STANDARD SETTING IN AN EVOLVING ASSESSMENT ENVIRONMENT

Andrew Wiley, ACS Ventures, LLC

February 19, 2018

#atpconf

≫ **Most prominent standard setting methods were developed with a focus on making judgments at an item level**

≫ **Bookmark procedure requires items be placed in the order of item difficulty; each item is represented on a single page (or screen)**

≫ **Angoff procedures require item by item judgement for all items on a given assessment**

≫ **Other methodologies have been developed to develop methods for handling performance assessments or similarly designed item types**

- Holistic judgments
- Scores on the overall task are considered

≫ **Most new assessments contain some type of combination of multiple choice, performance tasks, constructed response, and technology enhanced items (TEIs)**

≫ **Current methods can be modified to account for the different item types, but it is challenging for panelists to process and make appropriate judgments with more complex sophisticated item types**

>>> **Skorupski (2012) – Focuses on four areas that present cognitive challenges for standard setting panelists**

- Panelists understanding of Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs) and Minimally Competent Candidate (MCC)

- The standard setting method

- The role of discussion

- The impact of impact data

≫≫**Scorpio (2012) also highlights the challenges that panelists can face when trying to make their judgments**

≫≫**The Bookmark method frequently uses a 67% probability, and panelists may struggle to understand the value of 67% (may be confused with a D or C- minus grade**

- Hein and Skaggs (2009) surveyed panelists and many reported initially struggling to understand the response probability criterion

- Dawber et. al. (2002) found that panelists used slightly different strategies when making judgments from round 1 to later rounds, but did eventually feel comfortable with their judgments

≫ **A couple other areas that panelists have a tendency to struggle**

- Would versus should

- Test complexity of reading passages (or other stimuli) versus the difficulty of the items

》》**Drag and Drop**

》》**Multiple Selection**

》》**Drop down Menus**

》》**Equation Builders**

》》**Multi-part answer**

》》**Scoring on multiple domains**

Skorupski (2012) – Some recommendations

- More upfront time spent on training

- Evaluate panelists understanding of processes and procedures before they engage in critical ratings (i.e. Readiness Surveys)

- Use only experienced panelists (1st year attendees are treated as trainees)

- Provide continuing education credit for panelists

≫ **How well can panelists work with and understand TEI items**

≫ **CR and TEI items usually align each score point with a .67 probability of getting the MC items correct**

≫ **Many panelists struggle with understanding how they should work with the constructed response items and how they are lined up next to the tradition MC items**

»» **Provide information early and often**

»» **No decoder rings allowed!**

»» **Use terminology that is comfortable for panelists and provide an appropriate level of specificity**

»Mention TEIs from the very beginning

- Highlight the values and benefit that come with the TEIs (i.e. assessing what students really should know)

»During content specific training

- Allow panelists to see a complete item, along with the scoring rubrics

- Slow Walk the panelists through how the item is being presented in your standard setting process

»Evaluations

- Can ask questions targeted to these questions in any Readiness Surveys

- Ask specific questions about comfort working with these items in all evaluation surveys

Item ID	Translation
MC225561	Multiple-choice item
CR225564_2	Constructed response item
	2 score point
CR225567_C_2	Constructed response items
	Multi-domain item
	Cohesion domain
	2nd score point

Now, explain it to me like I am a four-year old

Psychometricians speaking amongst themselves

USE APPROPRIATE LANGUAGE

>>> **Beta test or pilot some of the explanations**

>>> **Essential that targeted appropriate facilitator scripts are utilized**

>>> **Utilize content experts**

>>> **Make sure all facilitators understand all aspects of the TEIs and how they are represented**

≫ **We are asking standard setting panelists to complete a task (for most of them) they have never heard about or thought about before**

≫ **They need to juggle not only the requirements of the standard setting methodology, but also their previous experience with students and the implications they know will result from the process**

≫ **The last thing needed is adding more cognitive complexity into the process, and we should find better ways to make the panelist task easier if at all possible**

>>> **Questions?**

>>> Awiley@acsventures.com
>>> www.acsventures.com