

SESSION OUTLINE

TAKS Two-Day Standard-Setting Sessions

DAY 1 – AM (approximate times)

8:30 – 9:00 **Welcome, Introductions**

Videotape of “Welcome” by Commissioner
Delimit the panel’s activities – “Groundrules”
Logistics – expenses, agenda, schedule
Brief overview of TAKS program and the standard-setting activities (i.e.,
how this session fits into all activities related to setting standards)

9:00 – 10:30 **Orientation to Setting Standards**

Agenda for the 2 days
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**

Specific performance descriptors to be used –*Commended Performance, Met the Standard, Did Not Meet the Standard*
General descriptions provided by the state for each category
Making these general descriptors concrete for the specific grade and subject area, starting with state’s descriptors and working to panel’s descriptions
What does **mean** for a student to be described this way –
What can these students *do*? What do they *know*?

11:30 – 12:30 **“Experience” the Test**

Overview of TEKS and the TAKS content outline
“Take” or at least “skim” the actual TAKS test;
answer the questions, make notes
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 item-mapping procedure;
what is the judges’ task?
Features of the “item mapping” procedure
How materials are sequenced

2:00 – 2:40 **“Practice Session” on Setting Standards**

Panelists use a short “practice test” on related content to tryout the specific
item-mapping methodology
Discussion of problems/questions on the *mechanics* of setting standards
for both cuts – *Did Not Meet/Met the Standard* and *Met the
Standard/Commended Performance*

2:40 – 3:00 **Preparation for Round 1 of Ratings**

Reminders of key issues
Distribute booklets and rating forms; orient panelists to use
What to do – how to indicate the two cuts
Rules for ratings – anonymity, independence, mechanics, security of
materials, Day 2 overview

3:00 – 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
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 standards)
Discussion of selected items or score points on extremes and near the middle of the Round 1 distribution of both cuts
“Shaping” of panelists’ considerations and judgments, focusing on critical considerations (threshold performance, “should vs. will,” descriptors, item mapping procedural confusions, construct issues)
Statewide student performance data by item (*p* values)
What the data *mean* and why they are only minimally useful in setting standards
Purpose of Rounds 2 & 3 – reflection, reconsideration, and comfort, not consensus
Reminder of key considerations
Distribution of Rating Form for Rounds 2 and 3

11:00 – 12:15 (or completion)

Round 2 of Judges’ Work

Opportunity to reconsider and adjust Round 1 ratings

DAY 2 – PM

1:00 – 2:15 Review of Round 2 Ratings

Questions/Observations of judges on the process
Implications of the preliminary cuts – “impact data”
 Meaning of the cuts and potential impact statewide
Feedback and discussions much like that after Round 1
Discussion of selected items or score points
Reminder of the meaning of *Commended Performance*, *Met the Standard*,
 Did Not Meet the Standard

2:15 – 2:45 Preparation for Final Ratings

Evaluation forms - Distributed by TEA staff
Questions, reminders, wrapup/thanks for participation

2:45 – 3:30 (or until completion*) Final Round of Ratings & Evaluation (panelists depart as they finish work; turn in rating form to BETA, evaluation to TEA staff)

* Panelists should be told that this day ends at 4:00 so no one has to rush to finish their work.

SESSION OUTLINE

TAKS Three-Day Standard-Setting Session

DAY 1 – AM

- 8:30 – 8:45 **Welcome, Introductions** (by TEA staff member)
Videotape of “Welcome” from state Commissioner
Delimit the panel’s activities – “Groundrules”
Logistics – expenses, agenda, schedule
Brief overview of TAKS program and standard-setting process (i.e., how this session fits with all the activities related to setting standards)
- 8:45 – 10:15 **Orientation to Setting Standards**
Agenda for the 3 days
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
 Why Panel must set standards on 2 tests
 Keys to making good judgments
- 10:30 – 11:15 **Definitions and Description of Performance Standards**
Specific performance descriptors to be used – *Commended Performance, Met the Standard, Did Not Meet the Standard*
General descriptions provided by the state
Making these general descriptors concrete for the specific **grades** and subject area
What does it mean for a student to be described this way –
 What can these students *do*? What do they *know*?
- 11:15 – 12:30 **“Experience” the Two Tests**
Overview TEKS and the TAKS test content outline
“Take” or at least “skim” the actual tests on which standards will be set
Discuss the tests – content, concerns, difficulty, “construct”

DAY 1 – PM

- 1:15 – 2:00 **Orientation to the Specific Standard-Setting Methodology**
“Mechanics” of setting standards using this procedure; judges’ task
Features of the procedure
How materials are sequenced
- 2:00 – 2:40 **“Practice Session” on Setting Standards**
Panelists use a short “practice test” on content to tryout the
specific methodology to be used
Discussion of problems/questions on the *mechanics* of setting the two standards
- 2:40 – 3:00 **Preparation for Round 1 of Ratings – *First Test***
Reminders of key issues
Distribute item-mapping booklets and rating forms; orient panelists to use
What to do – how to indicate the two cuts
Rules for ratings – anonymity, independence, mechanics, security of
materials, what happens *next*
- 3:00 – 4:30 (or until completion) **First Round of Judges’ Work – *First Test***
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 – 10:45 **Feedback & Discussion of Round 1 Ratings**
Feedback on Round 1 – Graphic portrayal of all panelists’ ratings
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 recommendations)

- (8:45 – 10:45 cont.) Discussion of selected items or score points on extremes and near the middle of the Round 1 distribution of cuts
“Shaping” of panelists’ considerations and judgments, focusing on critical considerations (threshold performance, “should vs. will,” descriptors, item mapping procedural confusions, construct issues)
Purpose of Rounds 2 & 3 – reflection, reconsideration, and comfort, not consensus
Distribute Rounds 2 & 3 Rating Forms
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 – First Test**
Opportunity to reconsider and adjust Round 1 judgments

DAY 2 – PM

- 1:00 – 2:15 **Review of Round 2 Ratings**
Questions/Observations of judges on the process
Implications of the preliminary cuts scores – “impact data”
Likely statewide impact of the Round 2 cuts
Feedback and discussions much like that for Round 1
Discussion of selected items or score points
- 2:15 – 2:45 **Preparation for Final Ratings – First Test**
Evaluation forms – Distributed by TEA staff
Questions, reminders
Instructions for doing First Round of ratings on the *Second Test*, to be done following completion of the Final Round of ratings on the First Test
- 2:45 – 3:15 (or until completion) **Final Round of Ratings & Evaluation**
Panelists turn in their ratings and evaluation when done, then begin work on Round 1 ratings for the *second* test
- 3:15 – 5:00 (or until completion) **First Round of Judges’ Work – Second Test**
Panelists leave for the day as they complete this activity

DAY 3 – AM

8:30 – 8:45

Review of Round 1 Issues and Problems

Questions/Observations of judges to the Day 2 activities
Clarification of general issues

8:45 – 9:15

Overview of Final Judgments for First Test

Summarize the judges' final recommendations for the *first* test
(This is done for both feedback and “guidance” purposes. That is, we would like panelists' recommendations for the second test to be similar to those for the first test; feedback at this stage should assist this to occur)

9:15 – 10:45

Feedback & Discussion of Round 1 Ratings for the Second Test

(These activities parallel those that took place on Day 2 for the First Test)

Feedback on Round 1 – Graphic portrayal of all panelists' ratings

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?)

Discussion of selected items or score points on extremes and near the middle of the Round 1 distribution of cuts

“Shaping” of panelists' considerations and judgments, focusing on critical considerations

Purpose of Rounds 2 & 3 – reflection, reconsideration, and comfort, not consensus

Distribute Rounds 2 & 3 Rating Forms

Student performance data by item (p values)

Limitations and potential use of the data

Reminder of key considerations

10:45 – 12:00 (or completion) **Round 2 of Judges' Work – Second Test**

Opportunity to reconsider and adjust Round 1 ratings

DAY 3 – PM

12:45 – 2:00

Review of Round 2 Ratings – Second Test

Feedback and discussions much like that for Round 1
Implications of the preliminary cuts scores – “impact data”
Likely statewide impact of the Round 2 cuts
Discussion of selected items or score points

2:00 – 2:20

Preparation for Final Ratings – First Test

Evaluation forms – Distributed by TEA staff
Questions, reminders
Wrapup and “Thank-You’s” – TEA and BETA staff

2:20 – 3:00 (or until completion*)

Final Round of Ratings & Evaluation

Panelists turn in their ratings (to BETA) and evaluation (to TEA) when done,
then are free to depart

* Panelists should be **told** that this day ends at 4:00 so no one has to rush to complete work. No panelist should be permitted to schedule a departure before that. Panelists are seldom unhappy when a meeting ends early, but often are grumpy if the meeting runs too long.

Schedule for TAKS Standard-Setting Sessions

Dates	Content Area	Grade(s)	No. Panelists
August 26–28	ELA	10–11	16
	Mathematics	10–11	19
	Social Studies	10–11	21
August 29–30	Reading	9	18
	Mathematics	9	18
	Social Studies	8	15
September 4–6	Reading	7–8	15
	Mathematics	7–8	17
	Writing	4, 7	20
September 9–11	Reading	5–6	17
	Mathematics	5–6	20
September 16–18	Reading	3–4	22
	Mathematics	3–4	20*
	Science	10–11	19
September 19–20	Science	5	17
October 2	Review Mathematics		14
October 3	Review ELA/Writing		18
	Review Science		8
	Review Social Studies		10
October 14–15	Spanish Writing/4		12
	Spanish Science/5		14
October 16–18	Spanish Reading	3–4	15
	Spanish Mathematics	3–4	12
October 21–23	Spanish Reading	5–6	15
	Spanish Mathematics	5–6	13

* One panelist completed recommendations for Grade 4, but was unable to participate for Grade 3 due to a family emergency; therefore, only 19 panel judgments were used for Grade 3.