



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

April 26, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Thomas D. Watkins, Jr., Chairperson  
*Tom Watt*

SUBJECT: Approval of Performance Standards (Cut Scores) for MI-Access Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE assessments

Over the past six years, Michigan has been working diligently to comply with a variety of federal and state requirements related to the assessment of students with disabilities and accountability. The development of MI-Access, Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program, and the approval of the Michigan Educational Assessment System (MEAS) have enabled the state to move toward compliance with these requirements (See Exhibit A – Overview of MI-Access).

The *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997* (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be included in *all* state assessments, with assessment accommodations as necessary. It also requires states to administer an alternate assessment to all students whose Individualized Education Program Teams (IEPTs) have determined it is not appropriate for them to take the general state assessment. By developing MI-Access, Michigan has complied with both of these requirements.

The recently passed *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) also requires that *all* students—including those with disabilities and limited English language proficiencies—be assessed. In addition, it requires states to have a single accountability system that includes all students. Michigan complied with this new legislation—even before its passage—by creating the MEAS (which includes the MEAP, MI-Access, and ELL-Access). The MEAS states that each local and intermediate school district and public school academy *must* ensure the participation of *all* students in the state's assessment system.

*Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1994*, now embedded in NCLB, requires states to develop a single assessment system. Again, because of the State Board of Education's adoption of the MEAS, Michigan is in compliance with this legislation.

Finally, because of the data that will be gathered through the MEAS—which includes previously uncollected data on the student achievement component of the State Board-approved *Education Yes! – A Yardstick for Excellent Schools* assessment of students with disabilities—the state will now have the information it needs to calculate the NCLB participation rates and Adequate Yearly Progress for MI-Access Phase 2 students. It also provides information to meet the student achievement component of the State Board-approved *Education Yes! – A Yardstick for Excellent Schools*.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • HERBERT S. MOYER – VICE PRESIDENT  
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • JOHN C. AUSTIN – TREASURER  
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER  
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

## **MI-Access Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE Assessments**

The MI-Access Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE assessments were administered for the first time statewide in winter 2004. In order to report the MI-Access Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE assessment results by the end of the school year, as required by the No Child Left Behind Act, one last important step must take place—the approval of performance standards. Once this final step is complete, all of the MI-Access reports (Phase 1 and Phase 2) can be produced and provided to districts before the end of the school year.

Performance standard setting meetings for MI-Access will take place April 27 and 28, 2004. Standard setting panels—comprised of interested qualified stakeholders who were nominated by local and intermediate school districts—made recommendations as to what they believed the cut scores should be. These recommendations will be provided to the MI-Access National Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which is comprised of national assessment and special education experts. The TAC is charged with making final recommendations for review by the Michigan Department of Education. (The final recommendations will be provided following the final recommendations provided by the National Technical Advisory Committee review and recommendation to the MDE in Exhibit A.)

## OVERVIEW OF MI-ACCESS

### Program Description

MI-Access is one component of the Michigan Educational Assessment System (MEAS), which was adopted by the State Board of Education in November 2001. Other components of the MEAS include the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP), which has been in place for over thirty years and ELL-Access (for English Language Learners). The MEAS is designed to provide opportunities for *all* students—including those with disabilities and limited English language proficiencies—to participate in appropriate and meaningful state assessments.

Within the MEAS, MI-Access is the state's standardized assessment designed specifically for students with disabilities whose Individualized Education Program Teams (IEPTs) have determined that the MEAP is not appropriate for them, even with assessment accommodations.

The primary purpose of MI-Access is to provide teachers, parents, and other stakeholders with a point-in-time picture of what students know and are able to do. The MI-Access assessments—all of which were designed with input from classroom teachers—are applicable to real world situations, that is, they reflect skills students will need to be successful in school and in adult life roles.

### Program Development

MI-Access was developed, in part, in response to the overriding belief that *all* students deserve full access to achievement. One way to help students achieve is to decide what they need to learn and develop assessment opportunities to determine whether they are learning it.

For many years, the only statewide assessment available to students in Michigan was the MEAP, which even with assessment accommodations is not appropriate for every special education student. As a result, the Michigan Department of Education's (MDE) Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE/EIS) began developing an alternate assessment, which is now called MI-Access.

Given the enormity and importance of the task of developing a completely new assessment program, the MDE decided to develop and implement MI-Access in two phases. Phase 1, which was administered for the first time statewide in winter 2002, includes two assessments—(1) MI-Access Participation and (2) MI-Access Supported Independence. Phase 2 MI-Access, which is designed for students for whom the MEAP, MEAP with assessment accommodations, MI-Access Participation or MI-Access Supported Independence are not appropriate. The following describes each of the assessments in greater detail.

#### *Phase 1: MI-Access Participation and Supported Independence Assessments*

MI-Access *Participation* assessments are for students who have, or function as if they have, *severe* cognitive impairment. These students are expected to require extensive, ongoing support in adulthood. They may also have significant cognitive and physical limitations that impede their ability to generalize or transfer learning, and thus render determining their abilities and skills difficult. For that reason, the *Participation* assessments focus on how a student responds to the opportunity to participate in an activity rather than on how well he or she carries out that activity.

**MI-Access *Supported Independence*** assessments are designed for students who have, or function as if they have, *moderate* cognitive impairment. These students are expected to require ongoing support in adulthood. They may also have cognitive impairments that impact their ability to generalize or transfer learning; however, they likely can follow learned routines and demonstrate independent living skills. The *Supported Independence* assessments, therefore, are designed to provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their skills. Specifically, they measure how students perform certain tasks while acknowledging that they may require some allowable level of assistance to do so.

Phase 1 MI-Access assessments—Participation and Supported Independence—are administered once each year to students who are in the same grades in which MEAP currently administers the English Language Arts and Mathematics assessments (grades 4, 7 and 11). This ensures that all students with disabilities are assessed with the same frequency as general education students (that is, they correspond with MEAP grades).

### ***Phase 2: Additional MI-Access Assessments***

Since Michigan's Phase 2 MI-Access assessments will not be ready for statewide administration until 2005/2006, the MDE has selected the BRIGANCE® to use in the interim based on input from the field. This decision was necessary because the No Child Left Behind Act requires that all students be assessed using a standardized, criterion-referenced assessment; unfortunately, many of the options the IEP Teams were using as interim alternate assessments did not meet that criteria. As a result, starting in 2003/2004, all students in grades 4, 7, 8 and 11 whose IEP Teams have determined that they should take Phase 2 MI-Access assessments in the content areas of English language arts and/or mathematics must be administered the BRIGANCE as customized for Michigan.

In Phase 2, Michigan is developing two additional assessments (Phase 2.1 and Phase 2.2) for students whose IEP Teams have determined it is not appropriate for them to take part in the MEAP, the MEAP with assessment accommodations, MI-Access Participation, or MI-Access Supported Independence. This involves an exceptionally wide range of special education students.

For example, the majority of special education students taking part in Phase 2 MI-Access will be those who have, or function as if they have, *mild* cognitive impairment (Phase 2.1). These students are capable of meeting their own needs and living successfully in their communities without overt support from others. They also are able to assess their personal strengths and limitations and access resources, strategies, supports, and linkages that will help them maximize their potential effectiveness.

Other students, however, may not have *cognitive* impairments but may have other disabilities that the IEP Team has determined will interfere with their ability to participate fully and appropriately in the MEAP even with assessment accommodations (Phase 2.2), such as a visual or hearing impairment.

Phase 2 MI-Access assessments are currently under development. As required by federal law, the assessments will include the subject areas of English language arts, mathematics, and eventually science. The assessments will incorporate multiple choice and written item formats suitable to the student population being assessed. It is expected that Phase 2 MI-Access assessments will be administered for the first time statewide during 2005/2006.

## Stakeholder Input

MI-Access was, and continues to be, developed through a rigorous process involving MDE staff as well as numerous other qualified Michigan stakeholders, ranging from special and general education classroom teachers, administrators, and specialists, to related services providers, legal experts, parents and academics. The assessment development process also benefits from the input of a specially convened group of nationally known psychometricians (educational assessment and research experts).

Stakeholders involved with MI-Access have participated in eight different committees, each of which is charged with specific tasks and responsibilities.

## Both Phase 1 and Phase 2 Committees

### Alternate Assessment Advisory Committee (AAAC)

The AAAC is an umbrella committee responsible for providing advice to the Assessment for Students With Disabilities Program on the overall development, implementation, and reporting of MI-Access. One of its first tasks was to write the *Proposed Plan for the Development of Alternate Assessments for Students Receiving Special Education Services*, which has been used as a blueprint for Phase 1 assessments.

- Sensitivity Review Committee (SRC)

The SRC is responsible for reviewing all MI-Access activities to prevent bias or discrimination based on disability, age, race, gender, and so forth. In addition, it looks for issues that, because of their sensitive nature, may not be appropriate for a statewide assessment. To ensure an independent review, SRC members are not allowed to be part of any other MI-Access committee.

### Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

The TAC provides the MDE with technical and research advice related to the development, implementation, reporting, and ongoing evaluation of all phases of MI-Access. TAC members are drawn from a pool of national assessment and special education experts and are instrumental in providing technical assistance and direction to the assessment development process.

## Phase 1 Committees

### Phase 1 Content Advisory Committee (CAC)

The Phase 1 CAC is comprised of classroom teachers, members of the other MI-Access committees (except the Sensitivity Review Committee), and additional practitioners familiar with assessment and/or the students taking part in MI-Access. The CAC is responsible for (1) making recommendations to MDE/OSE/EIS as to which AUEN components should be assessed as opposed to those that are more appropriately assessed by the local school district and (2) linking them to Michigan's Model Content Standards. In addition, the CAC is responsible for reviewing Phase 1 MI-Access activities and assessment materials prior to their implementation and distribution.

The CAC's review process ensures that the assessment activities included in Phase 1 MI-Access assessments are valid because they (1) accurately reflect the identified AUEN components, (2) meet specifications for conceptual accuracy and completeness, and (3) are age-appropriate.

### **Activity Development Teams (ADTs)**

Phase 1 ADTs are comprised of Michigan classroom teachers as well as other educators familiar with the students taking part in MI-Access. Each ADT includes two or three educators who work collaboratively to draft assessment activities. The activities are based on the specifications determined by the AAAC. The ADTs are required to participate in three workshops throughout the activity development period in which they receive continuous guidance and feedback from the MDE.

## **Phase 2 Committees**

### **Phase 2 Assessment Plan Writing Team (APWT)**

The Phase 2 APWT was comprised of a subgroup of the AAAC and additional general and special education practitioners familiar with the students who will be assessed with Phase 2 MI-Access. The team was charged with developing the draft Phase 2 Assessment Plan, which describes who will be assessed; what will be assessed and how; when the assessment will take place; the assessment formats (including prototype items); and how the assessments will be reported. Part of the process of putting the plan together is determining what State Board-approved content standards will be assessed. In addition, the team reviewed the Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE) and benchmarks in the Michigan Curriculum Framework and "extended" them, as needed, for the population being assessed. The draft plan went out for field review and comment in March 2004.

### **Phase 2 Content Advisory Committee (CAC2)**

The Phase 2 CAC is comprised of many of the Phase 2 Assessment Plan Writing Team members and additional practitioners familiar with the students taking part in Phase 2 MI-Access. For each required subject area, it determines which content standards are assessable at the state level and extends the benchmarks as needed. It also reviews Phase 2 MI-Access assessment items and materials prior to their implementation and distribution. The CAC's review process ensures that the assessment items included in Phase 2 MI-Access are valid because they (1) accurately reflect the identified content standards and GLCE/benchmarks, (2) meet specifications for conceptual accuracy and completeness, and (3) are grade appropriate.

The OSE/EIS involves these many and diverse stakeholders in developing MI-Access because it wants to ensure that the alternate assessment (1) was as broad-based as possible and (2) accurately reflect the ideas and experiences of the people who are directly involved with the students participating in MI-Access.

## FEDERAL AND STATE INFLUENCES ON MI-ACCESS

### Federal Initiatives

Several federal legislative initiatives helped spur the development of MI-Access. The federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 (IDEA), for example, requires that students with disabilities be included in all state assessments with assessment accommodations, as necessary. In addition, it mandates that an alternate assessment be developed and administered for students for whom their IEP Team determines it is not appropriate to take the general state assessment. MI-Access is the “alternate assessment” that Michigan developed to comply with this legislation.

Other federal requirements also influenced, and continue to influence, the development of MI-Access. Those laws include Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1994, and most recently the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. In different ways, these laws maintain that assessments are an integral part of the educational accountability system because they provide valuable information that can benefit all students by regularly measuring their progress against agreed-upon standards. They also maintain that all students—including those with disabilities—should be part of a *single* assessment system and should not be treated separately.

### State Initiatives

MI-Access also helps achieve various State Board of Education (SBE) policies, priorities, and goals. For example, SBE *policies* related to statewide assessment ask that the state (1) coordinate and focus all resources on improving student performance; (2) set performance expectations and measure progress; and (3) base accreditation on high levels of pupil achievement and continuous improvement. SBE *priorities* related to statewide assessment also ask that the state (1) raise student achievement in Michigan, and (2) promote options designed to improve student achievement [such as assessment]. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the SBE has two *goals* that relate specifically to MI-Access. They ask that the state (1) increase the participation and performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments, and (2) develop guidelines for Alternate Assessments for students for whom participation in the MEAP assessment is not appropriate.

Furthermore, in November 2001, when the SBE adopted a policy creating the MEAS, it stated that

“It shall be the policy of the State Board of Education that each local and intermediate school district and public school academy will ensure the participation of *all* students in the Michigan Educational Assessment System [the MEAP, MEAP with assessment accommodations, MI-Access, and ELL-Access].”

MI-Access helps to achieve all of these policies, priorities, and goals in a number of ways. It provides (1) access to the high standards reflected in Michigan’s Model Content Standards for the general curriculum; (2) access to the statewide assessment system, which many students with disabilities have not previously had; and (3) access to meaningful results showing student progress.

## PERFORMANCE STANDARD SETTING

To determine what it means to *Surpass*, *Attain*, or *Emergent Toward* a performance standard for MI-Access Participation and Supported Independence assessments, the MDE involved stakeholders—including classroom teachers (special and general education), building level administrators, parents, special education directors, school psychologists, and related support staff—in an intensive standard setting process. The process was conducted by BETA/TASA—the MI-Access operational contractor—and involved more than 75 people who were nominated by their school districts to participate. The nominees were divided into two panels—one for MI-Access Participation and another for MI-Access Supported Independence. Each panel met for two days.

## MI-ACCESS REPORTS

IDEA 1997 requires states to report alternate assessment data in the same frequency and manner as the general state assessment. Therefore, MI-Access results are reported similar to MEAP results. Using the assessment data provided by the districts, the MI-Access operational contractor produces a variety of reports at the state, district, school, and classroom levels. The following table shows the MI-Access reports produced.

| MI-Access Reports                   |       |          |        |           |
|-------------------------------------|-------|----------|--------|-----------|
| Report                              | State | District | School | Classroom |
| Summary Reports*                    | X     | X        |        |           |
| Listing Reports                     |       | X        | X      | X         |
| Frequency Reports*                  | X     | X        | X      |           |
| District Participation Rate Reports |       | X        |        |           |
| School Participation Rate Reports   |       |          | X      |           |
| Parent Reports                      |       |          | X      |           |
| Individual Student Reports          |       |          |        | X         |
| Disaggregated Summary Reports*      | X     | X        |        |           |
| Student Labels                      |       |          | X      |           |
| Item Analysis                       | X     | X        | X      |           |

\*These reports will be provided only when ten or more students of the same age take part in the same assessment.

The reports are returned either to the District Superintendent or the District MI-Access Coordinator depending on the option chosen by the district. To preserve student anonymity, summary reports are provided only in those districts where ten or more students of the same age take part in the assessment. Certain reports—including the Listing Reports, Summary Reports, and Participation Rate Reports—will also be rolled up to produce corresponding state reports.

## MI-Access Standard Setting Overview

The MI-Access assessments were administered statewide during the winter of 2004. This includes the Phase 1 MI-Access assessments (Participation and Supported Independence) and the Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE assessments in the content areas of English language arts and mathematics. In order to report MI-Access results, one last important step must take place before MI-Access reports can be produced and provided to districts by the end of the school year, as required by the No Child Left Behind Act. That step is approval of the performance standards for the Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE assessments. Performance standard setting is the process used to determine the criteria for calculating how a student has done on each of the content areas assessed by the MI-Access Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE assessments.

Correspondence for nominating panel members was disseminated to all District MI-Access Coordinators, the State Special Education Advisory Committee, and at professional conferences. It was also posted on the MI-Access Web page ([www.mi.gov/mi-access](http://www.mi.gov/mi-access)). Close to 100 nominations were received from all across Michigan.

The performance standard-setting meetings will take place April 27 and 28, 2004. There will be a total of four standard setting panels with approximately 15 members on each panel.

- Grade 4 English language arts and mathematics
2. Grade 7 English language arts and mathematics
3. Grade 11 English language arts
4. Grade 11 mathematics

Each panel will meet for two days each. The panels' members include qualified stakeholders, such as classroom teachers (special and general education), resource room teachers, building level administrators, parents, special education directors, assessment specialists, parents and school psychologists.

The performance standard recommendations made by the standard-setting panels will then be provided to the MI-Access National Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which is comprised of national assessment and special education experts. The TAC will be charged with making the final recommendation for review by the Michigan Department of Education. The final recommendations contained in Exhibit A will be provided to the SBE once they are final.

Beck Evaluation and Testing Associates, Inc (BETA) will conduct the standard-setting meetings using the same process that was used when the performance standard setting was conducted for the MI-Access Phase 1 assessments in April 2002. BETA has extensive experience in conducting standard-setting meetings in 16 other states. The following describes what will take place during the two days the panels meet.

### *Performance Standard Setting Session Organization*

All 4 panels will meet concurrently. The opening session (2 to 2 ½ hours) will be conducted in a large-group setting. Peggy Dutcher, Coordinator of the Assessment for Students with Disabilities Program, will provide an overview of the MI-Access program and the function of the Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE assessments in particular. Mike Beck, President of BETA, Inc., will provide an overview of the process of setting standards. Panels will then break into separate sessions to describe concretely the three performance categories, to take the appropriate assessments, and to do the standard-setting work. Thus, essentially the first morning of Day 1 will be a large-group session, with the remaining 1 ½ days conducted in smaller sessions. All 4 panels will follow the same basic script and will use the same session overheads, practice materials, feedback procedures, etc. The session agenda of the two days' activities is attached in Exhibit C.

### *Performance Category Labels*

The same performance category labels for the MI-Access Participation and Supported Independence assessments will be used.

Surpassed the Performance Standard  
 Attained the Performance Standard  
 Emerging toward the Performance Standard

Generic descriptors of these three labels will be used as a starting point for panel discussions. Panel member judges will recommend two cuts; the actual cut scores will be recommended by the Superintendent to the State Board of Education, which will be asked to approve them.

### *Methodology*

Based on BETA's recommendation and discussions with the MI-Access National Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Peggy Dutcher, BETA, Inc. has selected the Angoff procedures as the basic methodology for the standard setting sessions. This choice was based primarily on the fact that it does not require representative data to be available in advance for the population on which the standards will be set. Given that the Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE assessment materials will still be arriving at the MI-Access contractor for scanning and scoring until nearly the time of the standard-setting sessions, it seemed prudent to select this procedure.

Panel members or "judges" will make item-by-item judgments of the percent of borderline "attained" and borderline "exceeded" students who should answer the question. These judgments will be summed to determine the judge's recommended overall cut score. This basic "modified Angoff" procedure has been used successfully in multiple high-stakes state assessment programs and is soundly supported in the research literature. BETA has successfully led "Angoff" sessions in several states, most recently for the Standards Of Learning tests in Virginia.

### *Other Remaining Standard-Setting Issues*

**Number of Rounds of Judgments:** There will be three rounds of ratings, with discussions of fellow judges' ratings. Between Rounds 1 and 2, available state p-values (percent of students answering each item correctly) will be provided for panel consideration.

TAC representatives have volunteered to attend one or both days of the standard-setting sessions purely as observers. This will provide support to MDE and to the TAC in its consideration of the panels' recommendations.

**"Next Steps" After the Sessions:** a TAC meeting is scheduled for the day after the standard-setting sessions end. The panel recommendations, (represented by data displays by round, with appropriate summary data), will be reviewed by the TAC at that time. The MI-Access contractor will generate "supplemented" unit-interval raw-score frequency distributions and corresponding summary data, to include KR-21 (reliability) estimates, for this meeting. These data can be generated as late as April 27 or 28, as they should be as complete as possible for TAC review. TAC members also suggested that, if possible, various standard error estimates for the mean/median cut scores recommended by the panels as well as the conditional standard errors at the cut points, be available for their consideration on the 29<sup>th</sup>. TAC recommendations will then be taken to the Superintendent for consideration the following week.

## PERFORMANCE STANDARD SETTING SESSION AGENDA

### MI-Access Interim Phase 2 BRIGANCE Standard-Setting Session

#### DAY 1 – AM

- 8:30 – 8:40**                    **Welcome, Introductions** (Peggy Dutcher)
- 8:40 – 8:50**                    **Orientation to Setting Standards** (Mike Beck)  
Agenda for the 2 days of meetings  
Delimit the panel’s activities – “Ground rules”
- 8:50 – 9:20**                    **Overview of MI-Access Assessment System** (Peggy Dutcher)  
*Phase 1 – Participation & Supported Independence*  
*Phase 2.1 – Tryout status and next steps*  
*Phase 2.1 Interim BRIGANCE – purpose, timeline*  
Next steps
- 9:20 – 10:30**                    **Setting Performance Standards – General Process** (Mike Beck)  
What does it mean to set “performance standards”?  
Overview of the general process of setting standards  
Process of placing cut scores to segment a continuum of performance  
Drawing a discrete cutoff (threshold students)  
Errors of classification in any measurement process
- Why multiple rounds are required
  - Keys to making good judgments
- 10:45 – 11:30**                    **Definitions and Description of Performance Standards** (individual sessions)  
Specific performance descriptors to be used  
General descriptions provided by the state  
Making these general descriptors concrete for the specific grade and subject area  
What does it mean for a student to be described this way –  
What can these students *do*? What do they *know*?
- 11:30 – 12:15**                    **“Experience” the Test**  
“Take” the actual test on which standards will be set  
Discuss the test – content, concerns, difficulty, “construct”

**DAY 1 – PM**

1:15 – 2:00

**Orientation to the Specific Standard-Setting Methodology**  
 “Mechanics” of setting standards using the Angoff procedure; judges’ task  
 Features of the procedure  
 Item  $p$ -values – meaning

2:00 – 2:30

**“Practice Session” on Setting Standards**  
 Panelists use a short “practice test” of content to tryout the Angoff procedure  
 Discussion of problems/questions on the *mechanics* of setting standards

2:45 – 3:15

**Preparation for Round 1 of Ratings**  
 Reminders of key issues  
 Distribute materials and orient panelists to use  
 What to do – mechanics of making judgments  
 Rules for ratings – anonymity, independence, security of materials

3:15 – 4:30

(or until completion)

**First Round of Judges’ Work**

- Panelists work independently, turning in rating forms and leaving for the day when completed.

**DAY 2 – AM**

8:30 – 8:45

**Review of Round 1 Issues and Problems**

- Questions/Observations of judges to the process in Round 1
  - Clarification of general issues and “mechanics” of the process

8:45 – 10:30

**Feedback & Discussion of Round 1 Ratings**

Feedback on Round 1 – Graphic portrayal of all panelists’ ratings (anonymous)  
 Meaning of Round 1 ratings - distribution of cuts, median/mean cut  
 Discussion of *WHY*’s for Round 1 (i.e., what led panelists to
 

- set their standards as they did? Problems, issues, confusions,
- rationales for preliminary standard)

 Discussion of selected items or score points on extremes and near the middle of the Round 1 distribution of cuts  
 “Shaping” of panelists’ considerations, focusing on critical
 

- considerations (threshold performance, “should vs. will,”
- descriptors, item rating procedural confusions, construct issues)

 Purpose of Rounds 2 & 3 – reflection, reconsideration, and comfort, not consensus  
 Student performance data by item ( $p$ -values)
 

- What the data mean and why they are only minimally useful in setting standards

 Reminder of key considerations

**10:45 – 12:15**  
(or completion)

**Round 2 of Judges' Work**

Opportunity to reconsider and adjust Round 1 ratings

**DAY 2 – PM**

**1:00 – 2:30**

**Review of Round 2 Ratings**

Questions/Observations of judges on the process

Feedback and discussions much like that for Round 1

Projected “impact data” – implications of the Round 2 recommendations  
(based on data available at that time)

Discussion of selected items or score points

**2:30 – 3:00**

**Preparation for Final Ratings**

Evaluation forms - developed and distributed by MDE

Questions, reminders, wrap-up/thanks

**3:00 – 4:15**  
(or until completion)

**Final Round of Ratings & Evaluation**

(panelists depart as they finish work)