



Alaska Alternate Assessment

New Mentor Rater Proficiency & Protégé Review Accuracy

November 11, 2011

New Mentor Training

On September 26 and 27, 2011, Alaska educators seeking certification as Qualified Mentor-Trainers (QT) gathered in Juneau, Alaska. These Assessors-in-Training (AITs) participated in a two-day training that consisted of on-line training, large group training in Writing Scoring, web-based proficiency testing, peer-to-peer practice administration of sample Alternate Assessments and individual review of a sample protégé's test administration. The September training is designed to train participants to the Qualified Assessor level before requiring completion of tasks required to obtain Qualified Mentor-Trainer status. AITs were expected to complete all training and proficiency testing prior to joining the All Mentor Training in Anchorage at the end of October. All participants turned in their practice tests on time. Two participants had to re-submit specific portions of their practice tests to earn QA status after their initial proficiency was not at required levels. All participants earned QA status as a result of the iterative training process.

There were 20 AITs who participated in the training session. AITs who are new to the Alaska Alternate Assessment are required to administer practice tests in order to earn Qualified Assessor status.

New Mentor Training – Practice Test Scoring & Recording Proficiency

Trainees administered practice assessments to participants who had previously acquired Qualified Assessor status. In some cases, trainees administered the practice tests to other trainees. Each of the trainees administered one practice test in Reading, Writing, Mathematics and Science, as well as items from the ELOS Math and ELOS Reading practice tests. Each trainee was also evaluated on the overall administration of the practice assessments.

In each subject area, percent correct was calculated for appropriately recording the student's response (Student Response Total and Student Response Percent) and for correctly recording the appropriate score earned by the student (Score Record Total and Score Record Percent). The results are displayed for each subject area.

In each subject area, the trainee is asked to correctly record the student response in the scoring protocol. If the trainee correctly records the student response, a score of 1 is recorded in the calculations. If the trainee does not correctly record the student response, a score of 0 is recorded. For each subject area, a total possible Student Response is tallied (1 point for each correctly recorded response) for all practice tests. The total is recorded in the included tables, as "Student Response Total."

The same tally is derived for total Score Record, an assessment of whether the trainee correctly scored the item in the scoring protocol. For each subject area, a total possible Score Record is tallied (1 point for each correctly scored item) for all practice tests. The total is recorded in the included tables, as "Score Record Total."

Student Response Percent is a calculation of the total number of correctly recorded student responses per subject area, divided by the total possible Student Responses. Score Record

Percent is a calculation of the total number of correctly scored responses, divided by the total possible scores. Total Possible and Total Percent are calculations of Student Responses and Score Records combined, for a total percent inter-rater agreement per each subject area.

Practice Test Results

Total proficiency among trainees in scoring and recording Reading was 0.98.

Reading Total		Practice test
		20
Max Points		9
St Rspn Total		173
Sc Record Total		178
Std Rspn Percent		0.96
Sc Rcrd Percent		0.99
Total Possible		360
Total Percent		0.98

One AIT was required to rescore and resubmit his/her protégé analysis of the Writing assessment. Total proficiency among trainees in scoring and recording Writing was 0.88.

Writing Total		Practice test
N		20
Max Points		7
St Rspn Total		119
Sc Record Total		128
Std Rspn Percent		0.85
Sc Rcrd Percent		0.91
Total Possible		280
Total Percent		0.88

One AIT was required to rescore and resubmit his/her protégé analysis of the Math assessment. Total proficiency among trainees in scoring and recording Math was 0.93.

Math Total		Practice test
N		20
Max Points		14
St Rspn Total		246
Sc Record Total		272
Std Rspn Percent		0.88
Sc Rcrd Percent		0.97
Total Possible		560
Total percent		0.93

One AIT was required to rescore and resubmit his/her protégé analysis of the Science assessment. Total proficiency among trainees in scoring and recording Science was 0.87.

Science Total	Practice test
N	20
Max Points	8
St Rspn Total	127
Sc Record Total	151
Std Rspn Percent	0.79
Sc Rcrd Percent	0.94
Total Possible	320
Total percent	0.87

Total proficiency among trainees in scoring and recording ELOS tasks was .96.

ELOS	Practice test
N	20
Max Points	5
St Rspn Total	96
Sc Record Total	96
Std Rspn Percent	0.96
Sc Rcrd Percent	0.96
Total Possible	200
Total percent	0.96

Overall Review scores are an assessment of a trainee's adherence to test administration and scoring protocols, with possible scores of 1 = Unacceptable; 2 = Needs Additional Work; 3 = Satisfactory; 4 = Exceptional. Trainees earned an average of 93% of the available points.

Overall	Practice test
N	20
Max Points	28
Totals	523
Ttl Possible	560
Percent	0.93

New Mentor Training - Review of Protégé's Test Administration

All trainees participated in a review of a protégé's test administration in each of the four subject areas and in ELOS administration. Accuracy scores were determined based on an analysis of participants' reviews of a standardized protégé assessment administration packet of tests in Reading, Writing, Mathematics and Science, and ELOS administration. Additionally, participants were scored on overall administration constructs of accuracy in cover page, task administration, task scoring, clarity of markings and appropriate choices to stop testing.

In each subject area, percent correct were calculated for appropriately recording the student's response (Student Response Total and Student Response Percent) and for correctly recording the appropriate score earned by the student (Score Record Total and Score Record Percent). The results are displayed for each subject area.

Review of Protégé's Test Administration Results

Total accuracy among trainees in reviewing the scoring and recording of a Protégé in Reading was 0.90.

	Reading Total	Practice test
N		20
Maximum Points		9
St Rspn Total		163
Sc Record Total		161
Std Rspn Percent		0.91
Sc Rcrd Percent		0.89
Total Possible		360
Total Percent		0.90

Total accuracy among trainees in reviewing the scoring and recording of a Protégé in Writing was 1.00.

	Writing Total	Practice test
N		20
Maximum Points		7
St Rspn Total		140
Sc Record Total		140
Std Rspn Percent		1.00
Sc Rcrd Percent		1.00
Total Possible		280
Total Percent		1.00

Total accuracy among trainees in reviewing the scoring and recording of a Protégé in Math was 0.94.

Math Total		Practice test
N		20
Max Points		14
St Rspn Total		262
Sc Record Total		267
Std Rspn Percent		0.94
Sc Rcrd Percent		0.95
Total Possible		560
Total percent		0.94

Total accuracy among trainees in reviewing the scoring and recording of a Protégé in Science was 0.89.

Science		Practice test
N		20
Max Points		8
St Rspn Total		135
Sc Record Total		151
Std Rspn Percent		0.84
Sc Rcrd Percent		0.94
Total Possible		320
Total percent		0.89

Total accuracy among trainees in reviewing the scoring and recording of a Protégé on the ELOS administration was 1.00.

ELOS		Practice test
N		20
Max Points		5
St Rspn Total		100
Sc Record Total		100
Std Rspn Percent		1.00
Sc Rcrd Percent		1.00
Total Possible		200
Total percent		1.00

Overall Review scores are an assessment of a trainee's adherence to test administration and scoring protocols, with possible scores of 1 = Unacceptable; 2 = Needs Additional Work; 3 = Satisfactory; 4 = Exceptional. Trainees averaged a total accuracy of reviewing percentage of 0.93.

Total accuracy among trainees in reviewing the scoring and recording of a Protégé on the Overall Review scores was 1.00.

Overall	Practice test
N	20
Max Points	28
Totals	523
Ttl Possible	560
Percent	0.93

Implications for Future Training – Practice Test Scoring and Recording Accuracy

The results from this year's training suggest that trainees are being trained in a more comprehensive and accurate manner that they are more able to generalize independently. All metrics reported in this annual report reflect improvements compared to results reported for the 2010 trainings. The Writing task 1.34B continues to present the greatest difficulty for trainees, with trainees scoring student responses with a 65% rate of accuracy. Significant resources have been invested in training all Assessors in the area of scoring writing, including the development of a new Writing Scoring Manual, as well as a train-the-trainers package of writing scoring training materials that all mentors have been trained to use and implement.

Implications for Future Training – Review of Protégé's Test Administration

All scores from this year's evaluation report in the area of reviewing the work of protégé's also denote great improvements, with the lowest accuracy score of 89% exhibited in Science. However, there were several tasks with very low levels of success. Two items in the Reading review were very problematic for trainees: on Task 1.910A, only 15% of trainees noticed that the protégé was missing responses; on Task 2.910C, only 5% of trainees noticed a scoring recording error made by the protégé, where the score points awarded should have been 2 points. Similarly in Math, on Task 5.910A, only 55% of trainees realized that the protégé failed to record the student's responses. In Science, only 30% of trainees on Task 2.10 and 45% of trainees on Task 3.10 realized that the protégé failed to record the student's responses. Only 55% of trainees realized that there was a score point error on Task 3.10, as well, as the item was worth 2 points. Future trainings should over-emphasize the need for reviewers to ensure that all protégés have recorded the student's responses, primarily, and verified that the correct score points have been awarded, secondarily.