

Dynamic Learning Maps Preliminary Report on Standard Setting

June 22-23, 2015



The present publication was developed under grant 84.373X100001 from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. The views expressed herein are solely those of the author(s), and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department should be inferred.



DYNAMIC
LEARNING MAPS

Topics

- Overview of actual standard setting panel process
- Preliminary results
- Discussion
- Next steps & timeline

Panel Process: Anticipated

- Training
- Range finding and pinpointing
 - Including review of impact data, adjacent grade comparisons
- Draft grade/content PLDs

Panel Process: Actual

Training

- Advance
 - 4 modules in self-directed course
 - Self-assessment of comfort with key concepts
 - Opportunity to submit questions
- On-site
 - Focus primarily on standard setting methods
 - Some recap of key points and questions from advance training
 - Reminders & updates the morning of day 2 and day 3

Panel Process: Actual

- 14 panels, 40 tables, 120 cut points
- Range finding and pinpointing
 - No impact data or adjacent comparisons
- Draft grade/content PLDs
 - Identified skills that exemplified a performance level

Panel Process: Actual

Added two steps

- Edit a profile
 - Pick one that was difficult to rate (typically an odd pattern of mastery)
 - Add LL mastery to take it to the next highest performance level
- Final independent ratings
 - Comfortable with the table's pinpointing result? Y/N
 - Final recommended cut point

DLM Staff Impressions

- Complex process but panelists engaged and persistent
- Panels used the process as intended (content-based discussions)
- Challenges:
 - White space on the profile
 - Individual profile versus recommending a LL cut
 - One table was resistant to intervention

PRELIMINARY RESULTS



Year End Model – ELA

Grade	Emerging/ Approaching	Approaching/ Target	Target/ Advanced	Required Ls
3 rd	40	55	73	80
4 th	35	55	74	85
5 th	43	59	79	85
6 th	19	41	63	80
7 th	23	48	67	90
8 th	26	51	69	85
9 th	19	50	72	85
10 th	15	47	73	85
11 th	23	48	69	85
Eng 2	21	45	54	60
Eng 3	23	38	53	65

Year End Model – Math

Grade	Emerging/ Approaching	Approaching/ Target	Target/ Advanced	Required Ls
3 rd	15	24	42	55
4 th	19	29	50	80
5 th	13	30	39	75
6 th	16	26	42	55
7 th	18	41	51	70
8 th	22	37	53	70
9 th	9	26	34	40
10 th	6	16	37	45
11 th	13	24	39	45
Alg1	18	25	33	40
Alg 2	17	25	34	45
Geom	14	20	30	40

Are you comfortable with the recommended cut points?

Response	Count	Percentage
Yes	826	95.9%
No	35	4.1%

Summary of Independent Recommended Cut Points

- 25 out of 40 cut point panels (62.5%) had complete independent panelist agreement with all three recommended cut points
- 99 out of 120 individual cuts (82.5%) had complete panelist agreement with the recommended cut point

Summary of Independent Recommended Cut Points

- 1 person recommended 3 new cut points for one panel (all 1-off from original values)
- Two people on another panel recommended 2 new cut points (1-3 off from original values)
- Remaining recommendations were all to change one of the three cut points
- Most common recommended change to a cut point was a 1-point change (8 total)
- Largest difference was a 10-point increase in independent recommendation for a cut

Panels with Median Independent Cut Different than Recommended

Model/ Content Area	Grade	Performance Cut Point	Group Recommended Cut Point	Median Panelist Independent Cut Point
IM ELA	5	EM/AP	12	12
		AP/T	26	23
		T/ADV	35	35
YE ELA	3	EM/AP	40	40
		AP/T	55	48
		T/ADV	73	73

Observer Perspective on Panel Meeting

- Ed Roeber, TAC chair



Panelists' Evaluations of Standard Setting

- Overall, perceived experience as positive
 - Mean ratings 3.3 - 4.0 on 4-point scale
 - How to approach and complete tasks
 - Confidence in ratings
 - Endorsement of the group's decisions re: cut points
 - Quality of group deliberation
 - Validity of the recommended cut points
 - Only means < 3.5 were for:
 - Organization (YE =3.3; related to wait time for pinpointing folders)
 - Understanding of KSAs to demonstrate a profile (YE = 3.3, IM = 3.4)

Next Steps & Timeline

- Next: staff finish preparing impact data and begin technical report
- Early July: TAC call to review preliminary report
- July 7-8: States review and discuss results at governance meeting
- July 21: TAC call includes update on standard setting
- August: Full draft of technical report ready for review

THANK YOU!

For more information, please contact:

d1m@ku.edu

or

Go to: www.dynamiclearningmaps.org