

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

All Content Areas, All Grades
Sessions Held August 26-September 20, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards ¹ (N=256)	(n=1) Less than 1%	(n=12) 5%	(n=109) 43%	(n=133) 52%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors (N=256)		(n=10) 4%	(n=101) 40%	(n=142) 56%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test (N=256)	(n=1) Less than 1%	(n=3) 1%	(n=68) 27%	(n=184) 72%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise (N=256)	(n=1) Less than 1%	(n=12) 5%	(n=111) 44%	(n=131) 51%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1 (N=460)		(n=3) 1%	(n=169) 37%	(n=284) 62%
f. Group discussions following Round 1 (N=460)	(n=1) Less than 1%	(n=12) 3%	(n=145) 32%	(n=300) 66%
g. Discussions following Round 2 (N=460)	(n=1) Less than 1%	(n=21) 5%	(n=147) 32%	(n=290) 63%

¹ Note that not all panelists responded to all items and “skips” aren’t shown. Therefore the sum of the cell n’s may not equal the total N. In addition two types of evaluation forms were provided. Some panels set cut scores for two tests and some for only one test. An evaluation form was given to panelists after they completed the standard-setting process for their “first” test irrespective of whether they were judging a second test, and those panelists judging two tests were given a second evaluation form after completing the entire standard-setting process (and judging a second test as well). Some questions were common to both evaluation forms resulting in the higher N count shown for some items.

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category (N=256)	(n=2) 1%	(n=15) 6%	(n=120) 48%	(n=115) 46%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete (N=256)	(n=2) 1%	(n=16) 6%	(n=106) 42%	(n=131) 51%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1 (N=256)	(n=1) Less than 1%	(n=15) 6%	(n=104) 41%	(n=135) 53%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion) (N=460)		(n=10) 2%	(n=156) 34%	(n=292) 64%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3 (N=460)	(n=3) 1%	(n=18) 4%	(n=148) 32%	(n=291) 63%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion) (N=460)	(n=1) Less than 1%	(n=18) 4%	(n=156) 34%	(n=283) 62%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3 (N=255)	(n=4) 2%	(n=22) 9%	(n=71) 28%	(n=158) 62%
h. Your experience in making your recommendations for the <i>first</i> test ² (N=203)	(n=1) 1%	(n=6) 3%	(n=52) 26%	(n=144) 71%

²As noted in Footnote 1, panelists participated in two types of panels: 1) those that reviewed two tests, and 2) those that reviewed only one test. Panelists who participated in the first type of panel responded to two evaluation forms and were asked this question on the second evaluation form which they completed *after* recommending cut scores for both tests and completing the entire process.

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1 (N=256)	(n=1) Less than 1%	(n=12) 5%	(n=105) 41%	(n=137) 54%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1 (N=256)	(n=3) 1%	(n=16) 6%	(n=107) 42%	(n=128) 50%
c. Feedback provided between rounds (N=460)		(n=9) 4%	(n=120) 47%	(n=331) 72%
d. Facilities used for the sessions (N=256)	(n=1) Less than 1%	(n=7) 3%	(n=57) 22%	(n=191) 75%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings (N=460)		(n=2) Less than 1%	(n=107) 23%	(n=351) 76%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard (N=256)	(n=2) 1%	(n=27) 11%	(n=128) 50%	(n=98) 38%
b. Commended Performance (N=256)	(n=3) 1%	(n=14) 5%	(n=108) 42%	(n=129) 50%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=460	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
	(n=15) 3%	(n=213) 46%	(n=232) 50%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=460	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
	(n=46) 10%	(n=411) 90%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels (N=462)	(n=2) Less than 1%	(n=460) 100%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance (N=461)	(n=3) 1%	(n=458) 99%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards (N=463)	(n=7) 2%	(n=456) 98%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations (N=463)	(n=3) 1%	(n=460) 99%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views (N=463)	(n=10) 2%	(n=453) 98%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=460	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
	(n=2) Less than 1%	(n=10) 2%	(n=448) 97%

Some Comments from Panelists

- I learned a tremendous amount from this experience and hope I can be considered for other committee work.
- Thank you for the opportunity to serve on the science standard setting advisory panel. The discussions/meeting went great!
- This experience was very rewarding and I learned a lot on how standards are set for assessments. Great job!
- The process used is excellent and will hopefully yield good data for the decision making or recommendations that will be made to the SBOE. TEA is to be commended for using the national advisory group to help make these assessments of a high quality.
- Thank you for the opportunity to be part of this process.

- From being a part of this process I feel confident the recommendation made to the state board is fair to all students. The facilitator and facilities were excellent. Thank you for the opportunity to be a part of the process.
- TEKS-TAKS objectives should be literally examined before process begins (my opinion)
- I am very thankful to have been chosen to participate in this process. Thank you for all the support and time.
- Thank you for the opportunity to actively participate in the process.
- I am very honored to have been invited to be part of this standard setting committee. I feel it is vital to the accuracy of the testing to have input from the people that are “in the trenches” on a daily basis.
- Thanks for allowing me to participate in this process.
- Thank you for utilizing a process that involved a wide and diverse representation from across Texas. Thank you for seeking our input!
- I thought the bookmarking process was most helpful. I’d like to use this process in my district.
- Excellent facilitation of this process—serious of the task at hand was foremost in all entities’ minds – willingness to explain/backtrack in process when needed – all round excellent experience
- I was amazed at the diverse group of educators brought together. You did an amazing job of truly getting a “cross-section” of Texas!
- It was an eye opener – I would not have guessed this much time and effort went into standard setting.
- It is an honor and a privilege to serve on this Advisory Panel. THANK YOU!
- I felt the process was professionally presented, and every judge was treated with respect. Even though we all had differing opinion, in the end, we all wanted what was best for children.
- Being part of this panel broadens my views and confirms my believe that we should set our standards high and work-up to them.
- Very helpful training before we ever made any judgments. I thought 3 rounds were needed to be able to judge effectively. I was impressed by the training!

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

Mathematics

Sessions Held August 26-September 18, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards(N=76) ¹		(n=4) 5%	(n=22) 29%	(n=50) 66%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors (N=76)		(n=1) 1%	(n=28) 37%	(n=47) 62%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test (N=76)		(n=1) 1%	(n=25) 33%	(n=50) 66%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise (N=76)		(n=1) 1%	(n=29) 38%	(n=46) 61%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1 (N=150)	(n=1) 1%	(n=4) 3%	(n=43) 39%	(n=102) 68%
f. Group discussions following Round 1 (N=150)			(n=46) 31%	(n=103) 69%
g. Discussions following Round 2 (N=150)	(n=1) 1%	(n=5) 3%	(n=47) 32%	(n=96) 64%

¹ Note that not all panelists responded to all items and “skips” aren’t shown. Therefore the sum of the cell n’s may not equal the total N. In addition two types of evaluation forms were provided. Some panels set cut scores for two tests and some for only one test. An evaluation form was given to panelists after they completed the standard-setting process for their “first” test irrespective of whether they were judging a second test, and those panelists judging two tests were given a second evaluation form after completing the entire standard-setting process (and judging a second test as well). Some questions were common to both evaluation forms resulting in the higher N count shown for some items.

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category (N=76)	(n=2) 3%	(n=7) 9%	(n=34) 45%	(n=33) 43%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete (N=76)	(n=1) 1%	(n=6) 8%	(n=32) 43%	(n=36) 48%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1 (N=76)		(n=2) 3%	(n=24) 32%	(n=50) 66%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion) (N=150)		(n=2) 1%	(n=56) 37%	(n=92) 61%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3 (N=150)	(n=1) 1%	(n=6) 4%	(n=55) 36%	(n=88) 58%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion) (N=150)		(n=8) 5%	(n=51) 34%	(n=90) 60%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3 (N=76)	(n=1) 1%	(n=9) 12%	(n=22) 29%	(n=44) 58%
h. Your experience in making your recommendations for the <i>first</i> test ² (N=76)	(n=1) 1%	(n=3) 4%	(n=25) 34%	(n=45) 61%

² As noted in Footnote 1, panelists participated in two types of panels: 1) those that reviewed two tests, and 2) those that reviewed only one test. Panelists who participated in the first type of panel responded to two evaluation forms and were asked this question on the second evaluation form which they completed *after* recommending cut scores for both tests and completing the entire process.

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1 (N=76)		(n=1) 1%	(n=28) 37%	(n=47) 62%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1 (N=76)	(n=1) 1%	(n=5) 7%	(n=23) 30%	(n=47) 62%
c. Feedback provided between rounds (N=150)		(n=1) 1%	(n=32) 21%	(n=117) 78%
d. Facilities used for the sessions (N=76)		(n=2) 3%	(n=19) 25%	(n=55) 72%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings (N=150)		(n=1) 1%	(n=29) 19%	(n=120) 80%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard (N=76)	(n=2) 2%	(n=6) 9%	(n=45) 59%	(n=23) 30%
b. Commended Performance (N=76)	(n=1) 1%	(n=3) 4%	(n=34) 45%	(n=38) 50%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=150	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
	(n=6) 4%	(n=58) 39%	(n=86) 57%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=150	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
	(n=13) 9%	(n=137) 91%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

N=150	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels	(n=1) 1%	(n=149) 99%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance		(n=150) 100%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards	(n=2) 1%	(n=148) 99%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations	(n=1) 1%	(n=149) 99%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views	(n=4) 3%	(n=146) 97%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=150	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
	(n=1) .1%	(n=2) 1%	(n=147) 98%

Some Comments from Panelists

- I have a better understanding of what is going into the making of the TAKS.
- The integrity and standards of professionalism represented by the panelists were obviously very high.
- I feel that I am a fortunate person because I had an opportunity to take a part in the process.
- Even though we had differing opinions, we all wanted what was best for children.
- Being part of the panel broadens my views and confirms my belief that we should set our standards high.
- Thank you for the opportunity to be part of this process.
- Complex process but thoughtfully explained
- The well rounded representation of individual talents enabled me to make more effective judgments about the cut scores.
- The session was very well organized and facilitated. The process used kept the job from being overwhelming.

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

ELA/READING/WRITING
Sessions Held August 26-September 18, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards (N=106) ¹		(n=2) 2%	(n=49) 47%	(n=54) 51%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors (N=106)		(n=3) 3%	(n=36) 35%	(n=64) 62%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test (N=106)			(n=22) 21%	(n=84) 79%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise (N=106)	(n=1) 1%	(n=7) 7%	(n=43) 41%	(n=54) 51%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1 (N=195)		(n=2) 1%	(n=75) 39%	(n=116) 60%
f. Group discussions following Round 1 (N=195)		(n=6) 3%	(n=53) 27%	(n=135) 70%
g. Discussions following Round 2 (N=195)		(n=10) 5%	(n=60) 31%	(n=125) 64%

¹ Note that not all panelists responded to all items and “skips” aren’t shown. Therefore the sum of the cell n’s may not equal the total N. In addition two types of evaluation forms were provided. Some panels set cut scores for two tests and some for only one test. An evaluation form was given to panelists after they completed the standard-setting process for their “first” test irrespective of whether they were judging a second test, and those panelists judging two tests were given a second evaluation form after completing the entire standard-setting process (and judging a second test as well). Some questions were common to both evaluation forms resulting in the higher N count shown for some items.

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category (N=106)		(n=1) 1%	(n=50) 49%	(n=52) 51%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete (N=106)		(n=4) 4%	(n=46) 43%	(n=56) 53%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1 (N=106)		(n=7) 7%	(n=41) 39%	(n=57) 54%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion) (N=195)		(n=5) 3%	(n=56) 29%	(n=133) 69%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3 (N=195)		(n=5) 3%	(n=49) 25%	(n=140) 72%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion) (N=195)		(n=8) 4%	(n=56) 29%	(n=130) 67%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3 (N=106)	(n=2) 2%	(n=6) 6%	(n=23) 22%	(n=75) 71%
h. Your experience in making your recommendations for the <i>first</i> test ² (N=88)		(n=3) 3%	(n=16) 18%	(n=69) 78%

² As noted in Footnote 1, panelists participated in two types of panels: 1) those that reviewed two tests, and 2) those that reviewed only one test. Panelists who participated in the first type of panel responded to two evaluation forms and were asked this question on the second evaluation form which they completed *after* recommending cut scores for both tests and completing the entire process.

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1 (N=106)		(n=5) 5%	(n=42) 40%	(n=58) 54%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1 (N=106)	(n=1) 1%	(n=4) 4%	(n=48) 45%	(n=52) 49%
c. Feedback provided between rounds (N=195)		(n=5) 3%	(n=47) 24%	(n=143) 73%
d. Facilities used for the sessions (N=106)		(n=4) 4%	(n=19) 18%	(n=83) 78%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings (N=195)		(n=1) 1%	(n=43) 22%	(n=151) 77%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard (N=106)		(n=11) 10%	(n=52) 49%	(n=43) 41%
b. Commended Performance (N=106)	(n=1) 1%	(n=7) 7%	(n=45) 42%	(n=53) 50%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=195	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
	(n=7) 4%	(n=86) 44%	(n=102) 52%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=195	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
	(n=15) 8%	(n=177) 91%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

N=195	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels		(n=193) 100%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance	(n=1) 1%	(n=191) 99%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards	(n=4) 2%	(n=190) 98%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations	(n=2) 1%	(n=192) 99%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views	(n=2) 1%	(n=192) 99%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=195	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
		(n=6) 3%	(n=189) 97%

Some Comments from Panelists

I appreciated the opportunity to hear such diverse opinions. It added to the depth of discussion and resulted in a more thoughtful decision.

This process validates my confidence in our state assessments.

The responsibility of this task weighs on me, but the committee was heard and our reviews were respected.

The group's interaction and obvious respect for each other was very positive.

The diversity of the panel was beneficial. The facilitator was thoughtful and considerate as she guided us through the process.

This was an excellent experience. I feel that I have learned a tremendous amount about the testing process and standard setting.

I feel that we have all taken the time to carefully examine what is best for the students in Texas.

Serving on this panel was a valuable and rewarding experience.

It is reassuring to know how much time and consideration are taken with these tests.

I appreciate the fact that teachers, administrators, parents and community members were given the opportunity to provide input for this process.

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

Social Studies
Sessions Held August 26-30, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards (N=36) ¹		(n=1) 3%	(n=21) 58%	(n=14) 39%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors (N=36)		(n=1) 3%	(n=20) 56%	(n=15) 42%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test (N=36)	(n=1) 3%	(n=1) 3%	(n=9) 25%	(n=25) 69%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise (N=36)		(n=2) 6%	(n=19) 53%	(n=15) 42%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1 (N=57)			(n=21) 38%	(N=35) 63%
f. Group discussions following Round 1 (N=57)			(n=22) 39%	(n=35) 62%
g. Discussions following Round 2 (N=57)			(n=18) 32%	(n=39) 68%

¹ Note that not all panelists responded to all items and “skips” aren’t shown. Therefore the sum of the cell n’s may not equal the total N. In addition two types of evaluation forms were provided. Some panels set cut scores for two tests and some for only one test. An evaluation form was given to panelists after they completed the standard-setting process for their “first” test irrespective of whether they were judging a second test, and those panelists judging two tests were given a second evaluation form after completing the entire standard-setting process (and judging a second test as well). Some questions were common to both evaluation forms resulting in the higher N count shown for some items.

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category (N=37)		(n=4) 11%	(n=16) 46%	(n=15) 43%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete (N=36%)	(n=1) 3%		(n=14) 39%	(n=21) 58%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1 (N=36)		(n=3) 8%	(n=13) 36%	(n=20) 56%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion) (N=57)			(n=19) 33%	(n=38) 67%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3 (N=57)		(n=1) 2%	(n=19) 33%	(n=37) 65%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion) (N=57)			(n=22) 39%	(n=35) 61%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3 (N=36)		(n=1) 3%	(n=11) 31%	(n=24) 67%
h. Your experience in making your recommendations for the <i>first</i> test ² (N=21)			(n=3) 14%	(n=18) 86%

² As noted in Footnote 1, panelists participated in two types of panels: 1) those that reviewed two tests, and 2) those that reviewed only one test. Panelists who participated in the first type of panel responded to two evaluation forms and were asked this question on the second evaluation form which they completed *after* recommending cut scores for both tests and completing the entire process.

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1 (N=36)		(n=1) 3%	(n=19) 53%	(n=16) 44%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1 (N=36)		(n=4) 11%	(n=15) 42%	(n=17) 47%
c. Feedback provided between rounds (N=57)		(n=1) 2%	(n=18) 32%	(n=38) 66%
d. Facilities used for the sessions (N=38)	(n=1) 3%	(n=1) 3%	(n=9) 25%	(n=25) 69%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings (N=57)			(n=14) 25%	(n=43) 75%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard (N=36)		(n=3) 8%	(n=15) 42%	(n=17) 47%
b. Commended Performance (N=36)		(n=1) 3%	(n=13) 36%	(n=20) 55%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=57	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
		(n=31) 54%	(n=26) 46%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=57	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
	(n=9) 16%	(n=48) 84%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

N=57	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels	(n=1) 2%	(n=56) 98%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance		(n=57) 100%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards		(n=57) 100%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations		(n=57) 100%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views		(n=57) 100%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=57	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
			(n=57) 100%

Some Comments from Panelists

The representation of various districts from around the state was most helpful in focusing on all the student of Texas.

The facilitator did an excellent job. Overall, the process was very valuable.

I didn't realize there was so much involved in this process. The facilitator did an excellent job of making us feel our opinions were valuable.

The group discussions were very informational. There was a good cross section of the state represented.

I feel confident that the recommendation made to the state board is fair to all students. Thank you for the opportunity to be a part of the process.

I feel honored to have been asked to serve on this panel. I never dreamed that this process was so complicated.

It was a pleasure to serve on this panel.

There are so many variables involved in teaching. It was nice to be able to get together with teachers from across the state to discuss issues and concerns relating to the TAKS.

I have a better understanding of and appreciation for the testing system.

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

Science

Sessions Held September 16-20, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards ¹ (N=38)	(n=1) 3%	(n=5) 13%	(n=17) 45%	(n=15) 39%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors (N=38)		(n=5) 13%	(n=17) 45%	(n=16) 42%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test (N=38)		(n=1) 3%	(n=12) 32%	(n=25) 66%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise (N=38)		(n=2) 5%	(n=20) 53%	(n=16) 42%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1 (N=58)		(n=1) 2%	(n=27) 47%	(n=30) 52%
f. Group discussions following Round 1 (N=58)		(n=2) 4%	(n=27) 47%	(n=28) 49%
g. Discussions following Round 2 (N=58)		(n=6) 10%	(n=22) 38%	(n=30) 52%

¹ Note that not all panelists responded to all items and “skips” aren’t shown. Therefore the sum of the cell n’s may not equal the total N. In addition two types of evaluation forms were provided. Some panels set cut scores for two tests and some for only one test. An evaluation form was given to panelists after they completed the standard-setting process for their “first” test irrespective of whether they were judging a second test, and those panelists judging two tests were given a second evaluation form after completing the entire standard-setting process (and judging a second test as well). Some questions were common to both evaluation forms resulting in the higher N counts shown for some items.

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category (N=38)		(n=3) 8%	(n=20) 53%	(n=15) 40%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete (N=38)		(n=6) 16%	(n=14) 37%	(n=18) 47%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1 (N=38)	(n=1) 3%	(n=3) 8%	(n=26) 68%	(n=8) 21%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion) (N=58)		(n=3) 5%	(n=25) 44%	(n=29) 51%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3 (N=58)	(n=1) 2%	(n=5) 10%	(n=25) 43%	(n=26) 45%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion) (N=58)	(n=1) 2%	(n=2) 3%	(n=27) 47%	(n=28) 48%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3 (N=38)	(n=1) 3%	(n=6) 16%	(n=15) 41%	(n=15) 41%
h. Your experience in making your recommendations for the <i>first</i> test ² (N=20)			(n=8) 40%	(n=12) 60%

² As noted in Footnote 1, panelists participated in two types of panels: 1) those that reviewed two tests, and 2) those that reviewed only one test. Panelists who participated in the first type of panel responded to two evaluation forms and were asked this question on the second evaluation form which they completed *after* recommending cut scores for both tests and completing the entire process.

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1 (N=38)	(n=1) 3%	(n=5) 13%	(n=16) 42%	(n=16) 42%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1 (N=38)	(n=1) 3%	(n=3) 8%	(n=21) 55%	(n=12) 31%
c. Feedback provided between rounds (N=58)		(n=2) 3%	(n=23) 40%	(n=33) 57%
d. Facilities used for the sessions (N=38)			(n=10) 26%	(n=28) 74%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings (N=58)			(n=21) 36%	(n=37) 64%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard (N=38)		(n=7) 18%	(n=16) 42%	(n=15) 40%
b. Commended Performance (N=38)	(n=1) 3%	(n=3) 8%	(n=16) 42%	(n=18) 47%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=58	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
	(n=2) 3%	(n=38) 66%	(n=18) 31%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=58	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
	(n=9) 16%	(n=49) 84%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

N=58	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels		(n=58) 100%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance	(n=1) 2%	(n=57) 98%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards	(n=1) 2%	(n=57) 98%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations		(n=58) 100%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views	(n=2) 3%	(n=56) 97%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=58	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
	(n=1) 2%	(n=2) 3%	(n=55) 95%

Some Comments from Panelists

I am proud to have been a part of this process. It is good to see how standardized testing is handled in my state.

Panel was culturally diverse and added very interesting viewpoints.

This experience was very rewarding and I learned a lot about how standards are set for assessments.

I didn't realize the preparation and discussion that took place to create the state goals, tests and standards.

The facilitator was very skilled. I appreciated the way she kept everything moving and made each person feel good when they commented.

This meeting was enlightening and a worthwhile event.

We did it! I'm looking forward to the challenge that lies ahead.

This process has been extremely interesting. I can begin to see the big picture of how tests are developed in Texas.

The facilitator did a great job at keeping us thinking toward the goal and allowing all members to contribute to the discussion.

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

Spanish—All Content Areas, All Grades
Sessions Held October 14-23, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards ¹ (N=78)		(n=11) 14%	(n=29) 27%	(n=38) 49%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors (N=78)		(n=2) 3%	(n=32) 41%	(n=44) 56%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test (N=78)	(n=1) 1%		(n=18) 23%	(n=59) 76%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise (N=78)		(n=4) 5%	(n=34) 44%	(n=40) 51%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1 (N=132)		(n=7) 5%	(n=37) 28%	(n=88) 67%
f. Group discussions following Round 1 (N=132)	(n=1) 1%	(n=8) 6%	(n=28) 21%	(n=95) 72%
g. Discussions following Round 2 (N=132)		(n=4) 3%	(n=30) 23%	(n=98) 74%

¹ Note that not all panelists responded to all items and “skips” aren’t shown. Therefore the sum of the cell n’s may not equal the total N. In addition two types of evaluation forms were provided. Some panels set cut scores for two tests and some for only one test. An evaluation form was given to panelists after they completed the standard-setting process for their “first” test irrespective of whether they were judging a second test, and those panelists judging two tests were given a second evaluation form after completing the entire standard-setting process (and judging a second test as well). Some questions were common to both evaluation forms resulting in the higher N count shown for some items.

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category (N=78)		(n=6) 8%	(n=28) 36%	(n=44) 56%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete (N=78)		(n=4) 5%	(n=20) 26%	(n=54) 69%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1 (N=78)	(n=3) 4%	(n=9) 12	(n=22) 28%	(n=44) 56%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion) (N=132)	(n=1) 1%	(n=9) 7%	(n=20) 15%	(n=102) 77%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3 (N=132)		(n=4) 3%	(n=27) 20%	(n=101) 77%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion) (N=132)		(n=6) 5%	(n=23) 18%	(n=102) 78%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3 (N=132)		(n=4) 3%	(n=27) 20%	(n=101) 77%
h. Your experience in making your recommendations for the <i>first</i> test ² (N=54)			(n=7) 13%	(n=47) 87%

²As noted in Footnote 1, panelists participated in two types of panels: 1) those that reviewed two tests, and 2) those that reviewed only one test. Panelists who participated in the first type of panel responded to two evaluation forms and were asked this question on the second evaluation form which they completed *after* recommending cut scores for both tests and completing the entire process.

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1 (N=78)	(n=1) 1%	(n=8) 10%	(n=128) 36%	(n=41) 53%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1 (N=78)	(n=) 3%	(n=7) 9%	(n=125) 32%	(n=44) 56%
c. Feedback provided between rounds (N=132)	(n=3) 2%	(n=3) 2%	(n=26) 20%	(n=99) 76%
d. Facilities used for the sessions (N=78)		(n=2) 3%	(n=17) 22%	(n=59) 76%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings (N=132)		(n=1) 1%	(n=24) 18%	(n=107) 81%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard (N=78)		(n=3) 4%	(n=33) 42%	(n=42) 54%
b. Commended Performance (N=78)		(n=2) 3%	(n=28) 36%	(n=48) 62%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=132	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
		(n=40) 31%	(n=91) 69%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=460	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
	(n=4) 3%	(n=128) 97%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

N=132	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels	(n=2) 2%	(n=130) 98%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance	(n=3) 2%	(n=129) 98%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards	(n=2) 2%	(n=130) 98%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations	(n=1) 1%	(n=131) 99%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views	(n=5) 4%	(n=127) 96%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=132	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
		(n=2) 2%	(n=130) 98%

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

Spanish Mathematics
Sessions Held October 16-18, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards (N=25) ¹		(n=1) 4%	(n=8) 32%	(n=16) 64%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors (N=25)			(n=7) 28%	(n=18) 72%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test (N=25)			(n=4) 16%	(n=21) 84%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise (N=25)		(n=1) 4%	(n=7) 28%	(n=17) 68%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1 (N=50)		(n=2) 4%	(n=11) 22%	(N=37) 74%
f. Group discussions following Round 1 (N=50)		(n=2) 4%	(n=7) 14%	(n=41) 82%
g. Discussions following Round 2 (N=50)			(n=11) 22%	(n=39) 78%

¹ Note that not all panelists responded to all items and "skips" aren't shown. Therefore the sum of the cell n's may not equal the total N. In addition two types of evaluation forms were provided. Some panels set cut scores for two tests and some for only one test. An evaluation form was given to panelists after they completed the standard-setting process for their "first" test irrespective of whether they were judging a second test, and those panelists judging two tests were given a second evaluation form after completing the entire standard-setting process (and judging a second test as well). Some questions were common to both evaluation forms resulting in the higher N count shown for some items.

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category (N=25)		(n=3) 12%	(n=4) 16%	(n=18) 72%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete (N=25)		(n=2) 8%	(n=2) 8%	(n=21) 84%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1 (N=25)	(n=2) 8%	(n=1) 4%	(n=3) 12%	(n=19) 76%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion) (N=50)		(n=3) 6%	(n=5) 10%	(n=42) 84%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3 (N=50)		(n=3) 6%	(n=10) 20%	(n=37) 74%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion) (N=50)		(n=1) 2%	(n=8) 16%	(n=40) 80%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3 (N=50)		(n=1) 4%	(n=11) 22%	(n=38) 76%
h. Your experience in making your recommendations for the <i>first</i> test ² (N=25)			(n=2) 8%	(n=23) 92%

² As noted in Footnote 1, panelists participated in two types of panels: 1) those that reviewed two tests, and 2) those that reviewed only one test. Panelists who participated in the first type of panel responded to two evaluation forms and were asked this question on the second evaluation form which they completed *after* recommending cut scores for both tests and completing the entire process.

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1 (N=25)			(n=5) 20%	(n=20) 80%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1 (N=25)			(n=6) 24%	(n=19) 76%
c. Feedback provided between rounds (N=50)		(n=1) 2%	(n=7) 14%	(n=42) 84%
d. Facilities used for the sessions (N=25)		(n=1) 4%	(n=6) 24%	(n=18) 72%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings (N=50)			(n=5) 10%	(n=45) 90%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard (N=25)		(n=1) 4%	(n=11) 44%	(n=13) 52%
b. Commended Performance (N=25)			(n=11) 44%	(n=14) 56%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=50	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
		(n=19) 39%	(n=30) 61%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=50	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
		(n=50) 100%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

N=50	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels		(n=50) 100%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance		(n=50) 100%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards		(n=50) 100%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations		(n=50) 100%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views		(n=50) 100%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=50	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
			(n=50) 100%

Some Comments from Panelists

The whole process was conducted at a most professional and objective manner. The pace helped to keep us on a reflective mind set and considering the implications of our ratings on all our Spanish test takers.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity for expressing our students' needs and abilities.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process and for the extent to which you/we strive to have the best accountability system possible.

Experience was enlightening. Process is interesting.

Just a note to say that I felt this has been an eye-opening experience that has added light to my lack of knowledge of the assessment processes. Thanks!

Very informative. I guess I always thought some bureaucrat in Austin arbitrarily set the standard at X (TLI) so that the current (or past) governor could look good! Perhaps that has been the method in the past! Thanks for the insight.

This was a very valuable experience and gave me an additional piece of the process.

Process & discussions were well moderated and informative. I would like to know that these results were used intelligently by the board.

Thanks for the opportunity. It was very informative and I enjoyed being part of the process.

This was a useful session as it helps to have judges from various grade levels give input. Thank you.

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

Spanish Reading
Sessions Held October 16-18, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards (N=27) ¹		(n=4) 15%	(n=15) 56%	(n=8) 30%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors (N=27)			(n=16) 59%	(n=11) 41%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test (N=27)			(n=4) 15%	(n=23) 85%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise (N=27)		(n=2) 7%	(n=13) 48%	(n=12) 44%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1 (N=56)		(n=2) 4%	(n=17) 30%	(N=37) 66%
f. Group discussions following Round 1 (N=56)	(n=1) 2%	(n=2) 4%	(n=15) 27%	(n=38) 68%
g. Discussions following Round 2 (N=56)		(n=3) 5%	(n=13) 23%	(n=40) 71%

¹ Note that not all panelists responded to all items and “skips” aren’t shown. Therefore the sum of the cell n’s may not equal the total N. In addition two types of evaluation forms were provided. Some panels set cut scores for two tests and some for only one test. An evaluation form was given to panelists after they completed the standard-setting process for their “first” test irrespective of whether they were judging a second test, and those panelists judging two tests were given a second evaluation form after completing the entire standard-setting process (and judging a second test as well). Some questions were common to both evaluation forms resulting in the higher N count shown for some items.

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category (N=27)		(n=2) 7%	(n=13) 48%	(n=12) 44%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete (N=27)		(n=1) 4%	(n=11) 41%	(n=15) 56%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1 (N=27)		(n=5) 19%	(n=8) 30%	(n=14) 52%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion) (N=56)	(n=1) 2%	(n=2) 4%	(n=10) 18%	(n=43) 77%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3 (N=56)			(n=8) 14%	(n=48) 86%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion) (N=56)		(n=4) 7%	(n=8) 14%	(n=44) 79%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3 (N=56)		(n=2) 4%	(n=10) 18%	(n=44) 79%
h. Your experience in making your recommendations for the <i>first</i> test ² (N=29)			(n=5) 17%	(n=24) 83%

² As noted in Footnote 1, panelists participated in two types of panels: 1) those that reviewed two tests, and 2) those that reviewed only one test. Panelists who participated in the first type of panel responded to two evaluation forms and were asked this question on the second evaluation form which they completed *after* recommending cut scores for both tests and completing the entire process.

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1 (N=27)		(n=4) 15%	(n=14) 52%	(n=9) 33%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1 (N=27)		(n=4) 15%	(n=11) 41%	(n=11) 41%
c. Feedback provided between rounds (N=56)	(n=1) 2%	(n=1) 2%	(n=11) 20%	(n=42) 76%
d. Facilities used for the sessions (N=27)		(n=1) 4%	(n=6) 22%	(n=20) 74%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings (N=56)			(n=15) 27%	(n=41) 73%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard (N=27)		(n=1) 4%	(n=14) 52%	(n=12) 44%
b. Commended Performance (N=27)		(n=1) 4%	(n=8) 30%	(n=18) 67%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=56	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
		(n=13) 23%	(n=43) 77%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=56	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
	(n=2) 4%	(n=54) 96%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

N=56	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels		(n=56) 100%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance	(n=1) 2%	(n=55) 98%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards	(n=1) 2%	(n=55) 98%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations		(n=56) 100%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views		(n=56) 100%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=50	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
		(n=1) 98%	(n=55) 98%

Some Comments from Panelists

This was a learning experience and it gave me the opportunity to see what it is happening statewide.

Very informative and worthwhile experience.

This was a wonderful experience for me. I am grateful to have been a part of this session. I now feel better informed about the process of setting standards.

This was a great session. We have come a long way.

Very good, detailed training.

I am very thankful to have been a part of this committee. I feel I am very well informed about the process and now understand it very well.

I really have enjoyed this experience and have learned a lot of what it takes to implement such an important test, which is a high-stakes test for many.

Excellent process. My experience, a gift. Better comprehension of the test concept.

Congratulations to the people who organized the panel. This kind of meeting help us tremendously in the understanding of how things are putting into place. ...as well get more educated about expectations and standards. Keep up the good work!

The process was new to me and I thoroughly enjoyed learning all about it and experiencing it. The hotel accommodations were excellent as well as the lunches. I loved meeting others from around the state and

listening to what expertise they brought to the table! Thank you for inviting me to come and take part in this very important process I feel honored to have been invited!

Grateful to have had the opportunity to serve on this committee. It definitely gives me the feeling that the state is listening to the outcries of the teachers. Thank you.

Great process! Thank you for facilitating it.

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

Spanish Writing
Session Held October 14-15, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

N=12	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards			(n=5) 42%	(n=7) 58%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors			(n=3) 25%	(n=9) 75%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test			(n=6) 50%	(n=5) 42%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise			(n=7) 58%	(n=5) 42%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1			(n=) 25%	(n=9) 75%
f. Group discussions following Round 1		(n=1) 8%	(n=2) 17%	(n=9) 75%
g. Discussions following Round 2		(n=1) 8%	(n=2) 17%	(n=8) 67%

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

N=12	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category			(n=4) 33%	(n=8) 67%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete			(n=3) 25%	(n=9) 75%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1			(n=5) 42%	(n=7) 58%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion)		(n=1) 8%	(n=2) 17%	(n=9) 75%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3		(n=1) 8%	(n=4) 33%	(n=7) 58%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion)		(n=1) 8%	(n=2) 17%	(n=9) 58%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3			(n=4) 33%	(n=8) 67%

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

N=12	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1			(n=5) 42%	(n=7) 58%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1			(n=3) 25%	(n=9) 75%
c. Feedback provided between rounds		(n=1) 8%	(n=2) 17%	(n=9) 75%
d. Facilities used for the sessions			(n=3) 25%	(n=9) 75%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings		(n=1) 8%	(n=1) 8%	(n=10) 83%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

N=12	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard)			(n=3) 25%	(n=9) 75%
b. Commended Performance			(n=5) 42%	(n=7) 58%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=12	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
		(n=2) 17%	(n=10) 83%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=12	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
		(n=12) 100%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

N=12	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels		(n=12) 100%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance		(n=12) 100%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards		(n=12) 100%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations		(n=12) 100%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views		(n=12) 100%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=14	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
			(n=12) 100%

Summary of Evaluation Form Information
TAKS Standard Setting Advisory Panel Meetings

Spanish Science
Session Held October 14-15, 2002

1. Check the column below that best reflects your opinion about the level of success of these various components of the sessions in which you have just participated. The activities should have helped you both understand the process and feel confident in the judgments you made:

N=14	Not Successful	Partially Successful	Successful	Very Successful
a. Introduction to the process of setting performance standards		(n=6) 43%	(n=1) 7%	(n=7) 50%
b. Discussion of the performance categories and descriptors		(n=2) 14%	(n=6) 43%	(n=6) 43%
c. Experiencing/Taking the actual TAKS test			(n=4) 29%	(n=10) 71%
d. Overview of the Item-Mapping Method and Practice Exercise		(n=1) 7%	(n=7) 50%	(n=6) 43%
e. Feedback on judges' ratings following Round 1		(n=3) 21%	(n=6) 43%	(n=5) 36%
f. Group discussions following Round 1		(n=3) 21%	(n=4) 29%	(n=7) 50%
g. Discussions following Round 2			(n=4) 29%	(n=10) 71%

2. How useful do you feel the following activities or information were in assisting you to make your recommendations?

N=14	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. State-provided descriptors for each performance category		(n=1) 7%	(n=7) 50%	(n=6) 43%
b. Group discussion of the descriptors to make them more concrete		(n=1) 7%	(n=4) 29%	(n=9) 64%
c. Information provided by the facilitator prior to Round 1	(n=1) 7%	(n=3) 21%	(n=6) 43%	(n=4) 29%
d. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 1 (both peer ratings and discussion)		(n=3) 21%	(n=3) 21%	(n=8) 57%
e. Student item-performance data provided for Rounds 2&3			(n=5) 36%	(n=9) 64%
f. Feedback provided concerning your panel's judgments after Round 2 (peer ratings and discussion)			(n=5) 36%	(n=9) 64%
g. Projected "state impact data" provided prior to Round 3		(n=1) 7%	(n=2) 14%	(n=11) 79%

3. How adequate were the following elements of the session?

N=14	Not Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Adequate	Very Adequate
a. Training provided prior to Round 1		(n=4) 29%	(n=4) 29%	(n=5) 36%
b. Amount of time spent training before Round 1	(n=1) 7%	(n=3) 21%	(n=5) 36%	(n=5) 36%
c. Feedback provided between rounds	(n=2) 14%		(n=6) 43%	(n=6) 43%
d. Facilities used for the sessions			(n=2) 14%	(n=12) 86%
e. Total amount of time for the ratings			(n=3) 21%	(n=11) 76%

4. In applying the standard-setting method, your panel was asked to recommend two cut scores for student performance on TAKS. How confident do you feel that the **descriptions of the categories** are reasonable for each student performance level?

N=14	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
a. Met the Performance Standard)		(n=1) 7%	(n=5) 36%	(n=8) 57%
b. Commended Performance		(n=1) 7%	(n=4) 29%	(n=9) 64%

5. How confident do you feel that your final, Round 3 judgments represent appropriate levels of student performance for the two cut scores?

N=14	Not Very Confident	Confident	Very Confident
		(n=6) 43%	(n=8) 57%

6. Do you think you would have benefited from an additional round of ratings or were three rounds sufficient?

N=14	Another round would have been helpful	Three rounds were sufficient
	(n=2) 14%	(n=12) 86%

7. Did you have adequate opportunities during the session to:

N=14	Not Adequate	Adequate
a. Express your professional opinions about student performance levels	(n=2) 14%	(n=12) 86%
b. Express your professional opinions about appropriate standards of student performance	(n=2) 14%	(n=12) 86%
c. Ask questions about the uses to be made of the standards	(n=1) 7%	(n=13) 93%
d. Ask questions about the process of making recommendations	(n=1) 7%	(n=13) 93%
e. Interact with your fellow judges on your views	(n=4) 29%	(n=10) 71%

8. Do you believe your opinions and judgments were treated with respect by your fellow judges and by the moderators?

N=14	No	I'm Not Sure	Yes
		(n=1) 7%	(n=13) 93%

Some Comments from Panelists

Difficult task. Thanx for inviting me. Standards should be the same for Reg. Ed & bil students.

Discussion & dialogue is paramount in decision making of standards.

This was well organized and I felt session objectives were met for both presenter/facilitator and participant.

Very powerful and enlighting process. Very difficult decisions were made that affect all our children.

I am glad to have been a part of this process.

I feel that after hearing the group's discussions, I may have set my standards high. But in my opinion the cut scores I have recommended make me feel the most confident.

Session provided much information. However, the task is difficult to do with many variables in this group (sp. pop.) of students.

At the beginning it was really difficult to understand the procedures and focus of the standard-setting. Some teachers were allowed to continue discussing topics not related to the standards. The last part of the 2nd day was very beneficial. Panelists were able to express really sincere experiences of testing. Thank s for the opportunity to participate.