/A	0.0%	N/A	0.0%
10. The meeting was well organized.	N/A	89.0%	N/A	11.0%	N/A	0.0%	N/A	0.0%
11. Amplify staff knew the material.	N/A	100.0%	N/A	0.0%	N/A	0.0%	N/A	0.0%
12. The group was allowed to make recommendations and decisions.	N/A	100.0%	N/A	0.0%	N/A	0.0%	N/A	0.0%
13. The meeting facilities were appropriate.	N/A	78.0%	N/A	22.0%	N/A	0.0%	N/A	0.0%

N= 7 (2012), N = 9 (2013)

¹ In the 2012 workshop, one participant strongly disagreed that the method used during the workshop resulted in valid methods, and also disagreed that the training and discussion of Grade Level Expectations provided the information necessary to set cut points. This participant, however, still provided meaningful judgments and contributed to discussion during the workshop.

Participants rated the importance of various factors in their placement of cut points, as displayed in Table 7 below. Participant responses suggest that perception of the complexity of the book sets and group discussions were very important in their placement of the cut points. However, in regards to perception of book complexity, one participant commented that some books were not complex enough for the new standards. Participants in the 2012 workshop indicated that Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) were somewhat less important in their placement of the cut points as compared to 2013 workshop participants. Conversely, participants in the 2013 workshop felt that experiences with students, feedback data, and impact data were less important than 2012 workshop participants indicated.

Table 7. Participant Ratings of Importance

How important was each of the following factors in your placement of the cut points?	Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		No Response	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
Grade Level Expectations (GLEs)	57.1%	89.0%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%
My perception of the complexity of the books	85.7%	89.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%
My experiences with students	85.7%	56.0%	14.3%	33.0%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Group discussions	85.7%	78.0%	14.3%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Feedback data	100.0%	67.0%	0.0%	33.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Impact data	100.0%	67.0%	0.0%	33.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

In addition to rating the importance of various factors, participants rated the appropriateness of the time provided for aspects of the workshop. These results are in Table 8 below. Participants were in agreement that time spent on training and reviewing TRC book sets was “about right.” Participants were also in agreement that the time spent placing cut points during Round 1 was about right. Although participants in the 2013 workshop unanimously agreed that the time spent reviewing the CCSS was appropriate, the 2012 participant responses were divided. Two 2012 participants indicate too much time was spent, four participants indicated the time spent was about right, and one participant indicated that too little time was spent. During the 2012 workshop, participants and Amplify Insight

staff spent time at the beginning of the workshop determining that TRC editions needed to be considered separately, this resulted in loss of time for the remainder of the process. Overall, participant responses suggest the pace and timing of the workshop were appropriate, with the exception of the time devoted to review of the Common Core State Standards. Please see below for further detail.

Table 8. Participant Ratings of Workshop Time Allocation

How appropriate was the amount of time you were given to complete the following components of the workshop?	Too Much		About Right		Too Little		No Response	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
Training on the cut point placement method	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reviewing the Common Core State Standards	28.6%	0.0%	57.1%	100.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reviewing the TRC book sets	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Placement of your cut points in each round	0.0%	11.0%	85.6%	89.0%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
Round 1 discussion	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Round 2 discussion	0.0%	11.0%	100.0%	78.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%

Participants could provide open-ended feedback about the workshop. When asked whether they were satisfied with the new cut point placements, 15 of the 16 participants across years responded “Yes” and commented positively (e.g., “Having created cut points as a grade level, I found this experience to be validating and enlightening!”). The participant who indicated that she was not satisfied with the new cut point placements stated, “I feel the levels on the books were what we used to make determinations and not the characteristics of students at each grade.” One participant noted that she was satisfied with the placement of the cut points but felt that some of the materials (i.e., books) needed to change to better correspond to the CCSS. Another participant stated, “Given the text materials, I feel we reached appropriate cut points. We increased the levels which will address the rigor of the CCSS.” The most common sentiment repeated across years was that the net cut points were better matched to the CCSS for ELA.

Conclusion

This report describes the process by which panels of educators recommended performance standards for the TRC assessment and the outcomes of their deliberations. Panelists recommended performance standards based on review of the TRC assessment materials — texts from the Rigby, STEP, and Mondo editions — and the CCSS for ELA. Impact data was calculated using student results from the 2010–2011 (Rigby) and 2011–2012 (STEP and Mondo) national datasets.

A total of 16 panelists participated in recommending performance standards across the three book set editions available in TRC, with 7 panelists setting cut points for Rigby and 9 panelists setting cut points for STEP and Mondo. These panels were comprised of educators (i.e., teachers, administrators, etc.) from geographically diverse locations, representative of the TRC user base.

Overall, the standard-setting workshops proceeded according to plan. All processes were strictly followed, and panelists reported that they understood the task, felt comfortable in their roles, and were in agreement with the results. By the end of the standard setting workshop, each panel recommended 54 cut points differentiating the Well Below Proficient, Below Proficient, Proficient, and Above Proficient performance levels for each administration period in Kindergarten through Grade 5. Additionally, cut points for BOY and MOY in Kindergarten were suggested that were not previously available in TRC as panelists felt that student performance and the rigor of the CCSS for ELA support cut points at this grade level.

References

- Cameto, R., Knokey, A.M., Nagle, K., Sanford, C., Blackorby, J., Sinclair, B., and Riley, D. (2009). *National Profile on Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards. A Report From the National Study on Alternate Assessments* (NCSE 2009-3014). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Available at: <http://0-ies.ed.gov.opac.acc.msac.edu/ncser/pdf/20093014.pdf>.
- Cizek, G. J., Bunch, M. B., & Koons, H. (2004). Setting performance standards: Contemporary methods. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 23(4), 31–50.
- Clay, M. M. (1993). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. M. (2002). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement (2nd ed.)*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Ferrara, S., Perie, M., & Johnson, E. (2008). Matching the judgmental task with standard setting panelist expertise: The Item-Descriptor (ID) Matching method. *Journal of Applied Testing Technology*, 9(1), 1–22.
- Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (2011). *The continuum of literacy learning, grades PreK–8*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Appendix A: Impact Data

Table A-1. Impact Data as Percent At/Above Text Level, TRC Rigby Edition

Grade	K			1			2			3			4			5		
Text Level	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
PC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
RB	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
A	0.6	0.91	0.99	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
B	0.6	0.91	0.99	1	1	1	0.99	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
C	0.27	0.53	0.8	0.82	0.96	0.98	0.99	0.99	1	0.99	1	0.99	0.98	1	0.99	1	1	1
D	0.17	0.36	0.62	0.64	0.89	0.96	0.96	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.99	1	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	1
E	0.1	0.23	0.46	0.49	0.81	0.93	0.93	0.97	0.98	0.97	0.98	0.98	0.97	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.99	1
F	0.06	0.12	0.26	0.3	0.62	0.87	0.86	0.92	0.96	0.94	0.96	0.97	0.94	0.96	0.97	0.97	0.98	0.99
G	0.04	0.07	0.17	0.21	0.5	0.81	0.81	0.89	0.94	0.91	0.94	0.96	0.92	0.94	0.97	0.95	0.97	0.98
H	0.03	0.04	0.11	0.15	0.39	0.75	0.74	0.85	0.91	0.88	0.92	0.94	0.89	0.92	0.95	0.94	0.96	0.97
I	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.11	0.3	0.68	0.63	0.8	0.89	0.83	0.88	0.92	0.86	0.88	0.93	0.92	0.94	0.96
J	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.07	0.22	0.5	0.45	0.71	0.84	0.77	0.85	0.88	0.8	0.84	0.89	0.89	0.92	0.93
K	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.14	0.35	0.34	0.59	0.77	0.7	0.79	0.84	0.74	0.78	0.85	0.84	0.87	0.91
L	0	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.11	0.28	0.27	0.49	0.72	0.65	0.75	0.81	0.71	0.74	0.82	0.81	0.86	0.89
M	0	0	0.01	0.03	0.08	0.2	0.2	0.37	0.59	0.53	0.66	0.74	0.62	0.65	0.74	0.77	0.79	0.85
N	0	0	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.13	0.14	0.26	0.45	0.38	0.55	0.66	0.53	0.56	0.66	0.74	0.73	0.8
O	0	0	0	0.01	0.04	0.09	0.1	0.19	0.33	0.24	0.43	0.58	0.47	0.49	0.59	0.69	0.68	0.74
P	0	0	0	0.01	0.03	0.08	0.07	0.15	0.27	0.19	0.34	0.51	0.35	0.43	0.54	0.66	0.63	0.7
Q	0	0	0	0	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.12	0.22	0.15	0.28	0.42	0.26	0.38	0.49	0.63	0.59	0.66
R	0	0	0	0	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.1	0.18	0.12	0.23	0.34	0.21	0.28	0.42	0.54	0.51	0.59
S	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.11	0.07	0.14	0.21	0.12	0.1	0.23	0.29	0.31	0.42
T	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.05	0.11	0.16	0.08	0.06	0.16	0.2	0.22	0.34
U	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.08	0.12	0.05	0.04	0.1	0.13	0.13	0.25
V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Z	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sample Size	1882	14351	25908	12014	30519	32524	16870	34716	34846	13265	33077	30515	1090	8286	7804	810	6510	5518

Table A-2. Impact Data as Percent At/Above Text Level, TRC STEP and Mondo Editions

Grade	K			1			2			3			4			5		
Text Level	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY	BOY	MOY	EOY
PC	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	• 1
RB	0.99	0.99	1	0.99	1	1	1	1	1	0.99	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	• 1
A	0.78	0.9	0.97	0.94	0.99	1	1	0.99	1	0.99	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	• 1
B	0.71	0.85	0.94	0.91	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.99	1	1	0.99	1	0.99	• 1
C	0.24	0.44	0.71	0.63	0.92	0.96	0.96	0.97	0.99	0.95	0.97	0.98	0.99	0.99	1	0.99	1	• 0.99
D	0.13	0.19	0.43	0.42	0.81	0.91	0.91	0.95	0.96	0.93	0.96	0.97	0.89	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.99	• 0.99
E	0.13	0.2	0.42	0.41	0.8	0.92	0.91	0.95	0.97	0.93	0.95	0.96	0.88	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.99	• 0.99
F	0.06	0.08	0.2	0.22	0.53	0.81	0.81	0.88	0.92	0.88	0.92	0.94	0.86	0.96	0.97	0.97	0.97	• 0.98
G	0.06	0.08	0.2	0.22	0.51	0.8	0.8	0.88	0.93	0.87	0.91	0.93	0.86	0.96	0.97	0.97	0.98	• 0.98
H	0.03	0.04	0.11	0.12	0.32	0.66	0.63	0.79	0.86	0.8	0.86	0.9	0.83	0.93	0.95	0.95	0.96	• 0.97
I	0.03	0.04	0.11	0.11	0.32	0.64	0.62	0.78	0.86	0.79	0.85	0.89	0.82	0.93	0.95	0.95	0.96	• 0.96
J	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.07	0.19	0.45	0.42	0.66	0.79	0.7	0.79	0.85	0.78	0.89	0.92	0.92	0.93	• 0.95
K	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.18	0.4	0.38	0.63	0.77	0.63	0.74	0.79	0.69	0.82	0.87	0.88	0.89	• 0.9
L	0	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.11	0.27	0.28	0.49	0.68	0.54	0.66	0.74	0.65	0.77	0.82	0.75	0.85	• 0.86
M	0	0	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.16	0.16	0.31	0.49	0.42	0.57	0.66	0.6	0.72	0.79	0.73	0.82	• 0.84
N	0	0	0	0	0.03	0.09	0.09	0.19	0.32	0.27	0.45	0.57	0.55	0.66	0.73	0.71	0.79	• 0.81
O	0	0	0	0	0.02	0.06	0.07	0.12	0.22	0.18	0.35	0.49	0.51	0.62	0.7	0.69	0.76	• 0.79
P	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.1	0.16	0.12	0.25	0.39	0.42	0.55	0.66	0.66	0.74	• 0.76
Q	0	0	0	0	0	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.08	0.15	0.28	0.34	0.48	0.62	0.63	0.71	• 0.73
R	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.1	0.19	0.24	0.36	0.54	0.57	0.66	• 0.69
S	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.21	0.3	0.48	0.5	0.62	• 0.66
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.11	0.15	0.23	0.36	0.37	0.49	• 0.58
U	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.11	0.17	0.26	0.29	0.37	• 0.5
V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.14	0.2	0.25	0.3	• 0.42
W	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.11	0.15	0.18	0.22	• 0.31
X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	• 0
Y	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	• 0
Z	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	• 0
Sample Size	6739	25554	41387	39845	56877	64728	59777	67862	65858	14670	15036	14938	11166	8738	8072	10896	7805	6422

Appendix B: Workshop Evaluation Form

Workshop Evaluation Survey

This survey is conducted to evaluate your experience with the cut point placement workshop and to solicit feedback about the workshop for the organizers and staff at Amplify. This information will be summarized in a final report, which can be made available to you upon request, but will not contain any personally identifiable information. Information gathered about individuals is used for record-keeping purposes and will be presented in aggregate form only.

Please take a moment to answer the following questions and return the survey to a Amplify staff member when it is complete.

Amplify thanks you sincerely for your participation in this process.

Part I. About You

1. Name _____

2. Current Title _____

3. Years of Experience _____

4. Current Employer _____

5. Please indicate your degree of familiarity with Amplify prior to this workshop.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current Amplify user or customer | <input type="checkbox"/> Very familiar |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not a current Amplify user or customer | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat familiar |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unfamiliar |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> No previous experience with Amplify |

6. Please indicate your degree of familiarity with guided reading prior to this workshop.

- Very familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Somewhat unfamiliar
- No previous experience with Amplify

Part II. Overall Experience

1. Please read each of the following statements carefully and indicate your response.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. I understood the purpose of this workshop.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The method I used during this workshop results in setting valid performance levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The method I used during this workshop was fair and unbiased.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The training on the cut point placement process gave me the information I needed to complete my assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The discussion on the Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) gave me the information I needed to complete my assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The agreement data provided me with important information I needed to complete my assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The impact data provided me with important information I needed to complete my assignment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Instructions provided by Amplify staff were clear.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The presentations made by Amplify were clear and helpful.*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The meeting was well organized.*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Amplify staff knew the material.*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. The group was allowed to make recommendations and decisions.*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. The meeting facilities were appropriate.*	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. How important was each of the following factors in your placement of the cut points?

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
a. Grade Level Expectations (GLEs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. My perception of the complexity of the books	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. My experiences with students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Group discussions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Feedback data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Impact data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. How appropriate was the amount of time you were given to complete the following components of the workshop?

	Too Much	About Right	Too Little
a. Training on the cut point placement method	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Reviewing the Common Core State Standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Reviewing the TRC book sets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Placement of your cut points in each round	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Round 1 discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Round 2 discussion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part III. Workshop Outcome

Are you generally satisfied with the placement of the cut points?

- Yes
- No

Please explain

Part IV. Your Turn

What was the most effective portion of the training or cut point placement process?

What suggestions do you have to improve the training or cut point placement process?

Amplify insight.

For more information visit amplify.com.

Corporate:

55 Washington Street
Suite 900, Brooklyn
NY 11201-1071
212.796-2200

Sales Inquiries:

866. 212-8688 • amplify.com