Spring 2010 Voluntary Survey on Testing Accommodations

Executive Summary

In 2010, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Student Assessment Division collected information on testing accommodations provided to students on state assessments. A voluntary online survey was administered to district and campus personnel to collect information from educators about the testing accommodations provided to students taking the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS–Modified (TAKS–M), and Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) assessments. The educator response data were collected online. The survey was designed to gather information about educators' experiences with the implementation of testing accommodations. The results of the survey will serve as a means of evaluating the effectiveness and appropriateness of the accommodations used on state assessments and to plan for future training and policy decisions. For the complete results, please refer to the report, *Spring 2010 Survey on Testing Accommodations,* which follows this Executive Summary.

The testing accommodations survey was completed by 2,774 educators during the survey window from April 14, 2010 to May 26, 2010. These educators represented all 20 Education Service Center regions and 386 school districts in Texas. Most survey respondents were teachers (57%) and campus testing coordinators (20%). District testing coordinators (7%) comprised the next largest group of respondents. There were also a number of survey respondents who listed other roles, such as administrators, counselors, specialists, and diagnosticians. In total, there were 33 educator roles represented among the survey respondents.

In general, educators responded positively to the survey questions regarding the adequacy of accommodations training. Educators stated the training they received was sufficient to prepare them to select accommodations for use on state assessments, use the state's Accommodation Request Form (ARF), administer state assessments to students using testing accommodations, and evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of accommodations for students. Educators also provided feedback regarding how and when they determine whether an accommodation is effective for a student.

Specific key findings are listed below.

- The majority of educators (90%) indicated that the accommodations training they received was sufficient to prepare them to select accommodations for use on state assessments. Most educators indicated they received between one and two hours of training (32%) or more than two hours of training (51%).

- Educators were able to select the topics their accommodations training covered. The training topics educators selected most were how to administer specific types of accommodations (16%), how to determine which accommodations used during instruction are appropriate for state assessments (15%), and accommodations that require approval from the state through the submission of an Accommodations Request Form (14%).

- Fifty-six percent of educators responded that the training they received was sufficient to prepare them to use the state's Accommodations Request Form.

- Eighty-six percent of educators responded that the training they received was sufficient to prepare them to administer state assessments to students using testing accommodations

- Sixty-six percent of educators responded that the training they received was sufficient to prepare them to evaluate how appropriate and effective accommodations are for students.

- Most educators reported using materials produced by the state to learn about the testing accommodations for state assessments. The 2009–2010 Accommodations Manual received 31% of the responses; TEA PowerPoint presentations received 24% of the responses; and the 2009–2010 District and Campus Coordinator Manual received 21% of the responses. Educators also stated that they used locally-developed materials or other state-developed materials as resource materials.

- Seventy-seven percent of educators stated that the information in the Accommodations Manual is clear and useful.

- Of the 25 accommodations listed on the survey, educators were asked to select which are currently used by students; they selected oral administration (13%) and small-group administration (12%) most often.

- When asked to choose among several considerations regarding how educators select appropriate testing accommodations for state assessments, most educators indicated they select appropriate accommodations based on how a student performs on classroom assignments and assessments with and without the accommodation (18%), information from classroom assignments and assessments (17%), and observational notes from teachers involved in the student's education (17%).

- Most educators (83%) surveyed indicated they did not submit an Accommodations Request Form to the state. Of those educators who have submitted the form, the majority of the educators (77%) stated that the reasons provided by the state for the approval or denial of the requested accommodation(s) were clearly communicated.

- Seventy-six percent of educators stated that there are accommodations students use in the classroom that should be allowed on state assessments. Educators listed accommodations such as allowing teachers the ability to redirect students during the assessment, using music during the assessment, and allowing teachers to clarify questions or vocabulary for a student during the assessment.

- The majority of educators (88%) indicated that the accommodations students used on state assessments were administered in the same or a similar manner as the student would use the accommodation in the classroom.

- Obtaining an adequate number of test administrators or testing rooms (31%) and preparing test administrations for students with various accommodations (28%) were listed as the two most significant challenges educators face when administering state assessments to students using accommodations.

- Ninety percent of educators stated that students who received accommodations on the day of testing used the accommodations appropriately.

- Educators were asked to select several criteria they use to determine if an accommodation is effective. Four criteria were selected most often. Nineteen percent of educators determined that an accommodation was effective if the student indicated it was helpful; 15% determined that an accommodation was effective if it was useful in helping the student generalize the skill; 14% determined

that an accommodation was effective if the student was able to meet the standard when using the accommodation, and 13% determined that an accommodation was effective if the student showed improvement in understanding a skill when the accommodation was used.

- Fifty-three percent of educators stated they evaluate the effectiveness of testing accommodations throughout the school year, while 16% of educators stated they evaluate effectiveness at committee meetings (e.g., ARD, 504, LPAC).

- When asked how they would evaluate the effectiveness of testing accommodations, educators responded in two ways. Eight hundred forty-four respondents (60%) provided responses describing the effectiveness of the accommodations, while 392 respondents (28%) provided responses regarding how to evaluate the effectiveness of accommodations.

    - Of the 844 respondents, 81% described the use of accommodations as highly effective or effective.
    - Of the 392 respondents, 49% stated they would evaluate the effectiveness of accommodations using test results, while 26% stated they would evaluate the effectiveness of accommodations based on student performance with and without the use of accommodations.

Spring 2010 Survey on Testing Accommodations

Thank you for taking the time to complete this voluntary survey, which is designed for district and campus personnel responsible for overseeing the implementation of testing accommodations for students taking the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), TAKS (Accommodated), TAKS–Modified (TAKS–M), and Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) assessments. The information you provide will assist the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in evaluating the effectiveness and appropriateness of accommodations used on state assessments to plan for future training and policy decisions. Responses to this survey should be submitted electronically by May 26, 2010.

This survey is divided into the following sections: General Information, Accommodations Training, and Selecting Accommodations for Use on State Assessments, Administering Accommodations on State Assessments, and Evaluating the Effectiveness and Appropriateness of Accommodations.

Please answer all survey questions relevant to your role(s) in implementing accommodations on state assessments.

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Please select the role(s) that best describe(s) you. Check all that apply.

Response Options	N	%
District testing coordinator or special education coordinator	212	7.4
Campus testing coordinator or special education coordinator	585	20.3
Teacher	1644	57.1
Other	438	15.2

Notes: "N" represents the number of responses for each response option. The number of responses exceeds the total number of respondents because survey respondents were asked to select all that apply.

Other

There were 438 responses for "Other". There were 80 responses (18%) for the role of Administration, 60 responses for the role of Counselor (14%), 59 responses for the role of Specialist (13%), and 44 responses for the role of Diagnostician (10%). Survey respondents listed other roles as well. The complete list of educator roles is provided below.

Educator Roles	N	%
Administration	80	18.26%
Counselor	60	13.70%
Specialist	59	13.47%
Diagnostician	44	10.05%

Special Education Teacher	39	8.90%
Aide/Para-professional	38	8.68%
Testing Coordinator	17	3.88%
ARD Facilitator	14	3.20%
General Education Teacher	14	3.20%
Librarian	12	2.74%
Special Education Director	11	2.51%
Speech Language Pathologist	10	2.28%
ESL Teacher	7	1.60%
Monitor	6	1.37%
Licensed Specialist in School Psychology	5	1.14%
Academic Specialist	3	0.68%
Bilingual Coordinator	2	0.46%
Bilingual Interventionist	2	0.46%
Bilingual Special Areas Teacher	2	0.46%
Program Director	2	0.46%
School Nurse	2	0.46%
Bilingual Skills Teacher	1	0.23%
Bilingual Support Staff	1	0.23%
Parent Facilitator	1	0.23%
Peer Facilitator	1	0.23%
Region Service Center	1	0.23%
Special Education Coordinator	1	0.23%
Technology Teacher	1	0.23%
TELPAS	1	0.23%
Tutor	1	0.23%

SECTION II: ACCOMMODATIONS TRAINING

2. Did you receive training about testing accommodations for the state assessments?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	2477	89.8
No	280	10.2

Notes: No Response=17. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

3. How many hours of training did you receive about testing accommodations for state assessments?

Response Options	N	%
1 hour or less	460	18.0
Between 1 and 2 hours	804	31.6
More than 2 hours	1287	50.5

Notes: No Response=223. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

4. What specific topics did the accommodations training cover? Check all that apply.

Response Options	N	%
How to determine which accommodations used during instruction are appropriate for state assessments	1933	15.2
Accommodations that are allowed per local determination	1665	13.0
Accommodations that require approval from TEA through the submission of an Accommodation Request Form (ARF)	1750	13.7
How to complete an ARF that clearly indicates why the student needs the accommodation	1175	9.2
How to administer specific types of accommodations (e.g., oral administration, dyslexia bundled accommodations)	2010	15.8
How to document accommodation use in the appropriate student paperwork (e.g., IEP, IAP)	1522	11.9
How to document accommodation use on the answer document	1652	12.9
How to evaluate the effectiveness of accommodations throughout the year and from year to year	987	7.7
Other	65	0.5

Notes: "N" represents the number of responses for each response option. The number of responses exceeds the total number of respondents because survey respondents were asked to select all that apply.

Other

There were 65 responses for "Other". Twenty-one responses (32%) indicated that test administration procedures were covered in the accommodations training. Eight (12%) responses indicated that the accommodations manual and determining appropriate accommodations were covered in the accommodations training. Additional training topics were provided and are listed in the table below.

Training Topics	N	%
Test Administration Procedures	21	32.3%
Accommodations Manual	8	12.3%
Determining Appropriate Accommodations	8	12.3%
No specific topic provided	8	12.3%
Oral Administration	3	4.6%
Determining Accommodations	2	3.1%
Supplemental Aids	2	3.1%
ARF	1	1.5%

Sign Language	1	1.5%
Testing Procedures	1	1.5%
N/A	10	15.4%

5. Was the training you received sufficient to prepare you to:

A. Select accommodations for use on state assessments?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	2013	89.6
No	91	6.4
Not Applicable To My Role	367	4.0

Notes: No Response=251. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

If no, please explain:

There were 91 responses which indicated why educators selected "No". Eighteen respondents (20%) stated that they do not select accommodations or they are still unclear on which accommodations are allowable and which to choose. Sixteen respondents (18%) indicated that more training is needed and 11 respondents (12%) indicated that they trained themselves by studying the TEA manuals. Additional explanations were provided and are listed in the table below.

Explanations	N	%
Educator does not select accommodations	18	19.8%
Educator is still unclear on which accommodations are allowable or which to choose	18	19.8%
More thorough training needed	16	17.6%
Trained by studying the TEA manuals	11	12.1%
Educator would like to see more examples of approved accommodations	9	9.9%
More training on oral administration	2	2.2%
Training was not timely enough to be useful in this school year	2	2.2%
The accommodations manual is not clear	2	2.2%
Training is insufficient without the manuals	2	2.2%
ARF process training	1	1.1%
Training needs to provide more details on the changes from year to year	1	1.1%
Training was inadequate	1	1.1%
N/A	8	8.8%

B. Use the state's Accommodation Request Form?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	1285	55.9
No	128	5.6
Not Applicable To My Role	885	38.5

Notes: No Response=250. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

If no, please explain:

There were 128 responses which indicated why educators selected "No". Fifty-one respondents (40%) explained that they were not responsible for filling out the ARF. Twenty-five respondents (20%) stated that they did not receive training specific to the ARF, and sixteen respondents (13%) indicated that they did not have to fill out an ARF because none of their students required a form. Additional explanations were provided and are listed in the table below.

Explanations	N	%
Educator was not responsible for filling out the ARF	51	39.8%
Educator did not receive training specific to the ARF	25	19.5%
Did not have to fill out ARF, no student required the form	16	12.5%
Educator received brief training and had to look up additional directions	8	6.3%
Educator still unclear on what to write on ARF for TEA approval	3	2.3%
Little time was spent in modeling how to complete the ARF effectively	3	2.3%
Educator sought and received further training	2	1.6%
Educator wants more examples of approved ARF	2	1.6%
Educator felt more time for individual instruction was needed	1	0.8%
Educator felt the requirements of the form were too stringent	1	0.8%
Educator suggested that training included yearly updates	1	0.8%
Educator supplemented training with manuals	1	0.8%
Inconsistent on filling out the ARF	1	0.8%
N/A	13	10.2%

C. Administer state assessments to students using testing accommodations?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	2120	85.6
No	47	1.9
Not Applicable To My Role	311	12.6

Notes: No Response=254. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

If no, please explain:

There were 47 responses indicating why educators selected "No". Seventeen respondents (36%) explained that they did not have to administer the test; seven (15%) respondents stated that the training combined with the manual/individual research was necessary for sufficient preparation; and four respondents (9%) indicated that they did not receive any training. Additional explanations were provided and are listed in the table below.

Explanations	N	%
Educator did not have to administer the test	17	36.2%
Training combined with the manual/individual research was necessary for sufficient preparation	7	14.9%
No training was received	4	8.5%
More specific training for oral accommodations needed	3	6.4%
More thorough training is needed	3	6.4%
Training for small group administration was insufficient	3	6.4%
Educator suggests module demonstrations for testing accommodations	2	4.3%
More specific training for Braille accommodations needed	1	2.1%
Training for specific accommodations was not provided	1	2.1%
N/A	6	12.8%

D. Evaluate how appropriate and effective accommodations are for students?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	1508	65.8
No	123	5.4
Not Applicable To My Role	662	28.9

Notes: No Response=251. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

If no, please explain:

There were 123 responses which indicated why educators selected "No". Forty-three respondents (35%) stated that they did not receive training for this specific topic. Sixteen (13%) respondents stated that they are not responsible for an evaluation. Thirteen respondents (11%) felt that more thorough training is needed. Additional explanations were provided by educators and are listed in the table below.

Explanations	N	%
Educator did not receive training for this topic	43	35.0%
Educator is not responsible for evaluation	16	13.0%
More thorough training is needed	13	10.6%
Current evaluation is not possible due to unavailable test results	4	3.3%
Educator is not involved in classroom instruction or grade progress in order to make evaluation	3	2.4%
Educator is still unclear which accommodations are appropriate making evaluation difficult	3	2.4%
Educator did not administer an accommodations test	2	1.6%
Educator feels no training is needed	2	1.6%
Educator read the manuals	2	1.6%
Educator did not evaluate the appropriateness/effectives of the accommodations	1	0.8%
Educator does not see any scores so cannot evaluate accommodations	1	0.8%
Educator feels yearly updates would be beneficial	1	0.8%
Training was too late for school year	1	0.8%
N/A	31	25.2%

6. Which of the materials listed below have you used either in training or on your own to learn about the testing accommodations for state assessments? Check all that apply.

Response Options	N	%
2009-2010 Accommodations Manual	2092	31.3
2009-2010 District and Campus Coordinator Manual	1419	21.2
2009-2010 Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Manual	1062	15.9
TEA PowerPoint presentations	1630	24.4
Other	236	3.5
I have not used any materials regarding testing accommodations for state assessments	244	3.7

Notes: "N" represents the number of responses for each response option. The number of responses exceeds the total number of respondents because survey respondents were asked to select all that apply.

Other

There were 236 responses for "Other". Sixty-six responses (28%) indicated that educators have used local or district resources as resource materials. Fifty responses (21%) indicated that educators have used TEA student assessment division manuals or district or locally-developed PowerPoint presentations as resource materials. Forty-one responses (17%) indicated that a TEA resource other that the manual was used. Additional resource materials were provided and are listed in the table below.

Resource Materials	N	%
Local or district resources	66	28.0%
District or locally developed PowerPoint presentation	50	21.2%
TEA student assessment division manuals	50	21.2%
TEA resources other than the manual	41	17.4%
Online training	10	4.2%
Regional ESC resources	9	3.8%
TEA resources/ ESC resources	1	0.4%
N/A	9	3.8%

7. Is the information in the Accommodations Manual clear and useful?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	2106	77.1
No	123	4.5
I did not use this manual	504	18.4

Notes: No Response=46. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

If no, please make suggestions for improvement:

There were 123 responses which indicated why educators selected "No". Twenty-nine respondents (24%) suggested that the information needed more clarification. Fifteen (12%) respondents suggested that more examples and test administration training would be useful, while fourteen respondents (11%) stated that supplemental aids training would be useful. Additional suggestions were provided by educators and are listed in the table below.

Suggestions for Improvement	N	%
Clarify	29	23.6%
Examples	15	12.2%
Test administration training	15	12.2%
Supplemental aids training	14	11.4%
Determining appropriate accommodations	11	8.9%

Streamline	9	7.3%
Index	7	5.7%
General improvement	4	3.3%
Contradictions	3	2.4%
Documenting accommodations	3	2.4%
Format	1	0.8%
Identify changes	1	0.8%
N/A	11	8.9%

SECTION III: SELECTING ACCOMMODATIONS FOR USE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS

8. Only answer this question if you administered a state assessment. What accommodation(s) were used by students during a state assessment that you administered? Check all that apply.

Response Options	N	%
Large Print	252	2.2
Braille	20	0.2
Magnifying/low-vision device	63	0.6
Colored Overlays	386	3.4
Photocopy of Test	16	0.1
Place Marker	362	3.2
Read test aloud to self	502	4.5
Oral administration (math, science, social studies)	1406	12.5
Test administrator reading aloud test questions for TAKS–M reading	917	8.2
Dyslexia bundle	638	5.7
Signed/translated directions	43	0.4
Amplification device	92	0.8
Test administrator manipulating test materials for student	48	0.4
Other method of response	159	1.4
Spelling assistance	131	1.2
Calculation device	526	4.7
Supplemental aids	766	6.8

Manipulatives	365	3.2
Blank graphic organizers	408	3.6
Minimized distractions	521	4.6
Individual administration	722	6.4
Small-group administration	1292	11.5
Extended time	272	2.4
Multiple/frequent breaks	766	6.8
Visual/verbal/tactile reminders to stay on task	500	4.4
Other	75	0.7

Notes: "N" represents the number of responses for each response option. The number of responses exceeds the total number of respondents because survey respondents were asked to select all that apply.

Other:

There were 75 responses provided for "Other". The accommodations provided are listed in the table below.

Accommodations	N	%
Dictionary	3	4.0%
Highlighters	1	1.3%
N/A to my job	71	94.7%

9. How do you select the most appropriate testing accommodations for each student taking a state assessment? Check all that apply.

Response Options	N	%
Based on comments and suggestions from students and/or parents	1032	12.3
Based on observational notes from teachers involved in child's education	1439	17.2
Based on information from classroom assessments and assignments	1447	17.3
Based on information from district assessments	1153	13.8
Based on how student performs on assignments and classroom assessments with and without the use of the accommodation	1463	17.5
Based on state assessment scores	780	9.3
I do not select accommodations for individual students.	894	10.7
Other	159	2.1

Notes: "N" represents the number of responses for each response option. The number of responses exceeds the total number of respondents because survey respondents were asked to select all that apply.

Other:

There were 159 responses for "Other". There were 135 responses (85%) for a committee (ARD, 504, LPAC), and 24 responses (15%) which were not applicable to the topic.

10. How did you submit accommodation requests to TEA? Check all that apply.

Response Options	N	%
I used the online Accommodation Request Form.	325	12.5
I faxed the paper Accommodation Request Form.	88	3.4
I sent paper requests via e-mail.	17	0.7
I sent paper requests via U.S. mail.	10	0.4
I did not submit any accommodation requests.	2165	83.1

Notes: "N" represents the number of responses for each response option. The number of responses exceeds the total number of respondents because survey respondents were asked to select all that apply.

11. If you have participated in the accommodation request process, were the reasons provided by TEA for the approval/denial of the requested accommodation(s) clearly communicated?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	798	77.3
No	235	22.8

Notes: No Response=1741. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

If no, please make suggestions for improvement:

Of the 235 educators eligible to respond, 112 submitted suggestions. Ten respondents (9%) suggested that TEA make clearer what information is needed for the approval/denial of requested accommodations. Six respondents (5%) stated that their request was approved/denied, but TEA didn't provide any reasons, and one respondent (1%) stated that examples should have been provided. Ninety-five respondents (85%) provided responses which were not applicable to the topic.

12. Are there any accommodations used in classroom instruction that you think should be allowed on a state assessment?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	519	75.8
No	1622	24.2

Notes: No Response=633. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

If yes, please explain:

Of the 519 educators eligible to respond, 500 submitted responses. Educators suggested various accommodations students should be allowed to use on state assessments. The complete list of accommodations is provided in the table below.

Accommodations	N	%
Calculators	39	7.6%
Oral administration for all/entire assessments	39	7.6%
Oral administration for all/entire assessments & supplemental aids	32	6.2%
Math supplemental aids	30	5.8%
Dictionary/Glossary	29	5.7%
Two-day testing	25	4.9%
Ability to specifically redirect students during assessment	20	3.9%
Writing bundle for dyslexic students	19	3.7%
Any accommodation the student regularly uses	16	3.1%
Teacher clarification of questions/vocabulary	12	2.3%
Simplified test	11	2.1%
Visual aids	11	2.1%
Music	10	1.9%
Voice-feedback device (i.e. PVC phone)	10	1.9%
Highlighters, colored pencils, sticky notes, tabs	9	1.8%
Dyslexia bundle in upper grades	8	1.6%
Bilingual dictionary	7	1.4%
Math manipulatives	7	1.4%
Reading assistance for all students who ask	7	1.4%
Student journals	7	1.4%
Interval testing	6	1.2%
Larger print	6	1.2%
Spelling/Grammar aids	6	1.2%
Supplemental aids	5	1.0%

Answer questions for each passage before paired questions	4	0.8%
Color overlays	4	0.8%
Dyslexia accommodations for TELPAS	4	0.8%
Shorter test	4	0.8%
Typing responses	4	0.8%
Blank paper	3	0.6%
Familiar teacher	3	0.6%
Fewer answer choices	3	0.6%
Isolated testing environment	3	0.6%
Manipulatives	3	0.6%
Mnemonic devices	3	0.6%
Labeled graphic organizer	2	0.4%
Online testing	2	0.4%
Patty paper sheets	2	0.4%
Prediction software	2	0.4%
Blank foldables	1	0.2%
Document camera	1	0.2%
Electronic translator	1	0.2%
ESL language clarification	1	0.2%
Graph paper	1	0.2%
Math supplemental aids in Word format	1	0.2%
Notes	1	0.2%
Other methods of response	1	0.2%
Reading names to all	1	0.2%
Retesting	1	0.2%
Ruler	1	0.2%
Scribe	1	0.2%
Scribe interpretation of spelling/grammar and written composition	1	0.2%
Scribe for students with dyslexia	1	0.2%
Simplified Vocabulary	1	0.2%
Spanish version of TAKS-M	1	0.2%
Stress ball	1	0.2%
Standing while testing	1	0.2%
TAKS bundle for Math	1	0.2%
Thesaurus	1	0.2%
N/A	76	14.8%

Note: Total number of responses exceeds total number of "Yes" respondents because several respondents provided multiple suggestions.

SECTION IV: ADMINISTERING ACCOMMODATIONS ON STATE ASSESSMENTS

13. Were the accommodations students used on the state assessment administered in the same/similar way they are used by students in the classroom?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	2193	87.7
Sometimes	255	10.2
No	52	2.1

Notes: No Response=281. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

If sometimes or no, please explain:
Of the 307 educators eligible to respond, 128 submitted explanations. Seventy-six respondents (59%) stated that the accommodations were not consistent with those used in the classroom, while nine respondents (7%) stated that they didn't know if the accommodations were administered the same way. Three respondents (2%) cited insufficient staff, and two respondents (2%) stated that the accommodations on the state assessments were not routinely used. Additional explanations were provided and are listed in the table below.

Explanations	N	%
Not consistent	76	59.4%
Don't know	9	7.0%
Insufficient staff	3	2.3%
Not routinely used	2	1.6%
Lack of teacher training	1	0.8%
Oral reading	1	0.8%
Students play with manipulatives	1	0.8%
N/A	35	27.3%

14. Of the following, which are the three most significant challenges you face when administering state assessments to students using accommodations? Check the three most significant challenges that apply.

Response Options	N	%
I did not know how to document the selection and use of the accommodation in the appropriate student paperwork.	92	3.3
Preparing test administrations for students who used various accommodations was time consuming.	773	28.0
I was not sure how to administer certain accommodations.	81	2.9
The student did not know how to use the accommodation.	151	5.5

The use of the accommodation disturbed other students who were testing.	196	7.1
There were not enough test administrators or testing rooms to administer the state assessment to students using various accommodations.	845	30.6
I did not know how to document the accommodation(s) on the answer document.	86	3.1
I did not know what to do with certain accommodations (e.g., supplemental aids, photocopies) when testing was completed (e.g., ship with non-scorable materials, destroy).	181	6.5
Other	360	13.0

Notes: "N" represents the number of responses for each response option. The number of responses exceeds the total number of respondents because survey respondents were asked to select all that apply.

Other:

Of the 360 respondents who selected "Other", 422 responses were provided regarding the most significant challenges when administering state assessments using accommodations. One hundred sixty-one educators (38%) stated that there were no challenges when administering state assessments using accommodations, while 30 respondents (7%) listed identification and implementation of appropriate/allowable accommodations as a challenge. Twenty-nine respondents (7%) listed unused accommodations, and 21 respondents (5%) considered the oral administration procedures a challenge. Additional challenges were provided and are listed in the table below.

Challenges	N	%
No challenge	161	38.2%
Identification/implementation of appropriate/allowable accommodation(s)	30	7.1%
Unused accommodations	29	6.9%
Oral administration procedures	21	5.0%
Accommodations are distraction to students who have them	6	1.4%
Dyslexia bundled administration procedures	5	1.2%
Allowing teachers unfamiliar with a student to administer the test to the student	5	1.2%
Stress related to administration with accommodations	5	1.2%
Documentation is too complicated	3	0.7%
Last minute changes in accommodations for students	3	0.7%
After test procedures regarding supplemental materials	2	0.5%
Confusing administration directions/procedures	2	0.5%
Scribing procedures	2	0.5%
Students with pending record transfers	2	0.5%
Accommodation folders	1	0.2%
Accommodations not sent with student	1	0.2%
Complicated answer document	1	0.2%

Difficult to read answer choices on math test when they represented an object/line segment/pattern	1	0.2%
Directions do not mention accommodation material distribution	1	0.2%
Directions not correct for individual oral administration	1	0.2%
Lack of coordination between test administrators and special education staff	1	0.2%
Insufficient accommodations	1	0.2%
Ordering enough test booklets	1	0.2%
Organizing the individual supplemental aids	1	0.2%
Preparation of test facility	1	0.2%
Scribing difficulties related to Spanish language variations	1	0.2%
Students receiving accommodations dislike isolation	1	0.2%
Unbound material(s)	1	0.2%
N/A	132	31.3%

Note: Total number of responses exceeds total number of "Other" responses because some respondents provided more than one challenge.

SECTION V: EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND APPROPRIATENESS OF ACCOMMODATIONS

15. Only answer this question if you administered a state assessment. Did students who received accommodations on the day of the state assessment use them appropriately?

Response Options	N	%
Yes	1638	90.0
No	182	10.0

Notes: No Response=961. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

If no, please explain:

There were 182 responses which indicated why educators selected "No". Three educators (2%) stated that students did not use the accommodations appropriately because the accommodations were a distraction to the student during the test. Most educators indicated whether students used the accommodations on the state assessment. Seventy-six respondents (42%) indicated that students did not use the accommodations on the state assessment. Twenty-four respondents (13%) indicated that students rarely used the accommodations on the state assessment, and 33 respondents (18%) indicated that students intermittently used the accommodations on the state assessment. Additional explanations were provided and are listed in the table below.

Explanations	N	%
Students did not use the accommodations	76	41.8%
Students used the accommodations rarely	24	13.2%

Students used the accommodations intermittently	33	18.1%
Students used the accommodations often	4	2.2%
The accommodations were a distraction to the student during the test	3	1.7%
Student used the accommodations inappropriately	1	0.5%
Student did not receive the accommodation	1	0.5%
Do not know	27	14.8%
N/A	13	7.1%

16. What criteria do you use to determine if an accommodation is effective for a student? Check all that apply.

Response Options	N	%
The student may still not understand the skill but feels confident when provided the accommodation.	786	12.2
The student indicates the accommodation was helpful.	1215	18.9
The student may not be passing assignments and assessments but shows improvement in understanding the skill.	862	13.4
The student is able to generalize the skill to different settings and situations when using the accommodation.	939	14.6
The student is more independent because the accommodation is no longer needed or a less restrictive accommodation is needed.	630	9.8
The student meets the standard on a state assessment.	905	14.1
The student achieves commended performance on a state assessment.	264	4.1
This question is not applicable to my role.	751	11.7
Other	73	1.1

Notes: "N" represents the number of responses for each response option. The number of responses exceeds the total number of respondents because survey respondents were asked to select all that apply.

Other:

Of the 73 respondents selecting the "Other" response option, 87 responses were provided regarding the criteria used to determine effectiveness of an accommodation for a student. Eighteen responses (21%) indicated that they do not perform this task. Seventeen responses (20%) indicated that observations were the criteria used to determine effectiveness. Thirteen responses (15%) indicated a committee determines the criteria, and ten responses (12%) indicated that observations of students with and without use of

accommodations were the criteria used to determine whether an accommodation was effective. Additional criteria were provided and are listed in the table below.

Criteria	N	%
Educator does not perform this duty	18	20.7%
Observations	17	19.5%
Committee (ARD/504/LPAC)	13	14.9%
Observation with and without use of Accommodation	10	11.5%
Assessment results	3	3.4%
Student feedback	2	2.3%
N/A	24	27.6%

17. When do you evaluate the effectiveness of testing accommodations for your students?

Response Options	N	%
At the beginning of the school year	31	1.2
In the middle of the school year	26	1.0
At the end of the school year	23	0.9
Ongoing throughout the school year	1325	52.8
At committee meetings about the student (e.g., ARD, 504, LPAC)	405	16.1
Other	25	1.0
This question is not applicable to my role	676	26.9

Notes: No Response=272. "N" represents the number of responses for each response option.

Other:

There were 25 responses for "Other". Additional times when accommodations were evaluated for effectiveness were provided and are listed in the table below.

Times When Accommodations were Evaluated for Effectiveness	N	%
Benchmark	3	12.0%
Meetings (ARD, 504, LPAC)	2	8.0%
Not Evaluated	2	8.0%
Upon Test Completion	2	8.0%
Upon Test Results	1	4.0%

Upon Test Submission to District	1	4.0%
N/A	14	56.0%

18. At the district and campus level, how would you evaluate the effectiveness of testing accommodations used on state assessments?

Based on the responses, teachers answered this question in two ways:
1. Teachers addressed how he or she would evaluate the effectiveness of testing accommodations. These teachers' responses consisted of various methods they could use to measure the effectiveness of testing accommodations for their students.
2. Teachers addressed the quality of the effectiveness of testing accommodations. These teachers' responses consisted of a description of the effectiveness of the testing accommodations used on state assessments.

There were 1406 respondents to this question resulting in a total of 1408 responses.

- 172 (12% of total responses) replied "No Response or N/A"
- 392 (28% of total responses) provided responses on "how to evaluate the effectiveness of accommodations"
- 844 (60% of total responses) provided responses describing the "effectiveness of the accommodations"

Of the 392 responses on "how to evaluate the effectiveness of the accommodations", 191 respondents (49%) suggested they would evaluate the effectiveness of the accommodations using test results, 101 respondents (26%) stated they would evaluate the effectiveness of the accommodations based on student performance with or without the use of accommodations, and 35 respondents (9%) stated they would use benchmarks. Twenty-seven (7%) respondents stated they would evaluate the effectiveness of the accommodations by having meetings (ARD /504 /LPAC /KTI /Department), and 22 respondents (6%) stated they would use feedback from teachers, administrators and diagnosticians. Other evaluation methods listed include student feedback which had 8 responses (2%), evaluation through regular use of an accommodation with 4 responses (1%), and general feedback with 2 responses (1%). Two responses also stated that it was not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the testing accommodations used on state assessments.

Of the 844 responses describing the "effectiveness of the accommodations", 300 respondents (36%) described the effectiveness of the accommodations as highly effective, 380 respondents (45%) described the testing accommodations as effective, 132 respondents (16%) stated the accommodations were moderately effective, 11 respondents (1%) described the effectiveness as minimal, and 21 respondents (2%) stated the accommodations were not effective.

19. Please include any additional comments about testing accommodations for state assessments that were not addressed in this survey.

Three hundred fifty-nine respondents provided additional comments that were not addressed in the survey. Thirty-eight respondents (10.6%) stated they were pleased with the available accommodations, and 23 respondents (6.4%) wanted consistent and publicized accommodations statewide. Twenty-one respondents (5.8%) mentioned improvement of training, eleven respondents (3.1%) wanted clarification of guidelines for selecting, documenting, implementing an appropriate accommodation; and ten respondents (2.8%)

commented on having fewer accommodations. Seven respondents (1.9%) related the need for additional or different allowable accommodations, five respondents (1.4%) mentioned testing at functional-level and not grade level, and another five respondents (1.4%) suggested allowing oral administration to other students and or subjects. Earlier access to the accommodations manual and having a shorter test each had four responses (1.1%). Additionally, there were 73 comments summarized from one hundred three responses that could not be categorized. Individually, each comment accounted for less than 1% of responses, and the total of these uncategorized comments accounted for 28.7% of all responses. There were also 128 responses (36%) submitted which were not applicable to the topic.