
REPORT

**Alignment Analysis of Secondary
Language Arts Standards
and the SAT Reasoning Test**

Maine

Norman L. Webb

April 10, 2006

REPORT

Alignment Analysis of Secondary Language Arts Standards and the SAT Reasoning Test

Maine

Norman L. Webb

April 10, 2006

REPORT

Alignment Analysis of Secondary Language Arts Standards and the SAT Reasoning Test Maine

Norman L. Webb

April 10, 2006

This study is one of two alignment studies conducted for the State of Maine. An Alignment Analysis Institute was held December 8, 2005, in Madison, Wisconsin, to analyze the secondary language arts standards and the language arts SAT Reasoning Test. This study was done to provide an external analysis of a previous study conducted by the College Board, September, 2005. The report consists of a description of the four criteria used to judge the alignment between Maine Content Standards for language arts for high school and one form of the SAT Reasoning Test. This report includes tables listing the results of two reviewers' coding of the assessments and standards.

REPORT

Alignment Analysis of Secondary Language Arts Standards and the SAT Reasoning Test

Maine

Norman L. Webb

December 31, 2005

REPORT

Alignment Analysis of Secondary Language Arts Standards and the SAT Reasoning Test Maine

Norman L. Webb

December 31, 2005

This study is one of two alignment studies conducted for the State of Maine. An Alignment Analysis Institute was held December 8, 2005, in Madison, Wisconsin, to analyze the secondary language arts standards and the language arts SAT Reasoning Test. This study was done to provide an external analysis of a previous study conducted by the College Board, September, 2005. The report consists of a description of the four criteria used to judge the alignment between Maine Content Standards for language arts for high school and one form of the SAT Reasoning Test. This report includes tables listing the results of two reviewers' coding of the assessments and standards.

Acknowledgements

Reviewers:

John Fortier (Group Leader)	WI
Ellen Last	WI

The State of Maine funded this analysis. Horace (Brud) Maxcy and Valerie Seaberg, Coordinators of the Maine Educational Assessment, from the Maine Department of Education were the main contacts for the Department and oversaw the coordination of the study.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Introduction.....	1
Alignment Criteria Used for This Analysis	3
Categorical Concurrence.....	3
Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency.....	4
Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence.....	7
Balance of Representation	7
Source of Challenge.....	8
Findings.....	8
Standards.....	8
Alignment of Curriculum Standards and Assessments.....	10
Source of Challenge.....	15
Notes	15
General Comments made by Reviewers	15
Reliability Among Reviewers.....	17
Summary	17
References.....	18
Appendix A Group Consensus Values for Maine Language Arts Standards and Objectives	
Appendices B-J Tables	

Executive Summary

An alignment analysis was conducted on December 8, 2005, in Madison, Wisconsin, for the Maine Learning Results in Language Arts for high school and the SAT Reasoning Test. Two reviewers with extensive content expertise conducted the analysis. Results from this study are compared to a study conducted by the College Board of the same set of standards and the same test.

The Maine Learning Results and the SAT Reasoning Test for language arts were found to be partially aligned, with slight improvement needed to be fully aligned. The two reviewers judged that none of the 117 items on the SAT corresponded to the performance indicators under Standards C (Language and Images) and H (Research). For the other six standards, when the writing sample is given a value of 16 points, the SAT included an adequate number of items for each standard and an adequate proportion of items with an appropriate DOK level. For two of the six standards, the assessment was judged not to have a sufficient coverage of the performance indicators under the standard to meet an acceptable level on the Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence criterion. However, replacing or adding four of the items could readily resolve this alignment issue. For three of the six standards (Standards A, D, and G), one or two performance indicators were overemphasized compared to other performance indicators. This imbalance is not too critical when the range is appropriate, but one performance indicator for Standard A was clearly overemphasized, with only little or no attention given to the other performance indicators under that standard. The Learning Results and the SAT would be fully aligned by replacing or adding about 16 items—six items each to measure content related to Standards C and H and four items to increase the number of performance indicators under Standards A and B with at least one corresponding item.

The results of this analysis by two reviewers and the analysis conducted by the College Board reported in September 2005 were similar, but not identical. Both studies indicated that most standards had adequate coverage with appropriate DOK levels. However, there are some differences between the two analyses in the coding of items. The two Wisconsin reviewers used secondary hits judiciously, 150 hits for 117 items, whereas the reviewers for the College Board assigned secondary and tertiary hits to almost every item, 303 hits for 117 items. The College Board analysis found items that corresponded to Standard C (Language and Images), while the Wisconsin analysis did not. Also, the College Board analysis assigned about 32% of the hits to Standard B (Literature and Culture) whereas the Wisconsin analysis assigned only about 9% of the hits to this standard. There also were some differences in the assignment of items to performance indicators under a standard. For example, under Standard A the College Board study indicated that most of the items should be assigned to A.1, while the two Wisconsin reviewers indicated that most of the Standard A items should be assigned to A.6. These differences, however, do not have a great impact on the alignment findings. A full comparison of an item-by-item coding would require a more detailed analysis that is beyond the scope of this study.

Alignment Analysis of Secondary Language Arts Standards and the SAT Reasoning Test Maine

Norman L. Webb

Introduction

The alignment of expectations for student learning with assessments for measuring students' attainment of these expectations is an essential attribute for an effective standards-based education system. Alignment is defined as the degree to which expectations and assessments are in agreement and serve in conjunction with one another to guide an education system toward students learning what they are expected to know and do. As such, alignment is a quality of the relationship between expectations and assessments and not an attribute of any one of these two system components. Alignment describes the match between expectations and assessment that can be legitimately improved by changing either student expectations or the assessments. As a relationship between two or more system components, alignment is determined by using the multiple criteria described in detail in a National Institute for Science Education (NISE) research monograph, *Criteria for Alignment of Expectations and Assessments in Language Arts and Science Education* (Webb, 1997).

A one-day Alignment Analysis Institute was conducted December 8, 2005, in Madison, Wisconsin. Two language arts content experts who are experienced alignment reviewers and who have both been teachers as well as state department coordinators for implementing the language arts standards served as the reviewers. The Maine language arts standards for secondary education were compared to a released form of the SAT Reasoning Test. The same form of the assessment was used in this analysis as was used in a study conducted by the College Board, reported in September, 2005 (College Board, 2005).

For the purposes of this analysis, we have employed the convention of standards and objectives to describe two levels of expectations for what students are to know and do. Standard as used here refers to the Maine Learning Results secondary (grades 9–12) content standards. Each of the eight standards (A through H) is comprised of up to 12 performance indicators, or objectives. Standard F (English Conventions) was considered to have seven performance indicators or objectives. Standard F is divided into three performance indicators—F.1, F.2, and F.3. The first indicator, F.1, is further divided into five bullets. The College Board used the seven expectations (F.1.1, F.1.2, F.1.3, F.1.4, F.1.5, F.2, and F.3) all as objectives. This analysis used the same configuration. It is assumed that the performance indicators or objectives are intended to span the content of the standards under which they fall. The standards and objectives are reproduced in Appendix A.

The two reviewers were well familiar with the alignment coding process. They reviewed the procedures at the beginning of the analysis, but did not receive any formal training. The two reviewers did go over the definitions of the four depth-of-knowledge (DOK) levels. Then the reviewers participated in 1) a consensus process to determine the depth-of-knowledge levels of the Maine content objectives and 2) individual analyses of the items on the assessment.

To derive the results on the degree of agreement between the Maine language arts standards and the SAT, the reviewers' responses were averaged. Any variance among reviewers is considered legitimate, with the true depth-of-knowledge level for the item falling somewhere between two or more assigned values. Such variation could signify a lack of clarity in how the objectives were written, the robustness of an item that can legitimately correspond to more than one objective, and/or a depth of knowledge that falls in between two of the four defined levels. Reviewers were allowed to identify one assessment item as corresponding to up to three objectives—one primary hit (objective) and up to two secondary hits. Reviewers were instructed to use multiple hits for one item sparingly. Reviewers could only code one depth-of-knowledge level to each assessment item, even if the item corresponded to more than one objective. Finally, in addition to learning the process, reviewers were also asked to provide suggestions for improving it.

Reviewers were instructed to focus primarily on the alignment between the state standards and the SAT. However, they were encouraged to offer their opinions on the quality of the standards, or of the assessment activities/items, by writing a note about the item. Reviewers could also indicate whether there was a source-of-challenge issue with the item—i.e., a problem with the item that might cause the student who knows the material to give a wrong answer, or enable someone who does not have the knowledge being tested to answer the item correctly. For example, a language arts item that requires specialized knowledge from another area, such as science or mathematics, beyond that of reading comprehension, may represent a source-of-challenge issue because the skill required to answer the item is more than a reading skill. Reviewers only wrote a few notes and identified one or two source of challenge issues. In many cases, reviewers' notes and source-of-challenge comments referenced a difficulty in finding a precise match between an assessment item and a performance indicator.

The results produced from the institute pertain only to the issue of agreement between the Maine state standards and the SAT Reasoning Test. Note that this alignment analysis does not serve as verification of the general quality of the state's standards or the SAT. Rather, only the degree of alignment is discussed in this report. The averages of the reviewers' coding were used to determine whether the alignment criteria were met. When reviewers did vary in their judgments, the averages lessened the error that might result from any one reviewer's finding. Standard deviations are reported, which give one indication of the variance among reviewers.

To report on the results of an alignment study of Maine's Learning Results and the SAT, the study addressed specific criteria related to the content agreement between the state standards and grade-level assessments. Four alignment criteria received major

attention: categorical concurrence, depth-of-knowledge consistency, range-of-knowledge correspondence, and balance of representation.

Alignment Criteria Used for This Analysis

This analysis, which judged the alignment between standards and assessments on the basis of four criteria, also reported on the quality of items by identifying items with sources of challenge and other issues. For each alignment criterion, an acceptable level was defined by what would be required to assure that a student had met the standards.

Categorical Concurrence

An important aspect of alignment between standards and assessments is whether both address the same content categories. The categorical-concurrence criterion provides a very general indication of alignment if both documents incorporate the same content. The criterion of categorical concurrence between standards and assessment is met if the same or consistent categories of content appear in both documents. This criterion was judged by determining whether the assessment included items measuring content from each standard. The analysis assumed that the assessment had to have at least six items measuring content from a standard in order for an acceptable level of categorical concurrence to exist between the standard and the assessment. The number of items, six, is based on estimating the number of items that could produce a reasonably reliable subscale for estimating students' mastery of content on that subscale. Of course, many factors have to be considered in determining what a reasonable number is, including the reliability of the subscale, the mean score, and cutoff score for determining mastery. Using a procedure developed by Subkoviak (1988) and assuming that the cutoff score is the mean and that the reliability of one item is .1, it was estimated that six items would produce an agreement coefficient of at least .63. This indicates that about 63% of the group would be consistently classified as masters or nonmasters if two equivalent test administrations were employed. The agreement coefficient would increase if the cutoff score were increased to one standard deviation from the mean to .77 and, with a cutoff score of 1.5 standard deviations from the mean, to .88. Usually, states do not report student results by standards, or require students to achieve a specified cutoff score on subscales related to a standard. If a state did do this, then the state would seek a higher agreement coefficient than .63. Six items were assumed as a minimum for an assessment measuring content knowledge related to a standard and as a basis for making some decisions about students' knowledge of that standard. If the mean for six items is 3 and one standard deviation is one item, then a cutoff score set at 4 would produce an agreement coefficient of .77. Any fewer items with a mean of one-half of the items would require a cutoff that would only allow a student to miss one item. This would be a very stringent requirement, considering a reasonable standard error of measurement on the subscale.

Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency

Standards and assessments can be aligned not only on the category of content covered by each, but also on the basis of the complexity of knowledge required by each. *Depth-of-knowledge consistency between standards and assessment indicates alignment if what is elicited from students on the assessment is as demanding cognitively as what students are expected to know and do as stated in the standards.* For consistency to exist between the assessment and the standard, as judged in this analysis, at least 50% of the items corresponding to an objective had to be at or above the level of knowledge of the objective: 50%, a conservative cutoff point, is based on the assumption that a minimal passing score for any one standard of 50% or higher would require the student to successfully answer at least some items at or above the depth-of-knowledge level of the corresponding objectives. For example, assume an assessment included six items related to one standard and students were required to answer correctly four of those items to be judged proficient—i.e., 67% of the items. If three, 50%, of the six items were at or above the depth-of-knowledge level of the corresponding objectives, then to achieve a proficient score would require the student to answer correctly at least one item at or above the depth-of-knowledge level of one objective. Some leeway was used in the analysis on this criterion. If a standard had between 40% and 50% of items at or above the depth-of-knowledge levels of the objectives, then it was reported that the criterion was “weakly” met.

Interpreting and assigning depth-of-knowledge levels to standards and assessment items is an essential requirement of alignment analysis. The reading levels are based on Valencia and Wixson (2000, pp. 909–935). Marshá Horton, Sharon O’Neal, and Phoebe Winter developed the writing levels. The following definitions of depth-of-knowledge levels were used in this language arts analysis:

Reading

Reading Level 1. Level 1 requires students to receive or recite facts or to use simple skills or abilities. Oral reading that does not include analysis of the text, as well as basic comprehension of a text, is included. Items require only a shallow understanding of the text presented and often consist of verbatim recall from text, slight paraphrasing of specific details from the text, or simple understanding of a single word or phrase. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 1 performance are:

- Support ideas by reference to verbatim, or only slightly paraphrased, details from the text.
- Use a dictionary to find the meanings of words.
- Recognize figurative language in a reading passage.

Reading Level 2. Level 2 includes the engagement of some mental processing beyond recalling or reproducing a response; it requires both comprehension and subsequent processing of text or portions of text. Inter-sentence analysis of inference is required. Some important concepts are covered, but not in a complex way. Standards and

items at this level may include words such as summarize, interpret, infer, classify, organize, collect, display, compare, and determine whether fact or opinion. Literal main ideas are stressed. A Level 2 assessment item may require students to apply skills and concepts that are covered in Level 1. However, items require closer understanding of text, possibly through the item's paraphrasing of both the question and the answer. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 2 performance are:

- Use context cues to identify the meaning of unfamiliar words, phrases, and expressions that could otherwise have multiple meanings.
- Predict a logical outcome based on information in a reading selection.
- Identify and summarize the major events in a narrative.

Reading Level 3. Deep knowledge becomes a greater focus at Level 3. Students are encouraged to go beyond the text; however, they are still required to show understanding of the ideas in the text. Students may be encouraged to explain, generalize, or connect ideas. Standards and items at Level 3 involve reasoning and planning. Students must be able to support their thinking. Items may involve abstract theme identification, inference across an entire passage, or application of prior knowledge. Items may also involve more superficial connections between texts. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 3 performance are:

- Explain or recognize how an author's purpose affects the interpretation of a reading selection.
- Summarize information from multiple sources to address a specific topic.
- Analyze and describe the characteristics of various types of literature.

Reading Level 4. Higher-order thinking is central and knowledge is deep at Level 4. The standard or assessment item at this level will probably be an extended activity, with extended time provided for completing it. The extended time period is not a distinguishing factor if the required work is only repetitive and does not require the application of significant conceptual understanding and higher-order thinking. Students take information from at least one passage of a text and are asked to apply this information to a new task. They may also be asked to develop hypotheses and perform complex analyses of the connections among texts. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 4 performance are:

- Analyze and synthesize information from multiple sources.
- Examine and explain alternative perspectives across a variety of sources.
- Describe and illustrate how common themes are found across texts from different cultures.

Writing

Writing Level 1. Level 1 requires the student to write or recite simple facts. The focus of this writing or recitation is not on complex synthesis or analysis, but on basic ideas. The students are asked to list ideas or words, as in a brainstorming activity, prior to

written composition; are engaged in a simple spelling or vocabulary assessment; or are asked to write simple sentences. Students are expected to write, speak, and edit using the conventions of Standard English. This includes using appropriate grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. Students demonstrate a basic understanding and appropriate use of such reference materials as a dictionary, thesaurus, or Web site. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 1 performance are:

- Use punctuation marks correctly.
- Identify Standard English grammatical structures, including the correct use of verb tenses.

Writing Level 2. Level 2 requires some mental processing. At this level, students are engaged in first-draft writing, or in brief extemporaneous speaking for a limited number of purposes and audiences. Students are expected to begin connecting ideas, using a simple organizational structure. For example, students may be engaged in note-taking, outlining, or simple summaries. Text may be limited to one paragraph. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 2 performance are:

- Construct or edit compound or complex sentences, with attention to correct use of phrases and clauses.
- Use simple organizational strategies to structure written work.
- Write summaries that contain the main idea of the reading selection and pertinent details.

Writing Level 3. Level 3 requires some higher-level mental processing. Students are engaged in developing compositions that include multiple paragraphs. These compositions may include complex sentence structure and may demonstrate some synthesis and analysis. Students show awareness of their audience and purpose through focus, organization, and the use of appropriate compositional elements. The use of appropriate compositional elements includes such things as addressing chronological order in a narrative, or including supporting facts and details in an informational report. At this stage, students are engaged in editing and revising to improve the quality of the composition. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 3 performance are:

- Support ideas with details and examples.
- Use voice appropriate to the purpose and audience.
- Edit writing to produce a logical progression of ideas.

Writing Level 4. Higher-level thinking is central to Level 4. The standard at this level is a multi-paragraph composition that demonstrates the ability to synthesize and analyze complex ideas or themes. There is evidence of a deep awareness of purpose and audience. For example, informational papers include hypotheses and supporting evidence. Students are expected to create compositions that demonstrate a distinct voice and that stimulate the reader or listener to consider new perspectives on the addressed

ideas and themes. An example that represents, but does not constitute all of, Level 4 performance is:

- Write an analysis of two selections, identifying the common theme and generating a purpose that is appropriate for both.

Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence

For standards and assessments to be aligned, the breadth of knowledge required on both should be comparable. *The range-of-knowledge criterion is used to judge whether a comparable span of knowledge expected of students by a standard is the same as, or corresponds to, the span of knowledge that students need in order to correctly answer the assessment items/activities.* The criterion for correspondence between span of knowledge for a standard and an assessment considers the number of objectives within the standard with one related assessment item/activity. Fifty percent of the objectives for a standard had to have at least one related assessment item in order for the alignment on this criterion to be judged acceptable. This level is based on the assumption that students' knowledge should be tested on content from over half of the domain of knowledge for a standard. This assumes that each objective for a standard should be given equal weight. Depending on the balance in the distribution of items and the necessity for having a low number of items related to any one objective, the requirement that assessment items need to be related to more than 50% of the objectives for a standard increases the likelihood that students will have to demonstrate knowledge on more than one objective per standard to achieve a minimal passing score. As with the other criteria, a state may choose to make the acceptable level on this criterion more rigorous by requiring an assessment to include items related to a greater number of the objectives. However, any restriction on the number of items included on the test will place an upper limit on the number of objectives that can be assessed. Range-of-knowledge correspondence is more difficult to attain if the content expectations are partitioned among a greater number of standards and a large number of objectives. If 50% or more of the objectives for a standard had a corresponding assessment item, then the range-of-knowledge criterion was met. If between 40% and 50% of the objectives for a standard had a corresponding assessment item, the criterion was “weakly” met.

Balance of Representation

In addition to comparable depth and breadth of knowledge, aligned standards and assessments require that knowledge be distributed equally in both. The range-of-knowledge criterion only considers the number of objectives within a standard hit (a standard with a corresponding item); it does not take into consideration how the hits (or assessment items/activities) are distributed among these objectives. *The balance-of-representation criterion is used to indicate the degree to which one objective is given more emphasis on the assessment than another.* An index is used to judge the distribution of assessment items. This index only considers the objectives for a standard that have at least one hit—i.e., one related assessment item per objective. The index is computed by considering the difference in the proportion of objectives and the proportion of hits

assigned to the objective. An index value of 1 signifies perfect balance and is obtained if the hits (corresponding items) related to a standard are equally distributed among the objectives for the given standard. Index values that approach 0 signify that a large proportion of the hits are on only one or two of all of the objectives hit. Depending on the number of objectives and the number of hits, a unimodal distribution (most items related to one objective and only one item related to each of the remaining objectives) has an index value of less than .5. A bimodal distribution has an index value of around .55 or .6. Index values of .7 or higher indicate that items/activities are distributed among all of the objectives at least to some degree (e.g., every objective has at least two items) and is used as the acceptable level on this criterion. Index values between .6 and .7 indicate the balance-of-representation criterion has only been “weakly” met.

Source-of-Challenge

The source-of-challenge criterion is only used to identify items on which the major cognitive demand is inadvertently placed and is other than the targeted language arts skill, concept, or application. Cultural bias or specialized knowledge could be reasons for an item to have a source-of-challenge problem. Such item characteristics may result in some students not answering an assessment item, or answering an assessment item incorrectly, or at a lower level, even though they possess the understanding and skills being assessed.

Findings

Standards

Two reviewers participated in the depth-of-knowledge (DOK) level consensus process for the standards and performance indicators for the Maine language arts standards. A summary of their deliberations is presented in Table 1. The complete group consensus values for each standard and objective can be found in Appendix A. It should be noted that the two reviewers’ assignment of the DOK levels differ some from the DOK levels assigned in the College Board analysis. Overall, the College Board reviewers assigned 51% of the 70 performance indicators a DOK Level 2 and 49% of the performance indicators at DOK Level 3. The two reviewers in this analysis judged that there was more variability in the complexity of the performance indicators. They assigned 8% of the performance indicators with a DOK level of 1, 32% with a DOK level of 2, 41% with a DOK level of 3, and 17% with a DOK level of 4. Thus, there were some differences in the interpretation of the DOK levels. However, these differences will not necessarily produce differences in the attainment of the alignment criteria as long as reviewers consistently applied the DOK levels in judging both the performance indicators and the assessment items.

Table 1

Percent of Objectives by Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Levels for Secondary Standards, Maine Alignment Analysis for Language Arts

Grade	Total number of objectives	DOK Level	# of objs by Level	% within std by Level
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	11	1 2 3	1 4 6	9 36 54
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	11	2 3 4	3 6 2	27 54 18
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	8	1 2 3 4	1 2 4 1	12 25 50 12
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening and viewing strategies to informational texts ...	6	1 2 3 4	1 2 1 2	16 33 16 33
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	4	3 4	1 3	25 75
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	7	1 2 3 4	1 3 2 1	14 42 28 14
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	11	2 3 4	4 6 1	36 54 9
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	12	1 2 3 4	2 5 3 2	16 41 25 16
Total	70	1 2 3 4	6 23 29 12	8 32 41 17

Reviewers judged in this analysis that 58% of the performance indicators had a DOK level of 3 or 4. This indicates that they felt the Maine language arts standards are fairly demanding, with the majority of the expectations requiring students to make inferences, draw upon reasoning skills, make abstract analyses, and apply higher-order thinking.

The reviewers were told that within each of the eight standards, the performance indicators were intended to fully span the content of that standard and, in turn, each goal is spanned by the objectives that fall under it. For this reason, the reviewers only coded items to a standard if there were no performance indicator that the item appeared to target. As indicated in Table 2, both reviewers coded seven items to Standard F (Standard English Conventions). Their notes (Table 9.7 in Appendix B) indicate that they did not find any specific performance indicator that addressed verb form. This appears to be an issue with either an omission within the standards, or because the reviewers did not have sufficient information about the standards to locate the precise performance indicator that addresses verb forms.

Table 2

Items Coded to Generic Objectives by More Than One Reviewer, Maine Alignment Analysis for Language Art with the SAT Reasoning Test

Grade	Assessment Item	Generic Objective (Number of Reviewers)
9-12	5, 8, 15, 16, 20, 24, 29	F

Alignment of Curriculum Standards and Assessments

The results from the alignment analysis are presented in Tables 3a and 3b. “Yes” indicates that an acceptable level on the criterion was fully met. “WEAK” indicates that the criterion was nearly met, within a margin that could simply be due to error in the system. “NO” indicates that the criterion was not met by a noticeable margin. (More detailed data on each of the criteria are given in Appendix B in the first three tables for each of the grade levels. The first table for each assessment, Table 9.1, lists the average number of items coded by the two reviewers for each standard.) Reviewers could code an item as measuring content related to more than one performance indicator. Reviewers used, on an average, 33 secondary hits in this analysis. The SAT had 117 items, including the writing sample. The two reviewers recorded, on the average, 150 hits. This is drastically fewer than the 303 hits recorded in the analysis by the College Board.

The alignment results are reported in two ways or parts. In Part 1 (Table 3a), the results are reported for the two reviewers, with each of the items, including the writing sample, given a value of one point. This is what was done in the College Board analysis. In Part 2 (Table 3b), the results are reported for the two reviewers with the writing sample (Item 1) assigned 16 points and the remaining 116 items assigned one point each.

Table 3a

Summary of Acceptable Levels on the Four Alignment Criteria for Maine Language Arts Standards and SAT Reasoning Test: Part 1 (All Items with Equal Value)

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
Part 1: All Items Equal Weight				
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	YES	YES	WEAK	NO
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	YES	YES	NO	YES
C. – LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	NO	NO	NO	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening, viewing strat. to informational texts ...	YES	YES	YES	WEAK
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	NO	NO	YES	YES
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	YES	YES	YES	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	YES	YES	YES	YES
H. – RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	NO	NO	NO	NO

Table 3b

Summary of Acceptable Levels on the Four Alignment Criteria for Maine Language Arts Standards and SAT Reasoning Test (Writing Sample Weighted as 16 Points)

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
Part 2: Item 1 (Writing Sample) Weighted as 16 Points				
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	YES	YES	WEAK	NO
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	YES	YES	NO	YES
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	NO	NO	NO	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening, and viewing strat. to informational texts ...	YES	YES	YES	WEAK
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	YES	YES	YES	YES
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	YES	YES	YES	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	YES	YES	YES	NO
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	NO	NO	NO	NO

Part 1: Alignment with All Items Given a Value of One Point

In the analysis by the two reviewers, the results indicate that the Maine Learning Results in Language Arts are partially aligned with the SAT Reasoning Test (Table 3a). There are sufficient items on the SAT to meet an acceptable level on the Categorical Concurrence criterion of six or more items for five of the eight standards (A, B, D, F, and G). These items were judged to correspond to these five standards and have a sufficient DOK level to meet an acceptable level on the Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency criterion. This means that over half of the items have a DOK level that is the same or higher than the DOK level of the corresponding performance indicator.

The general results on these two alignment criteria are the same as that found in the College Board analysis, with one exception. The two Wisconsin reviewers did not code any items as corresponding to performance indicators under Standard C, Language and Images) (Table 4). The College Board analysis reports that the SAT had 13 hits corresponding to objectives under Standard C. Neither analysis found a sufficient number of items for Standards E (Processes of Writing and Speaking) and H (Research) when the writing sample is only given a value of one point.

Even though the alignment results are similar for Categorical Concurrence and Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency, there are some noticeable differences in the distribution of items among the standards and performance indicators within standards as judged by each analysis (Table 4). The Wisconsin analysis coded only 9% of the hits as corresponding to Standard B (Literature and Culture). This varies considerably from the 32% of the hits found in the College Board analysis. Although it is not possible to resolve the inconsistency without further investigation, a likely reason for this difference is that the College Board reviewers judged items asking questions about a passage as relating to literature characteristics of the passage, whereas the two reviewers judged the items as corresponding only to comprehension (Standard A). Another difference in the two analyses was the assignment of items to performance indicators under Standard A. The Wisconsin reviewers primarily assigned items to performance indicator A.6, while the College Board reviewers coded the items to A.1.

The Wisconsin analysis results indicate that the SAT did not have items that covered a sufficient breadth of content for two standards (Standards A and B), in addition to the fact that Standards C and H did not have any items. For Standard A, the two reviewers, on the average, coded items to 5 of the 11 level performance indicators. For Standard B, the two reviewers coded items to 3 or 4 of the 11 performance indicators. Thus, Standards A and B did not meet an acceptable level on the Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence criterion requiring that at least half of the performance indicators have at least one corresponding item. Not achieving an adequate range on Standards A and B is one difference between the two analyses. Another difference is in the distribution of items assigned to Standard D (Informational Texts).

The two Wisconsin reviewers varied in their coding of items to Standard D, one assigned items to only performance indicators D.4 and D.5, similar to the SAT analysis,

while one assigned items to four of the six performance indicators. On the average, the results of the two met the acceptable level of three of the six objectives with at least one corresponding item. However, the low number of reviewers probably had some influence on this result. In both analyses, nearly all of the items assigned to performance indicators under Standard D corresponded to only two indicators (D.4 and D.5).

Table 4
Number and Percentage of Hits by Standard for Each Analysis

Standards	WI Analysis		College Board Analysis	
	Hits	Percent	Hits	Percent
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	46	31	99	33
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	13	8	96	32
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	0	0	13	4
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening, and viewing strat. to informational texts ...	29	19	53	18
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	3	2	0	0
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	49	33	26	8
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	10	7	16	5
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	0	0	0	0
Total	150	100	303	100

In the Wisconsin analysis, an acceptable level on the Balance of Representation criterion was not fully met for four of the standards, two of which did not have any corresponding items (Table 3a). These results do not compare very closely to those from the College Board analysis, where only two standards (C and D) were judged to have fully met an acceptable level for balance. This discrepancy is probably due to the large number of hits coded in the College Board analysis that had a limited number of performance indicators assigned corresponding items.

Part II: Alignment with the Writing Sample Assigned 16 Points

When the writing sample was assigned 16 points, the SAT was found to be fully aligned with Standard E (Table 3b). All four alignment criteria were fully met for this standard. The writing sample was judged to correspond to two performance indicators, E.3 and G.5. In addition to improving the alignment results for Standard E, the weighting resulted in an imbalance for Standard G, with an overemphasis on G.5 compared to the other performance indicators with corresponding items. Otherwise, the alignment results are the same as for all the analysis with all of the items weighted equally.

Source of Challenge

Reviewers were asked to indicate whether there was a source-of-challenge issue on any of the items. The concerns expressed by the reviewers are given in the fifth table (Table 9.5) in Appendix B. At least one reviewer identified a source-of-challenge issue for four items. Neither of the two reviewers found an adequate match for Item 8 (no subject-verb agreement in the standards). One reviewer questioned the number of possible choices on three other items. Reviewers did not identify any other source-of-challenge issues. Thus, the two reviewers found the items to be of a high quality.

Notes

The two reviewers made other comments about the items, which they recorded as notes. These notes are presented in the seventh table (Table 9.7) in Appendix B. Reviewers' notes sometimes clarify the match between the item and the objective as being weak. The notes also indicate issues that a reviewer might have found with an item and his/her suggestion regarding how the item could be improved.

General Comments made by Reviewers

After coding the assessment, the two reviewers together responded to four questions about their opinions of the general alignment between the standards and the assessments:

- A. For each standard, did the items cover the most important topics you expected from the standard? If not, what topics were not assessed that should have been?

- B. For each standard, did the items cover the most important performance (DOK levels) you expected of the standard? If not, what performance was not assessed?
- C. Was there any content you expected to be assessed, but found no items assessing that content? What was that content?
- D. What is your general opinion of the alignment between the standards and assessment:
 - i. Perfect alignment
 - ii. Acceptable alignment
 - iii. Needs slight improvement
 - iv. Needs major improvement
 - v. Not aligned in any way.
- E. Other Comments.

The reviewers' responses indicate the reflections of the reviewers at the time of coding. They complement and inform the more rigorous analysis, but should not be interpreted as definitive, only impressionistic. The responses by the language arts reviewers are presented below.

- A. *For each standard, did the items cover the most important topics you expected by the standard? If not, what topics were not assessed that should have been?*

No abbreviations or acronyms. No relating reading to readers' own experience—prior knowledge items. Little on text structure—macro. Little on theme. Did not find any items addressing the “C” competency/standard. No research items.

- B. *For each standard, did the items cover the most important performance (DOK levels) you expected by the standard? If not, what performance was not assessed?*

Items were fairly challenging and pretty consistent with depth of knowledge of the objectives.

- C. *Was there any content you expected to be assessed, but found no items assessing that content? What was that content?*

See answer to “A” above. (No abbreviations or acronyms. No relating reading to readers' own experience—prior knowledge items. Little on text structure—macro. Little on theme. Did not find any items addressing the “C” content/standard. No research items.) Also there should be an objective to which you could code items addressing verb problems—form and agreement. No fact/opinion items.

- D. *What is your general opinion of the alignment between the standards and assessment?*

Acceptable alignment/Needs slight improvement

E. Other comments.

The assessment had challenging items. These items made the test fun to work with. It was sometimes frustrating to find the appropriate objective to which to code an item. The fit of the items to the objectives is not as close as desired. There were areas in standards not related to items. There is an overdose on vocabulary and context. Standards do not have subject verb agreement.

Reliability Among Reviewers

The pairwise agreement among the two language arts reviewers' assignment of DOK levels to items was .59. This is very close to a reasonable value of .6 or higher for two reviewers. However, the agreement was not as high as would be desired. This needs to be taken into consideration in interpreting the results. The pairwise agreement among the two reviewers in assigning items to standards was .72. In general, with eight or more reviewers, an agreement of .9 is desired. The pairwise agreement among the two reviewers in assigning items to performance indicators was .49, a little lower than desired. The lack of agreement among reviewers in assigning items to performance indicators can be due to the reviewers not having as much knowledge of the Maine Learning Results and because of some overlap in coverage among the performance indicators under the standards. The results for this analysis are computed by averaging results between the two reviewers. This helps to lessen the error or inconsistency among reviewers.

Summary

The Maine Learning Results and the SAT Reasoning Test for language arts were found to be partially aligned, with slight improvement needed to be fully aligned. The two reviewers judged that none of the 117 items on the SAT corresponded to the performance indicators under Standards C (Language and Images) and H (Research). For the other six standards, when the writing sample is given a value of 16 points, the SAT included an adequate number of items for each standard and an adequate proportion of items with an appropriate DOK level. For two of the six standards, the assessment was judged not to have a sufficient coverage of the performance indicators under the standard to meet an acceptable level on the Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence criterion. However, replacing or adding four items could readily resolve this alignment issue. For three of the six standards (Standards A, D, and G), one or two performance indicators were overemphasized compared to other performance indicators. This imbalance is not too critical when the range is appropriate; but for Standard A, one performance indicator clearly was overemphasized with only little or no attention given to the other performance indicators under that standard. The Learning Results and the SAT would be fully aligned by replacing or adding about 16 items—six items each to measure content related to Standards C and H and four items to increase the number of performance indicators under Standards A and B with at least one corresponding item.

The results of this analysis done by two reviewers compared with the one conducted by the College Board reported in September, 2005, were similar, but not identical. Both studies indicated that most standards had adequate coverage with appropriate DOK levels. However, there were some differences in the coding of items between the two analyses. The two Wisconsin reviewers used secondary hits judiciously, 150 hits for 117 items, whereas the College Board assigned secondary and tertiary hits to almost every item, 303 hits. The College Board analysis found items that corresponded to Standard C (Language and Images), whereas the Wisconsin analysis did not. Also, the College Board analysis assigned about 32% of the hits to Standard B (Literature and Culture) compared to the Wisconsin analysis, where only about 9% of the hits corresponded to this standard. There also were some differences in the assignment of items to performance indicators under a standard. For example, under Standard A, the College Board study indicated that most of the items should be assigned to A.1, while the two Wisconsin reviewers indicated that most of the Standard A items should be assigned to A.6. Such differences as these, however, do not have a great impact on the alignment findings. A full comparison of an item-by-item coding would require a more detailed analysis that is beyond the scope of this study.

Two reviewers conducted this analysis. Normally, a full alignment analysis would require from six to eight reviewers. The two reviewers had reasonable agreement in assigning DOK levels to items and items to standards. The final results were determined by averaging the results from each of the reviewers to lessen the error for any one reviewer. The reviewers used statements of the standards and performance indicators, but did not have available to them other materials or access to people from the state with a greater depth in knowledge of what is included under a performance indicator. However, the reviewers, who were language arts content experts who have extensive experience in interpreting performance indicators, assigned items to the performance indicators based on a common interpretation of the wording.

References

- College Board. (2005). *Report for the State of Maine on the Alignment of the SAT and PSAT/NMSQT to the Maine Learning Results*.
http://www.maine.gov/education/sat_initiative/docs/sat_align_study.pdf
- Subkoviak, M. J. (1988). A practitioner's guide to computation and interpretation of reliability indices for mastery tests. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 25(1), 47-55.
- Valencia, S. W., & Wixson, K. K. (2000). Policy-oriented research on literary standards and assessment. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol III*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Webb, N. L. (1997). *Criteria for alignment of expectations and assessments in language*

arts and science education. Council of Chief State School Officers and National Institute for Science Education Research Monograph No. 6. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Appendix A

Maine Language Arts Standards and Pair Consensus DOK Values

Table 9.13
Group Consensus
Maine English Language Arts, Language Arts, Grade 12

Level	Description	DOK
A.	PROCESS OF READING: Students will use the skills and strategies of the reading process to comprehend, interpret, evaluate, and appreciate what they have read.	3
A.1.	Demonstrate an understanding that reading is a gradual process of constructing meaning and revising initial understandings.	3
A.2.	Demonstrate an understanding that a single text will elicit a wide variety of responses, each of which may be the point of view of the individual reader or listener.	3
A.3.	Identify the author's purpose and analyze the effects of that purpose on the text.	3
A.4.	Identify the author's point of view and analyze the effects of that point of view on the text.	2
A.5.	Identify the devices an author uses to persuade readers and critique the effectiveness of the use of those devices.	3
A.6.	Use the context of a work to determine the figurative, idiomatic, and technical meanings of terms.	2
A.7.	Use the context of a work to determine the meanings of abbreviations and acronyms.	2
A.8.	Find the meaning of relatively uncommon technical terms used in informational texts.	1
A.9.	Identify the philosophical assumptions and basic beliefs underlying a particular text.	3
A.10.	Analyze how the cultural context of a literary work is evident in the text.	3
A.11.	Represent key ideas and supporting details in various written forms (e.g., outline, paraphrase, concise summary).	2
B.	LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Students will use reading, listening, and viewing strategies to experience, understand, and appreciate literature and culture.	3
B.1.	Distinguish between the purpose of a literary work and the personal response of an individual reader.	3
B.2.	Identify the simple and complex actions and interactions involving main and subordinate characters in a work.	2
B.3.	Make abstract connections (e.g., connections about thoughts, ideas, values) between their own lives and the characters, events, and circumstances represented in various works.	3
B.4.	Demonstrate an understanding of the stylistic effect of dialogues on the style of a work.	2
B.5.	Identify and analyze the details and effects of complex literary devices on the overall quality of a work (e.g., foreshadowing, flashbacks, time frames in the future or past).	3
B.6.	Identify and analyze how complex elements of plot (e.g., setting, major events, problems, conflicts, resolutions) effect the overall quality of a work.	2
B.7.	Apply mature strategies to the reading and interpretation of lengthy adult level fiction, (e.g., satires, parodies, plays, poems, novels) using texts that are complex in terms of character, plot, theme, structure, and dialogue and sophisticated in style, point of view, and use of literary devices.	4
B.8.	Apply mature strategies to the reading and interpretation of lengthy adult level nonfiction texts with appropriate complexity of content and sophistication of style.	4
B.9.	Demonstrate an understanding of the defining features and structure of literary texts encountered at this level.	3

Table 9.13
Group Consensus
Maine English Language Arts, Language Arts, Grade 12

B.10.	Draw from a broad base of knowledge about literature of the United States and the world to examine and critique how print and visual texts explore the human experience and condition.	3
B.11.	Examine, evaluate, and elaborate on universal themes in literature, using reading and viewing to explain how themes are developed and achieved.	3
C.	LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Students will demonstrate an understanding of how words and images communicate.	3
C.1.	Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among perception, thought, and language.	4
C.2.	Demonstrate an understanding of how language considerations and representations involving gender affect communication.	3
C.3.	Compare the ways various social, occupational, and cultural groups use language, and comment on the impact of language use on the way people are viewed and treated.	3
C.4.	Compare form, meaning, and value of different kinds of symbol systems (e.g., religious symbols, holiday symbols, the symbolism of particular types of architecture).	3
C.5.	Demonstrate understanding of the history of and changes in the English language by explaining examples.	2
C.6.	Use dictionaries, handbooks, and other language-related resources to evaluate the accuracy of their use of English.	1
C.7.	Demonstrate an understanding of the political implications of different forms of language.	3
C.8.	Identify propaganda techniques used by writers and speakers.	2
D.	INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Students will apply reading, listening, and viewing strategies to informational texts across all areas of curriculum.	3
D.1.	Scan a passage to determine whether a text contains relevant information.	1
D.2.	Distinguish between apparent fact and opinion in nonfiction texts.	2
D.3.	Use discussions with peers as a way of understanding information.	4
D.4.	Identify complex structures in informational texts and the relationships between the concepts and details in those structures using texts from various disciplines.	2
D.5.	Analyze and synthesize the concepts and details in informational texts.	3
D.6.	Explain how new information from a text changes personal knowledge.	4
E.	PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Students will demonstrate the ability to use the skills and strategies of the writing process.	4
E.1.	Ask pertinent questions during writing conferences and when working alone, using knowledge of personal writing strategies, strengths, and weaknesses to improve one's own writing.	4
E.2.	Reflect on, evaluate, revise, and edit a sequence of drafts to improve and polish finished	4

Table 9.13
Group Consensus
Maine English Language Arts, Language Arts, Grade 12

	work.	
E.3.	Use planning, drafting, and revising to produce, on demand, a well-developed, organized piece that demonstrates effective language use, voice, and command of mechanics.	3
E.4.	Evaluate the remarks and oral presentations of others to find the key ideas, and explain the ways in which these ideas were developed.	4
F.	STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Students will write and speak correctly, using conventions of standard written and spoken English.	2
F.1.1	Edit written work for standard English spelling and usage, evidenced by pieces that show and contain: no significant errors in the use of pronouns, nouns, adjectival and adverbial forms.	2
F.1.2	Edit written work for standard English spelling and usage, evidenced by pieces that show and contain: coordinating and subordinating conjunctions.	3
F.1.3	Edit written work for standard English spelling and usage, evidenced by pieces that show and contain: no significant errors in the spelling of frequently used words and the correct use of commonly confused terms.	1
F.1.4	Edit written work for standard English spelling and usage, evidenced by pieces that show and contain: no significant errors in the common conventions of capitalization and ending punctuation marks and common uses of the comma.	2
F.1.5	Edit written work for standard English spelling and usage, evidenced by pieces that show and contain: few significant errors in the spelling of commonly misspelled and rare words, the less common capitalization conventions, the colon, semicolon, hyphen, dash, apostrophe, quotation marks, italics, marginal notes, and footnotes.	2
F.2.	Demonstrate how language usage may depend on the situation.	3
F.3.	Demonstrate command of the conventions involved in a formal speech, effectively engaging peers during presentation and fielding responses afterwards.	4
G.	STYLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Students will use stylistic and rhetorical aspects of writing and speaking to explore ideas, to present lines of thought, to represent and reflect on human experience, and to communicate feelings, knowledge, and opinions.	3
G.1.	Write stories that effectively develop such elements as setting, major events, problems and solutions.	3
G.2.	Write pieces and deliver oral presentations that effectively use descriptive language to clarify, enhance, and develop ideas.	3
G.3.	Write pieces and deliver oral presentations that include a variety of sentence structures and lengths.	2
G.4.	Write pieces and deliver oral presentations that are targeted for various audiences (e.g., informed or uninformed, sympathetic or hostile).	3
G.5.	Write pieces and deliver oral presentations that achieve distinct purposes (e.g., to persuade, evaluate, analyze, defend).	3
G.6.	Write pieces and deliver oral presentations that effectively employ explicit transitional devices in order to change a situation or to move the reader/listener through the piece.	2

Table 9.13
Group Consensus
Maine English Language Arts, Language Arts, Grade 12

G.7.	Write pieces and deliver oral presentations in which the organization of the work follows from the purpose.	3
G.8.	Write pieces and deliver oral presentations in a personal style, with a discernible voice and effective wording.	3
G.9.	Write essays and deliver oral presentations that reliably support and provide details for the explicitly stated generalizations.	2
G.10.	Make effective use of a variety of techniques to provide supporting detail (e.g., analogies, anecdotes, illustrations, detailed descriptions, restatements, paraphrases, examples, comparisons) in written work and oral presentations.	2
G.11.	Make effective use of a variety of techniques for introducing and representing ideas and insights in written work and oral presentations.	4
H.	RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Students will work, write, and speak effectively when doing research in all content areas.	2
H.1.	Develop an appropriate strategy for finding information on a particular topic.	2
H.2.	Use referencing while doing research.	1
H.3.	Record significant information from events attended and interviews conducted.	4
H.4.	Identify and use library information services.	1
H.5.	Use government publications, in-depth field studies, and almanacs for research.	2
H.6.	Use CD-ROM, microfiche, and similar resource media for research.	2
H.7.	Identify and use a variety of news sources (e.g., newspapers, magazines, broadcast and recorded media, artifacts), informants, and other likely sources for research purposes.	2
H.8.	Use search engines and other Internet resources to do research.	2
H.9.	Make extensive use of primary sources when researching a topic and carefully evaluate the motives and perspectives of the authors.	3
H.10.	Analyze the validity and weigh the reliability of primary information sources and make appropriate use of such information for research purposes.	3
H.11.	Evaluate information for accuracy, currency, and possible bias.	3
H.12.	Report orally, using a variety of technological resources to present the results of a research project.	4

Appendix B

Data Analysis Tables

Language Arts

SAT Analysis for Maine

Part 1: Computation with All Items of Equal Value

Part 2: Computation with Writing Sample given a Weight of 16 Points

Brief Explanation of Data in the Alignment Tables by Column

Tables (Grade).(Form).1

Goals #	Number of objectives plus one for a generic objective for each standard.
Objectives #	Average number of objectives for reviewers. If the number is greater than the actual number in the standard, then at least one reviewer coded an item for the goal/objective but did not find any objective in the goal that corresponded to the item.
Level	The Depth-of-Knowledge level coded by the reviewers for the objectives for each standard.
# of objectives by Level	The number of objectives coded at each level
% w/in std by Level	The percent of objectives coded at each level
Hits	
Mean & SD	Mean and standard deviation number of items reviewers coded as corresponding to standard. The total is the total number of coded hits.
Cat. Conc. Accept.	“Yes” indicates that the standard met the acceptable level for criterion. “Yes” if mean is six or more. “Weak” if mean is five to six. “No” if mean is less than five.

Tables (Grade).(Form).2

	First five columns repeat columns from Table 1.
Level of Item w.r.t. Stand	Mean percent and standard deviation of items coded as “under” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding objective, as “at” (the same) the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding objective, and as “above” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding objective.
Depth-of-Know. Consistency	
Accept.	<p>“Yes” indicates that 50% or more of the items were rated as “at” or “above” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding objectives.</p> <p>“Weak” indicates that 40% to 50% of the items were rated as “at” or “above” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding objectives.</p> <p>“No” indicates that less than 40% items were rated as “at” or “above” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding objectives.</p>

Tables (Grade).(Form).3

First five columns repeat columns from Table 1 and 2.

Range of Objectives

Objectives Hit Average number and standard deviation of the objectives hit coded by reviewers.

% of Total Average percent and standard deviation of the total objectives that had at least one item coded.

Range of Know.

Accept. “Yes” indicates that 50% or more of the objectives had at least one coded objective.

“Weak” indicates that 40% to 50% of the objectives had at least one coded objective.

“No” indicates that 40% or less of the objectives had at least one coded objective.

Balance Index

% Hits in

Std/Ttl Hits Average and standard deviation of the percent of the items hit for a standard of total number of hits (see total under the Hits column).

Index Average and standard deviation of the Balance Index.

$$\text{Note: BALANCE INDEX} = 1 - \left(\sum_{k=1} \left| \frac{1}{(O)} - \frac{I_{(k)}}{(H)} \right| \right) / 2$$

Where O = Total number of objectives hit for the standard

I_(k) = Number of items hit corresponding to objective (k)

H = Total number of items hit for the standard

Bal. of Rep

Accept. “Yes” indicates that the Balance Index was .7 or above (items evenly distributed among objectives).

“Weak” indicates that the Balance Index was .6 to .7 (a high percentage of items coded as corresponding to two or three objectives).

“No” indicates that the Balance Index was .6 or less (a high percentage of items coded as corresponding to one objective.)

Tables (Grade).(Form).4

Summary if standard met the acceptable level for the four criteria by each standard.

Tables (Grade).(Form).5

Comments made by reviewers on items identified as having a source of challenge issue by item number.

Tables (Grade).(Form).6

The DOK value for each assessment item given by each reviewer. The intraclass correlation for the group of reviewers is given on the last row.

Tables (Grade).(Form).7

All notes made by reviewers on items by item number.

Tables (Grade).(Form).8

The DOK level and objective code assigned by each reviewer for each item.

Tables (Grade).(Form).9

This list for each item all of the objectives coded by the eight reviewers as corresponding to the item. Repeat of an objective indicates the number of reviewers who coded that objective as corresponding to the item.

Tables (Grade).(Form).10

This lists for each objective all of the items coded by the eight reviewers as corresponding to the objective. Repeat of an item indicates the number of reviewers who coded the item as corresponding to the objective.

Tables (Grade).(Form).11

This table summarizes the number of reviewers who coded an item as corresponding to an objective. It contains the same information as in Table 10.

Tables (Grade).12

This table can be used to compare the DOK level of an objective to the average DOK level of the items reviewers assigned to the objective. This table is helpful to identify items with a lower DOK level that should be replaced by an item with a higher DOK level to improve the Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency.

Table 9.1

*Categorical Concurrence Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Two Reviewers
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting
Number of Assessment Items - 117*

Standards		Level by Objective				Hits		Cat. Concurr.
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Level	# of objs by Level	% w/in std by Level	Mean	S.D.	
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	11	11	1 2 3	1 4 6	9 36 54	46	1	YES
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	11	11	2 3 4	3 6 2	27 54 18	13	2	YES
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	8	8	1 2 3 4	1 2 4 1	12 25 50 12	0	0	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening a viewing to informational texts ...	6	6	1 2 3 4	1 2 1 2	16 33 16 33	29	8	YES
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	4	4	3 4	1 3	25 75	3.5	2.5	NO
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	7	8	1 2 3 4	1 3 2 1	14 42 28 14	49.5	1.5	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	11	11	2 3 4	4 6 1	36 54 9	10	3.5	YES
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	12	12	1 2 3 4	2 5 3 2	16 41 25 16	0	0	NO
Total	70	71	1 2 3 4	6 23 29 12	8 32 41 17	149.5	13.5	

Table 9.2

Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Two Reviewers

Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Number of Assessment Items - 117

Standards			Hits		Level of Item w.r.t. Standard						DOK Consistency
					% Under		% At		% Above		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	11	11	46	1	24	32	65	32	12	18	YES
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	11	11	13	2	29	40	57	37	14	24	YES
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening a viewing to informational texts ...	6	6	29	8	21	32	50	34	29	37	YES
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	4	4	3.5	2.5	67	41	33	41	0	0	NO
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	7	8	49.5	1.5	15	39	85	39	0	0	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	11	11	10	3.5	27	45	73	45	0	0	YES
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NO
Total	70	71	149.5	13.5	32	41	60	40	8	20	

Table 9.3

*Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence and Balance of Representation Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Two Reviewers
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting
Number of Assessment Items - 117*

Standards			Hits		Range of Objectives				Rng. of Know.	Balance Index				Bal. of Represent.
					# Obs Hit		% of Total			% Hits in Std/Ttl Hits		Index		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	11	11	46	1	5	1	45	9	WEAK	31	2	0.48	0.05	NO
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	11	11	13	2	3.5	0.5	32	5	NO	9	1	0.82	0.06	YES
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	NO	0	0	0	0	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening a viewing to informational texts ...	6	6	29	8	3	0	50	0	YES	19	4	0.64	0.16	WEAK
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	4	4	3.5	2.5	2	1	50	25	YES	3	2	0.92	0.08	YES
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	7	8	49.5	1.5	5.5	0.5	69	6	YES	33	2	0.71	0.02	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	11	11	10	3.5	6.5	0.5	59	5	YES	6	2	0.96	0.04	YES
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	NO	0	0	0	0	NO
Total	70	71	149.5	13.5	3.06	1.50	37	16		12	12	0.57	0.18	

Table 9.4

Summary of Attainment of Acceptable Alignment Level on Four Content Focus Criteria as Rated by Two Reviewers

Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Number of Assessment Items - 117

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	YES	YES	WEAK	NO
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	YES	YES	NO	YES
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	NO	NO	NO	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening a viewing to informational texts ...	YES	YES	YES	WEAK
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	NO	NO	YES	YES
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	YES	YES	YES	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	YES	YES	YES	YES
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	NO	NO	NO	NO

Table 9.5

Source-of-Challenge Issues by Reviewer

Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
8	No objective for verb problems.
8	Standards make no reference to subject-verb agreement.
9	No real objective dealing with parallel structure.
23	Although "D" is probably the choice being looked for, "still" is redundant given the use of "even" earlier in the sentence.
91	None of the possible answers seem to really capture the purpose of the first paragraph.

Table 9.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2
1	3	3
2	2	2
3	2	2
4	2	2
5	2	2
6	2	2
7	2	1
8	1	2
9	2	2
10	1	2
11	2	2
12	1	2
13	1	2
14	2	2
15	1	2
16	1	2
17	2	2
18	1	2
19	1	2
20	2	2
21	1	2
22	2	2
23	2	2
24	1	2
25	1	2
26	2	2
27	2	2
28	2	2
29	1	2
30	2	2
31	2	2
32	2	2
33	2	2
34	2	2
35	2	2
36	3	2
37	3	3
38	1	1
39	3	3
40	2	1

Table 9.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2
41	1	2
42	3	3
43	2	3
44	3	3
45	3	3
46	2	1
47	3	2
48	3	2
49	3	3
50	3	2
51	2	2
52	3	2
53	3	2
54	2	1
55	3	2
56	2	2
57	2	1
58	2	2
59	2	2
60	2	2
61	3	3
62	2	1
63	2	2
64	3	3
65	2	2
66	3	3
67	2	2
68	3	2
69	2	2
70	3	2
71	3	2
72	2	2
73	3	2
74	2	2
75	3	2
76	2	2
77	3	2
78	3	2
79	2	2
80	3	2

Table 9.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2
81	2	2
82	2	2
83	2	1
84	3	2
85	2	1
86	2	2
87	2	1
88	3	3
89	3	3
90	2	1
91	3	2
92	2	2
93	2	1
94	3	2
95	3	2
96	2	2
97	3	2
98	2	2
99	2	2
100	3	2
101	2	2
102	3	2
103	2	2
104	2	2
105	2	2
106	2	2
107	2	2
108	2	2
109	2	2
110	2	2
111	2	2
112	2	2
113	2	2
114	2	2
115	2	2
116	2	2
117	3	2

Intraclass Correlation: 0.535

Pairwise Comparison: 0.5897

Table 9.7
Notes by Reviewer
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
3	This is the second item that is basically a subordination/coordination item with punctuation elements.
5	None of the "F" subpoints deal with verb issues. This is at least partly a verb form issue. Therefore I have coded to the competency rather than the objective.
5	Standards contain no language relating to verb usage.
6	Not a good match with any of the objectives. It deals with parallel structure.
12	Parallel structure again.
15	No specific objective for this verb form item.
15	No standard refers to verb forms.
16	Verb form issue again.
16	Verb tense does not appear in the standards.
20	No error. Student would have to know a number of objectives in "F" to answer correctly.
21	Verb issue again. No objectives address this.
24	The verb issue again. There should be an objective for verb issues.
24	Standards contain no reference to subject-verb agreement.
26	The verb form issue again.
29	Verb issue again.
29	Subject-verb agreement isn't specified in the standards.
30	Involves a number of the "F" objectives.
113	No objective really addresses verb problems.
113	Subject-verb agreement

Table 9.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Item	DO K0	PObj 0	S1Ob j0	S2Ob j0	DOK 1	PObj 1	S1Ob j1	S2Ob j1
1	3	E.3.	G.5		3	E.3.	G.5	
2	2	F.1.2	F.1.4		2	F.1.2	F.1.4	
3	2	F.1.2	F.1.4		2	F.1.2		
4	2	F.1.5			2	F.1.5		
5	2	F.	F.1.2		2	F.	F.1.2	
6	2	E.4.			2	D.4.		
7	2	F.1.4			1	F.1.4		
8	1	F.			2	F.		
9	2	F.			2	F.1.1		
10	1	F.1.2	F.1.4		2	F.1.4	F.1.2	
11	2	F.2.			2	F.1.2		
12	1	F.			2	F.1.2		
13	1	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
14	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
15	1	F.			2	F.		
16	1	F.			2	F.		
17	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.2		
18	1	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
19	1	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
20	2	F.			2	F.	D.4.	F.1.4
21	1	F.			2	D.4.		
22	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.2		
23	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
24	1	F.			2	F.		
25	1	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
26	2	F.			2	F.1.1		
27	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
28	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.2		
29	1	F.			2	F.		
30	2	F.			2	F.1.5		
31	2	F.1.5			2	G.10.	F.1.2	
32	2	G.10.	F.1.2		2	G.10.	F.1.2	
33	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.2	F.1.1	
34	2	G.9.	D.1.		2	G.9.	G.6.	
35	2	G.6.			2	G.6.	F.1.2	
36	3	G.2.			2	G.5.	G.9.	
37	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		

Table 9.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Item	DO K0	PObj 0	S1Ob j0	S2Ob j0	DOK 1	PObj 1	S1Ob j1	S2Ob j1
38	1	A.6.			1	A.6.		
39	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
40	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
41	1	A.6.			2	A.6.	D.4.	
42	3	D.5.	A.6.		3	A.6.	D.5.	
43	2	B.5.			3	A.5.	B.5.	
44	3	A.6.			3	D.4.	A.6.	
45	3	A.6.			3	D.4.	D.5.	
46	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
47	3	D.4.			2	D.5.		
48	3	A.6.			2	D.4.	D.5.	
49	3	D.5.	A.10.		3	D.4.	D.5.	
50	3	D.5.	A.10.		2	D.5.	D.4.	
51	2	D.5.			2	D.5.		
52	3	A.6.			2	A.6.	G.6.	
53	3	D.5.			2	D.5.		
54	2	A.6.			1	A.6.	F.1.1	
55	3	A.3.			2	D.5.		
56	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
57	2	D.5.	A.6.		1	A.6.	D.5.	
58	2	D.5.			2	D.4.		
59	2	D.5.			2	D.5.		
60	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
61	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
62	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
63	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
64	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
65	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
66	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
67	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
68	3	D.5.			2	D.5.	A.4.	
69	2	D.5.			2	A.4.	D.5.	
70	3	A.9.	A.4.		2	A.6.	A.4.	
71	3	A.5.			2	A.4.		
72	2	A.4.	G.8.		2	A.4.	D.5.	
73	3	B.5.			2	A.1.	B.4.	
74	2	A.6.			2	A.6.	B.5.	

Table 9.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Item	DO K0	PObj 0	S1Ob j0	S2Ob j0	DOK 1	PObj 1	S1Ob j1	S2Ob j1
75	3	A.3.			2	B.2.	B.11.	
76	2	A.3.			2	B.5.	B.4.	
77	3	B.4.			2	B.4.		
78	3	B.2.			2	B.2.	B.5.	
79	2	B.4.	B.2.		2	B.5.		
80	3	B.2.	B.5.		2	B.2.		
81	2	A.6.			2	A.6.	B.5.	
82	2	B.4.			2	B.2.		
83	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
84	3	B.5.			2	B.2.	A.6.	
85	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
86	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
87	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
88	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
89	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
90	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
91	3	D.5.			2	D.4.	A.4.	
92	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
93	2	D.4.			1	A.6.		
94	3	D.5.			2	D.2.	G.5.	
95	3	D.5.	A.9.		2	D.5.		
96	2	A.5.			2	D.5.	D.2.	
97	3	A.6.			2	D.5.	A.6.	
98	2	A.3.			2	A.4.	D.2.	
99	2	D.5.			2	D.4.	D.2.	
100	3	D.5.	B.5.		2	A.4.	D.5.	
101	2	D.5.			2	D.2.	A.4.	
102	3	D.5.			2	D.4.	A.4.	
103	2	D.5.			2	D.5.	A.4.	
104	2	F.1.2	F.1.4		2	F.	G.3.	
105	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.1	G.2.	
106	2	E.3.	F.2.		2	F.1.1	G.3.	
107	2	E.3.			2	F.1.1		
108	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
109	2	F.			2	F.1.1		
110	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
111	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.1		

Table 9.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Item	DO K0	PObj 0	S1Ob j0	S2Ob j0	DOK 1	PObj 1	S1Ob j1	S2Ob j1
112	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.4		
113	2	F.			2	F.1.1		
114	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.4		
115	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.2		
116	2	E.2.			2	F.1.4		
117	3	F.1.2	E.2.		2	F.1.1		

Objective Pairwise Comparison: 0.4881

Standard Pairwise Comparison: 0.7219

Table 9.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Low		Medium		High
2		2.555556		4

1	E.3.	E.3.	G.5	G.5
2	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	F.1. 4	F.1. 4
3	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	F.1. 4	
4	F.1. 5	F.1. 5		
5	F.	F.	F.1. 2	F.1. 2
6	D.4.	E.4.		
7	F.1. 4	F.1. 4		
8	F.	F.		
9	F.	F.1. 1		
10	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	F.1. 4	F.1. 4
11	F.1. 2	F.2.		
12	F.	F.1. 2		
13	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
14	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
15	F.	F.		
16	F.	F.		
17	F.1. 2	F.1. 2		
18	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
19	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
20	D.4.	F.	F.	F.1. 4
21	D.4.	F.		
22	F.1. 2	F.1. 2		
23	F.1.	F.1.		

Table 9.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

	1	1		
24	F.	F.		
25	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
26	F.	F.1. 1		
27	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
28	F.1. 1	F.1. 2		
29	F.	F.		
30	F.	F.1. 5		
31	F.1. 2	F.1. 5	G.10 .	
32	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	G.10 .	G.10 .
33	F.1. 1	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	
34	D.1.	G.6.	G.9.	G.9.
35	F.1. 2	G.6.	G.6.	
36	G.2.	G.5.	G.9.	
37	A.6.	A.6.		
38	A.6.	A.6.		
39	A.6.	A.6.		
40	A.6.	A.6.		
41	A.6.	A.6.	D.4.	
42	A.6.	A.6.	D.5.	D.5.
43	A.5.	B.5.	B.5.	
44	A.6.	A.6.	D.4.	
45	A.6.	D.4.	D.5.	
46	A.6.	A.6.		
47	D.4.	D.5.		
48	A.6.	D.4.	D.5.	
49	A.10 .	D.4.	D.5.	D.5.
50	A.10 .	D.4.	D.5.	D.5.
51	D.5.	D.5.		
52	A.6.	A.6.	G.6.	
53	D.5.	D.5.		
54	A.6.	A.6.	F.1.	

Table 9.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

			1	
55	A.3.	D.5.		
56	A.6.	A.6.		
57	A.6.	A.6.	D.5.	D.5.
58	D.4.	D.5.		
59	D.5.	D.5.		
60	A.6.	A.6.		
61	A.6.	A.6.		
62	A.6.	A.6.		
63	A.6.	A.6.		
64	A.6.	A.6.		
65	A.6.	A.6.		
66	A.6.	A.6.		
67	A.6.	A.6.		
68	A.4.	D.5.	D.5.	
69	A.4.	D.5.	D.5.	
70	A.4.	A.4.	A.6.	A.9.
71	A.4.	A.5.		
72	A.4.	A.4.	D.5.	G.8.
73	A.1.	B.4.	B.5.	
74	A.6.	A.6.	B.5.	
75	A.3.	B.2.	B.11	
			.	
76	A.3.	B.4.	B.5.	
77	B.4.	B.4.		
78	B.2.	B.2.	B.5.	
79	B.2.	B.4.	B.5.	
80	B.2.	B.2.	B.5.	
81	A.6.	A.6.	B.5.	
82	B.2.	B.4.		
83	A.6.	A.6.		
84	A.6.	B.2.	B.5.	
85	A.6.	A.6.		
86	A.6.	A.6.		
87	A.6.	A.6.		
88	A.6.	A.6.		
89	A.6.	A.6.		
90	A.6.	A.6.		
91	A.4.	D.4.	D.5.	
92	A.6.	A.6.		
93	A.6.	D.4.		
94	D.2.	D.5.	G.5.	

Table 9.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

95	A.9.	D.5.	D.5.	
96	A.5.	D.2.	D.5.	
97	A.6.	A.6.	D.5.	
98	A.3.	A.4.	D.2.	
99	D.2.	D.4.	D.5.	
100	A.4.	B.5.	D.5.	D.5.
101	A.4.	D.2.	D.5.	
102	A.4.	D.4.	D.5.	
103	A.4.	D.5.	D.5.	
104	F.	F.1. 2	F.1. 4	G.3.
105	F.1. 1	F.1. 2	G.2.	
106	E.3.	F.1. 1	F.2.	G.3.
107	E.3.	F.1. 1		
108	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
109	F.	F.1. 1		
110	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
111	F.1. 1	F.1. 2		
112	F.1. 1	F.1. 4		
113	F.	F.1. 1		
114	F.1. 2	F.1. 4		
115	F.1. 2	F.1. 2		
116	E.2.	F.1. 4		
117	E.2.	F.1. 1	F.1. 2	

Table 9.10
 Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
 Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

C.5.																				
C.6.																				
C.7.																				
C.8.																				
D.																				
D.1.	34																			
D.2.	94	96	98	99	101															
D.3.																				
D.4.	6	20	21	41	44	45	47	48	49	50	58	91	93	99	102					
D.5.	42	42	45	47	48	49	49	50	50	51	51	53	53	55	57	57	58	59	59	68
	68	69	69	72	91	94	95	95	96	97	99	100	100	101	102	103	103			
D.6.																				
E.																				
E.1.																				
E.2.	116	117																		
E.3.	1	1	106	107																
E.4.	6																			
F.	5	5	8	8	9	12	15	15	16	16	20	20	21	24	24	26	29	29	30	104
	109	113																		
F.1.1	9	13	13	14	14	18	18	19	19	23	23	25	25	26	27	27	28	33	54	105
	106	107	108	108	109	110	110	111	111	112	113	114	114							
F.1.2	2	2	3	3	5	5	10	10	11	12	17	17	22	22	28	31	32	32	33	33
	35	104	105	111	114	115	115	117												
F.1.3																				
F.1.4	2	2	3	7	7	10	10	20	104	112	114	116								
F.1.5	4	4	30	31																
F.2.	11	106																		
F.3.																				

Table 9.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

G.				
G.1.				
G.2.	36	10		
		5		
G.3.	10	10		
	4	6		
G.4.				
G.5.	1	1	36	94
G.6.	34	35	35	52
G.7.				
G.8.	72			
G.9.	34	34	36	
G.10	31	32	32	
.				
G.11				
.				
H.				
H.1.				
H.2.				
H.3.				
H.4.				
H.5.				
H.6.				
H.7.				
H.8.				
H.9.				
H.10				
.				
H.11				
.				
H.12				
.				

Table 9.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Low		Medium		High
1		1		2

A.														
A.1.	73:1													
A.2.														
A.3.	55:1	75:1	76:1	98:1										
A.4.	68:1	69:1	70:2	71:1	72:2	91:1	98:1	100:1	101:1	102:1	103:1			
A.5.	43:1	71:1	96:1											
A.6.	37:2	38:2	39:2	40:2	41:2	42:2	44:2	45:1	46:2	48:1	52:2	54:2	56:2	
	57:2	60:2	61:2	62:2	63:2	64:2	65:2	66:2	67:2	70:1	74:2	81:2	83:2	
	84:1	85:2	86:2	87:2	88:2	89:2	90:2	92:2	93:1	97:2				
A.7.														
A.8.														
A.9.	70:1	95:1												
A.10	49:1	50:1												
.														
A.11														
.														
B.														
B.1.														
B.2.	75:1	78:2	79:1	80:2	82:1	84:1								
B.3.														
B.4.	73:1	76:1	77:2	79:1	82:1									
B.5.	43:2	73:1	74:1	76:1	78:1	79:1	80:1	81:1	84:1	100:1				
B.6.														
B.7.														
B.8.														
B.9.														
B.10														
.														
B.11	75:1													
.														
C.														
C.1.														
C.2.														
C.3.														
C.4.														
C.5.														

Table 9.11
 Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
 Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

C.6.													
C.7.													
C.8.													
D.													
D.1.	34:1												
D.2.	94:1	96:1	98:1	99:1	101:1								
D.3.													
D.4.	6:1	20:1	21:1	41:1	44:1	45:1	47:1	48:1	49:1	50:1	58:1	91:1	93:1
	99:1	102:1											
D.5.	42:2	45:1	47:1	48:1	49:2	50:2	51:2	53:2	55:1	57:2	58:1	59:2	68:2
	69:2	72:1	91:1	94:1	95:2	96:1	97:1	99:1	100:2	101:1	102:1	103:2	
D.6.													
E.													
E.1.													
E.2.	116:1	117:1											
E.3.	1:2	106:1	107:1										
E.4.	6:1												
F.	5:2	8:2	9:1	12:1	15:2	16:2	20:2	21:1	24:2	26:1	29:2	30:1	104:1
	109:1	113:1											
F.1.1	9:1	13:2	14:2	18:2	19:2	23:2	25:2	26:1	27:2	28:1	33:1	54:1	105:1
	106:1	107:1	108:2	109:1	110:2	111:1	112:1	113:1	117:1				
F.1.2	2:2	3:2	5:2	10:2	11:1	12:1	17:2	22:2	28:1	31:1	32:2	33:2	35:1
	104:1	105:1	111:1	114:1	115:2	117:1							
F.1.3													
F.1.4	2:2	3:1	7:2	10:2	20:1	104:1	112:1	114:1	116:1				
F.1.5	4:2	30:1	31:1										
F.2.	11:1	106:1											
F.3.													

Table 9.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

G.			
G.1.			
G.2.	36:1	105:1	
G.3.	104:1	106:1	
G.4.			
G.5.	1:2	36:1	94:1
G.6.	34:1	35:2	52:1
G.7.			
G.8.	72:1		
G.9.	34:2	36:1	
G.10	31:1	32:2	
.			
G.11			
.			
H.			
H.1.			
H.2.			
H.3.			
H.4.			
H.5.			
H.6.			
H.7.			
H.8.			
H.9.			
H.10			
.			
H.11			
.			
H.12			
.			

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

Low DOK		Matched DOK		High DOK
1		1		2

A.														
[3]:														
A.1.	73:1													
[3]:	[2]													
A.2.														
[3]:														
A.3.	55:1	75:1	76:1	98:1										
[3]:	[3]	[3]	[2]	[2]										
A.4.	68:1	69:1	70:2	71:1	72:2	91:1	98:1	100:	101:	102:	103:			
[2]:	[2]	[2]	[2.5]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	1[2]	1[2]	1[2]	1[2]			
A.5.	43:1	71:1	96:1											
[3]:	[3]	[3]	[2]											
A.6.	37:2	38:2	39:2	40:2	41:2	42:2	44:2	45:1	46:2	48:1	52:2	54:2	56:2	
[2]:	[3]	[1]	[3]	[1.5]	[1.5]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[1.5]	[3]	[2.5]	[1.5]	[2]	
	57:2	60:2	61:2	62:2	63:2	64:2	65:2	66:2	67:2	70:1	74:2	81:2	83:2	
	[1.5]	[2]	[3]	[1.5]	[2]	[3]	[2]	[3]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[1.5]	
	84:1	85:2	86:2	87:2	88:2	89:2	90:2	92:2	93:1	97:2				
	[2]	[1.5]	[2]	[1.5]	[3]	[3]	[1.5]	[2]	[1]	[2.5]				
A.7.														
[2]:														
A.8.														
[1]:														
A.9.	70:1	95:1												
[3]:	[3]	[3]												
A.10	49:1	50:1												
[3]:	[3]	[3]												
A.11														
[2]:														
B.														
[3]:														
B.1.														
[3]:														
B.2.	75:1	78:2	79:1	80:2	82:1	84:1								
[2]:	[2]	[2.5]	[2]	[2.5]	[2]	[2]								
B.3.														
[3]:														
B.4.	73:1	76:1	77:2	79:1	82:1									

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

[2]:	[2]	[2]	[2.5]	[2]	[2]														
B.5. [3]:	43:2 [2.5]	73:1 [3]	74:1 [2]	76:1 [2]	78:1 [2]	79:1 [2]	80:1 [3]	81:1 [2]	84:1 [3]	100: 1[3]									
B.6. [2]:																			
B.7. [4]:																			
B.8. [4]:																			
B.9. [3]:																			
B.10 [3]:																			
B.11 [3]:	75:1 [2]																		
C. [3]:																			
C.1. [4]:																			
C.2. [3]:																			
C.3. [3]:																			
C.4. [3]:																			
C.5. [2]:																			
C.6. [1]:																			
C.7. [3]:																			
C.8. [2]:																			
D. [3]:																			
D.1. [1]:	34:1 [2]																		
D.2. [2]:	94:1 [2]	96:1 [2]	98:1 [2]	99:1 [2]	101: 1[2]														
D.3. [4]:																			
D.4.	6:1[20:1	21:1	41:1	44:1	45:1	47:1	48:1	49:1	50:1	58:1	91:1	93:1						

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

[2]:	2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[2]	[3]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
	99:1 [2]	102: 1[2]											
D.5. [3]:	42:2 [3]	45:1 [3]	47:1 [2]	48:1 [2]	49:2 [3]	50:2 [2.5]	51:2 [2]	53:2 [2.5]	55:1 [2]	57:2 [1.5]	58:1 [2]	59:2 [2]	68:2 [2.5]
	69:2 [2]	72:1 [2]	91:1 [3]	94:1 [3]	95:2 [2.5]	96:1 [2]	97:1 [2]	99:1 [2]	100: 2[2. 5]	101: 1[2]	102: 1[3]	103: 2[2]	
D.6. [4]:													
E. [4]:													
E.1. [4]:													
E.2. [4]:	116: 1[2]	117: 1[3]											
E.3. [3]:	1:2[3]	106: 1[2]	107: 1[2]										
E.4. [4]:	6:1[2]												
F. [2]:	5:2[2]	8:2[1.5]	9:1[2]	12:1 [1]	15:2 [1.5]	16:2 [1.5]	20:2 [2]	21:1 [1]	24:2 [1.5]	26:1 [2]	29:2 [1.5]	30:1 [2]	104: 1[2]
	109: 1[2]	113: 1[2]											
F.1. 1 [2]:	9:1[2]	13:2 [1.5]	14:2 [2]	18:2 [1.5]	19:2 [1.5]	23:2 [2]	25:2 [1.5]	26:1 [2]	27:2 [2]	28:1 [2]	33:1 [2]	54:1 [1]	105: 1[2]
	106: 1[2]	107: 1[2]	108: 2[2]	109: 1[2]	110: 2[2]	111: 1[2]	112: 1[2]	113: 1[2]	117: 1[2]				
F.1. 2 [3]:	2:2[2]	3:2[2]	5:2[2]	10:2 [1.5]	11:1 [2]	12:1 [2]	17:2 [2]	22:2 [2]	28:1 [2]	31:1 [2]	32:2 [2]	33:2 [2]	35:1 [2]
	104: 1[2]	105: 1[2]	111: 1[2]	114: 1[2]	115: 2[2]	117: 1[3]							
F.1. 3 [1]:													
F.1. 4 [2]:	2:2[2]	3:1[2]	7:2[1.5]	10:2 [1.5]	20:1 [2]	104: 1[2]	112: 1[2]	114: 1[2]	116: 1[2]				
F.1. 5 [2]:	4:2[2]	30:1 [2]	31:1 [2]										

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

F.2. [3]:	11:1 [2]	106: 1[2]	
F.3. [4]:			
G. [3]:			
G.1. [3]:			
G.2. [3]:	36:1 [3]	105: 1[2]	
G.3. [2]:	104: 1[2]	106: 1[2]	
G.4. [3]:			
G.5. [3]:	1:2 [3]	36:1 [2]	94:1 [2]
G.6. [2]:	34:1 [2]	35:2 [2]	52:1 [2]
G.7. [3]:			
G.8. [3]:	72:1 [2]		
G.9. [2]:	34:2 [2]	36:1 [2]	
G.10 [2]:	31:1 [2]	32:2 [2]	
G.11 [4]:			
H. [2]:			
H.1. [2]:			
H.2. [1]:			
H.3. [4]:			
H.4. [1]:			
H.5. [2]:			
H.6. [2]:			

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Secondary Language Arts--Part 1: Equal Weighting

H.7. [2]:
H.8. [2]:
H.9. [3]:
H.10 . [3]:
H.11 . [3]:
H.12 . [4]:

Table 9.1

*Categorical Concurrence Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Two Reviewers
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points
Number of Assessment Items - 117*

Standards		Level by Objective				Hits		Cat. Concurr.
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Level	# of objs by Level	% w/in std by Level	Mean	S.D.	
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	11	11	1 2 3	1 4 6	9 36 54	46	1	YES
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	11	11	2 3 4	3 6 2	27 54 18	13	2	YES
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	8	8	1 2 3 4	1 2 4 1	12 25 50 12	0	0	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening a viewing to informational texts ...	6	6	1 2 3 4	1 2 1 2	16 33 16 33	29	8	YES
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	4	4	3 4	1 3	25 75	18.5	2.5	YES
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	7	8	1 2 3 4	1 3 2 1	14 42 28 14	49.5	1.5	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	11	11	2 3 4	4 6 1	36 54 9	24.5	3.5	YES
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	12	12	1 2 3 4	2 5 3 2	16 41 25 16	0	0	NO
Total	70	71	1 2 3 4	6 23 29 12	8 32 41 17	180.5	13.5	

Table 9.2

Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Two Reviewers

*Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points
Number of Assessment Items - 117*

Standards			Hits		Level of Item w.r.t. Standard						DOK Consistency
					% Under		% At		% Above		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	11	11	46	1	24	32	65	32	12	18	YES
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	11	11	13	2	29	40	57	37	14	24	YES
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening a viewing to informational texts ...	6	6	29	8	21	32	50	34	29	37	YES
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	4	4	18.5	2.5	12	47	88	47	0	0	YES
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	7	8	49.5	1.5	38	39	62	39	0	0	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	11	11	24.5	3.5	18	37	82	37	0	0	YES
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NO
Total	70	71	180.5	13.5	28	39	64	39	8	20	

Table 9.3

*Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence and Balance of Representation Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Two Reviewers
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points
Number of Assessment Items - 117*

Standards			Hits		Range of Objectives				Rng. of Know.	Balance Index				Bal. of Represent.
					# Objs Hit		% of Total			% Hits in Std/Ttl Hits		Index		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	11	11	46	1	5	1	45	9	WEAK	26	1	0.48	0.05	NO
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	11	11	13	2	3.5	0.5	32	5	NO	7	1	0.82	0.06	YES
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	NO	0	0	0	0	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening a viewing to informational texts ...	6	6	29	8	3	0	50	0	YES	16	3	0.64	0.16	WEAK
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	4	4	18.5	2.5	2	1	50	25	YES	10	2	0.74	0.26	YES
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	7	8	49.5	1.5	5.5	0.5	69	6	YES	28	1	0.71	0.02	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	11	11	24.5	3.5	6	0	55	0	YES	14	1	0.46	0.06	NO
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	NO	0	0	0	0	NO
Total	70	71	180.5	13.5	3.12	1.57	38	16		12	8	0.48	0.19	

Table 9.4

Summary of Attainment of Acceptable Alignment Level on Four Content Focus Criteria as Rated by Two Reviewers

*Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points
Number of Assessment Items - 117*

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
A. - PROCESS OF READING: Use reading process skills to comprehend ...	YES	YES	WEAK	NO
B. - LITERATURE AND CULTURE: Use reading, listening, and viewing to understand literature...	YES	YES	NO	YES
C. - LANGUAGE AND IMAGES: Demonstrate understanding of words and images to communicate ...	NO	NO	NO	NO
D. - INFORMATIONAL TEXTS: Apply reading, listening a viewing to informational texts ...	YES	YES	YES	WEAK
E. - PROCESSES OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Demonstrate use of writing skills ...	YES	YES	YES	YES
F. - STANDARD ENGLISH CONVENTIONS: Write and speak correctly ...	YES	YES	YES	YES
G. - SYTLISTIC AND RHETORICAL ASPECTS OF WRITING AND SPEAKING: Use these skills to explore ideas ...	YES	YES	YES	NO
H. - RESEARCH-RELATED WRITING AND SPEAKING: Work, write, and speak effectively when doing research ...	NO	NO	NO	NO

Table 9.5

Source-of-Challenge Issues by Reviewer

Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
8	No objective for verb problems.
8	Standards make no reference to subject-verb agreement.
9	No real objective dealing with parallel structure.
23	Although "D" is probably the choice being looked for, "still" is redundant given the use of "even" earlier in the sentence.
91	None of the possible answers seem to really capture the purpose of the first paragraph.

Table 9.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2
1	3	3
2	2	2
3	2	2
4	2	2
5	2	2
6	2	2
7	2	1
8	1	2
9	2	2
10	1	2
11	2	2
12	1	2
13	1	2
14	2	2
15	1	2
16	1	2
17	2	2
18	1	2
19	1	2
20	2	2
21	1	2
22	2	2
23	2	2
24	1	2
25	1	2
26	2	2
27	2	2
28	2	2
29	1	2
30	2	2
31	2	2
32	2	2
33	2	2
34	2	2
35	2	2
36	3	2
37	3	3
38	1	1
39	3	3
40	2	1

Table 9.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2
41	1	2
42	3	3
43	2	3
44	3	3
45	3	3
46	2	1
47	3	2
48	3	2
49	3	3
50	3	2
51	2	2
52	3	2
53	3	2
54	2	1
55	3	2
56	2	2
57	2	1
58	2	2
59	2	2
60	2	2
61	3	3
62	2	1
63	2	2
64	3	3
65	2	2
66	3	3
67	2	2
68	3	2
69	2	2
70	3	2
71	3	2
72	2	2
73	3	2
74	2	2
75	3	2
76	2	2
77	3	2
78	3	2
79	2	2
80	3	2

Table 9.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2
81	2	2
82	2	2
83	2	1
84	3	2
85	2	1
86	2	2
87	2	1
88	3	3
89	3	3
90	2	1
91	3	2
92	2	2
93	2	1
94	3	2
95	3	2
96	2	2
97	3	2
98	2	2
99	2	2
100	3	2
101	2	2
102	3	2
103	2	2
104	2	2
105	2	2
106	2	2
107	2	2
108	2	2
109	2	2
110	2	2
111	2	2
112	2	2
113	2	2
114	2	2
115	2	2
116	2	2
117	3	2

Intraclass Correlation: 0.535

Pairwise Comparison: 0.5897

Table 9.7

*Notes by Reviewer**Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points*

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
3	This is the second item that is basically a subordination/coordination item with punctuation elements.
5	None of the "F" subpoints deal with verb issues. This is at least partly a verb form issue. Therefore I have coded to the competency rather than the objective.
5	Standards contain no language relating to verb usage.
6	Not a good match with any of the objectives. It deals with parallel structure.
12	Parallel structure again.
15	No specific objective for this verb form item.
15	No standard refers to verb forms.
16	Verb form issue again.
16	Verb tense does not appear in the standards.
20	No error. Student would have to know a number of objectives in "F" to answer correctly.
21	Verb issue again. No objectives address this.
24	The verb issue again. There should be an objective for verb issues.
24	Standards contain no reference to subject-verb agreement.
26	The verb form issue again.
29	Verb issue again.
29	Subject-verb agreement isn't specified in the standards.
30	Involves a number of the "F" objectives.
113	No objective really addresses verb problems.
113	Subject-verb agreement

Table 9.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Item	DOK 0	PObj 0	S1Ob j0	S2Ob j0	DOK 1	PObj 1	S1Ob j1	S2Ob j1
1	3	E.3.	G.5.		3	E.3.	G.5.	
2	2	F.1.2	F.1.4		2	F.1.2	F.1.4	
3	2	F.1.2	F.1.4		2	F.1.2		
4	2	F.1.5			2	F.1.5		
5	2	F.	F.1.2		2	F.	F.1.2	
6	2	E.4.			2	D.4.		
7	2	F.1.4			1	F.1.4		
8	1	F.			2	F.		
9	2	F.			2	F.1.1		
10	1	F.1.2	F.1.4		2	F.1.4	F.1.2	
11	2	F.2.			2	F.1.2		
12	1	F.			2	F.1.2		
13	1	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
14	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
15	1	F.			2	F.		
16	1	F.			2	F.		
17	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.2		
18	1	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
19	1	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
20	2	F.			2	F.	D.4.	F.1.4
21	1	F.			2	D.4.		
22	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.2		
23	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
24	1	F.			2	F.		
25	1	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
26	2	F.			2	F.1.1		
27	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
28	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.2		
29	1	F.			2	F.		
30	2	F.			2	F.1.5		
31	2	F.1.5			2	G.10.	F.1.2	
32	2	G.10.	F.1.2		2	G.10.	F.1.2	
33	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.2	F.1.1	
34	2	G.9.	D.1.		2	G.9.	G.6.	
35	2	G.6.			2	G.6.	F.1.2	
36	3	G.2.			2	G.5.	G.9.	
37	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		

Table 9.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Item	DOK 0	PObj 0	S1Ob j0	S2Ob j0	DOK 1	PObj 1	S1Ob j1	S2Ob j1
38	1	A.6.			1	A.6.		
39	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
40	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
41	1	A.6.			2	A.6.	D.4.	
42	3	D.5.	A.6.		3	A.6.	D.5.	
43	2	B.5.			3	A.5.	B.5.	
44	3	A.6.			3	D.4.	A.6.	
45	3	A.6.			3	D.4.	D.5.	
46	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
47	3	D.4.			2	D.5.		
48	3	A.6.			2	D.4.	D.5.	
49	3	D.5.	A.10.		3	D.4.	D.5.	
50	3	D.5.	A.10.		2	D.5.	D.4.	
51	2	D.5.			2	D.5.		
52	3	A.6.			2	A.6.	G.6.	
53	3	D.5.			2	D.5.		
54	2	A.6.			1	A.6.	F.1.1	
55	3	A.3.			2	D.5.		
56	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
57	2	D.5.	A.6.		1	A.6.	D.5.	
58	2	D.5.			2	D.4.		
59	2	D.5.			2	D.5.		
60	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
61	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
62	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
63	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
64	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
65	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
66	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
67	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
68	3	D.5.			2	D.5.	A.4.	
69	2	D.5.			2	A.4.	D.5.	
70	3	A.9.	A.4.		2	A.6.	A.4.	
71	3	A.5.			2	A.4.		
72	2	A.4.	G.8.		2	A.4.	D.5.	
73	3	B.5.			2	A.1.	B.4.	
74	2	A.6.			2	A.6.	B.5.	

Table 9.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Item	DOK 0	PObj 0	S1Ob j0	S2Ob j0	DOK 1	PObj 1	S1Ob j1	S2Ob j1
75	3	A.3.			2	B.2.	B.11.	
76	2	A.3.			2	B.5.	B.4.	
77	3	B.4.			2	B.4.		
78	3	B.2.			2	B.2.	B.5.	
79	2	B.4.	B.2.		2	B.5.		
80	3	B.2.	B.5.		2	B.2.		
81	2	A.6.			2	A.6.	B.5.	
82	2	B.4.			2	B.2.		
83	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
84	3	B.5.			2	B.2.	A.6.	
85	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
86	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
87	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
88	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
89	3	A.6.			3	A.6.		
90	2	A.6.			1	A.6.		
91	3	D.5.			2	D.4.	A.4.	
92	2	A.6.			2	A.6.		
93	2	D.4.			1	A.6.		
94	3	D.5.			2	D.2.	G.5.	
95	3	D.5.	A.9.		2	D.5.		
96	2	A.5.			2	D.5.	D.2.	
97	3	A.6.			2	D.5.	A.6.	
98	2	A.3.			2	A.4.	D.2.	
99	2	D.5.			2	D.4.	D.2.	
100	3	D.5.	B.5.		2	A.4.	D.5.	
101	2	D.5.			2	D.2.	A.4.	
102	3	D.5.			2	D.4.	A.4.	
103	2	D.5.			2	D.5.	A.4.	
104	2	F.1.2	F.1.4		2	F.	G.3.	
105	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.1	G.2.	
106	2	E.3.	F.2.		2	F.1.1	G.3.	
107	2	E.3.			2	F.1.1		
108	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
109	2	F.			2	F.1.1		
110	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.1		
111	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.1		

Table 9.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Item	DOK 0	PObj 0	S1Ob j0	S2Ob j0	DOK 1	PObj 1	S1Ob j1	S2Ob j1
112	2	F.1.1			2	F.1.4		
113	2	F.			2	F.1.1		
114	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.4		
115	2	F.1.2			2	F.1.2		
116	2	E.2.			2	F.1.4		
117	3	F.1.2	E.2.		2	F.1.1		

Objective Pairwise Comparison: 0.5678

Standard Pairwise Comparison: 0.7237

Table 9.9

Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers

Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Low		Medium		High
2		3.08547		64

1	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.
	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	
	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	
	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	E.3.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	
	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	
	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	
	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	G.5.	
2	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	F.1. 4	F.1. 4						
3	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	F.1. 4							
4	F.1. 5	F.1. 5								
5	F.	F.	F.1. 2	F.1. 2						
6	D.4.	E.4.								
7	F.1. 4	F.1. 4								
8	F.	F.								
9	F.	F.1. 1								
10	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	F.1. 4	F.1. 4						
11	F.1. 2	F.2.								
12	F.	F.1. 2								
13	F.1. 1	F.1. 1								
14	F.1. 1	F.1. 1								
15	F.	F.								
16	F.	F.								
17	F.1. 2	F.1. 2								
18	F.1. 1	F.1. 1								
19	F.1.	F.1.								

Table 9.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

	1	1		
20	D.4.	F.	F.	F.1. 4
21	D.4.	F.		
22	F.1. 2	F.1. 2		
23	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
24	F.	F.		
25	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
26	F.	F.1. 1		
27	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
28	F.1. 1	F.1. 2		
29	F.	F.		
30	F.	F.1. 5		
31	F.1. 2	F.1. 5	G.10 .	
32	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	G.10 .	G.10 .
33	F.1. 1	F.1. 2	F.1. 2	
34	D.1.	G.6.	G.9.	G.9.
35	F.1. 2	G.6.	G.6.	
36	G.2.	G.5.	G.9.	
37	A.6.	A.6.		
38	A.6.	A.6.		
39	A.6.	A.6.		
40	A.6.	A.6.		
41	A.6.	A.6.	D.4.	
42	A.6.	A.6.	D.5.	D.5.
43	A.5.	B.5.	B.5.	
44	A.6.	A.6.	D.4.	
45	A.6.	D.4.	D.5.	
46	A.6.	A.6.		
47	D.4.	D.5.		
48	A.6.	D.4.	D.5.	
49	A.10	D.4.	D.5.	D.5.

Table 9.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

	.			
50	A.10	D.4.	D.5.	D.5.
51	D.5.	D.5.		
52	A.6.	A.6.	G.6.	
53	D.5.	D.5.		
54	A.6.	A.6.	F.1.	
			1	
55	A.3.	D.5.		
56	A.6.	A.6.		
57	A.6.	A.6.	D.5.	D.5.
58	D.4.	D.5.		
59	D.5.	D.5.		
60	A.6.	A.6.		
61	A.6.	A.6.		
62	A.6.	A.6.		
63	A.6.	A.6.		
64	A.6.	A.6.		
65	A.6.	A.6.		
66	A.6.	A.6.		
67	A.6.	A.6.		
68	A.4.	D.5.	D.5.	
69	A.4.	D.5.	D.5.	
70	A.4.	A.4.	A.6.	A.9.
71	A.4.	A.5.		
72	A.4.	A.4.	D.5.	G.8.
73	A.1.	B.4.	B.5.	
74	A.6.	A.6.	B.5.	
75	A.3.	B.2.	B.11	
			.	
76	A.3.	B.4.	B.5.	
77	B.4.	B.4.		
78	B.2.	B.2.	B.5.	
79	B.2.	B.4.	B.5.	
80	B.2.	B.2.	B.5.	
81	A.6.	A.6.	B.5.	
82	B.2.	B.4.		
83	A.6.	A.6.		
84	A.6.	B.2.	B.5.	
85	A.6.	A.6.		
86	A.6.	A.6.		
87	A.6.	A.6.		

Table 9.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

88	A.6.	A.6.		
89	A.6.	A.6.		
90	A.6.	A.6.		
91	A.4.	D.4.	D.5.	
92	A.6.	A.6.		
93	A.6.	D.4.		
94	D.2.	D.5.	G.5.	
95	A.9.	D.5.	D.5.	
96	A.5.	D.2.	D.5.	
97	A.6.	A.6.	D.5.	
98	A.3.	A.4.	D.2.	
99	D.2.	D.4.	D.5.	
100	A.4.	B.5.	D.5.	D.5.
101	A.4.	D.2.	D.5.	
102	A.4.	D.4.	D.5.	
103	A.4.	D.5.	D.5.	
104	F.	F.1. 2	F.1. 4	G.3.
105	F.1. 1	F.1. 2	G.2.	
106	E.3.	F.1. 1	F.2.	G.3.
107	E.3.	F.1. 1		
108	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
109	F.	F.1. 1		
110	F.1. 1	F.1. 1		
111	F.1. 1	F.1. 2		
112	F.1. 1	F.1. 4		
113	F.	F.1. 1		
114	F.1. 2	F.1. 4		
115	F.1.	F.1.		

Table 9.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

5	2	2	
11 6	E.2.	F.1. 4	
11 7	E.2.	F.1. 1	F.1. 2

Table 9.10

Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective

Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Low		Medium		High
0		4.56962		67

A.																				
A.1.	73																			
A.2.																				
A.3.	55	75	76	98																
A.4.	68	69	70	70	71	72	72	91	98	10	10	10	10							
A.5.	43	71	96																	
A.6.	37	37	38	38	39	39	40	40	41	41	42	42	44	44	45	46	46	48	52	52
	54	54	56	56	57	57	60	60	61	61	62	62	63	63	64	64	65	65	66	
	66	67	67	70	74	74	81	81	83	83	84	85	85	86	86	87	87	88	88	
	89	89	90	90	92	92	93	97	97											
A.7.																				
A.8.																				
A.9.	70	95																		
A.10	49	50																		
A.11																				
.																				
B.																				
B.1.																				
B.2.	75	78	78	79	80	80	82	84												
B.3.																				
B.4.	73	76	77	77	79	82														
B.5.	43	43	73	74	76	78	79	80	81	84	10	0								
B.6.																				
B.7.																				
B.8.																				
B.9.																				
B.10																				
.																				
B.11	75																			
.																				
C.																				
C.1.																				
C.2.																				
C.3.																				
C.4.																				

Table 9.10
 Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
 Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

C.5.																				
C.6.																				
C.7.																				
C.8.																				
D.																				
D.1.	34																			
D.2.	94	96	98	99	101															
D.3.																				
D.4.	6	20	21	41	44	45	47	48	49	50	58	91	93	99	102					
D.5.	42	42	45	47	48	49	49	50	50	51	51	53	53	55	57	57	58	59	59	68
	68	69	69	72	91	94	95	95	96	97	99	100	100	101	102	103	103			
D.6.																				
E.																				
E.1.																				
E.2.	116	117																		
E.3.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	106	107						
E.4.	6																			
F.	5	5	8	8	9	12	15	15	16	16	20	20	21	24	24	26	29	29	30	104
	109	113																		
F.1.1	9	13	13	14	14	18	18	19	19	23	23	25	25	26	27	27	28	33	54	105
	106	107	108	108	109	110	110	111	111	112	113	117								
F.1.2	2	2	3	3	5	5	10	10	11	12	17	17	22	22	28	31	32	32	33	33
	35	104	105	111	114	115	115	117												
F.1.3																				
F.1.4	2	2	3	7	7	10	10	20	104	112	114	116								
F.1.5	4	4	30	31																
F.2.	11	106																		

Table 9.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
 Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Low		Medium		High										
1		1		2										
A.														
A.1.	73:1													
A.2.														
A.3.	55:1	75:1	76:1	98:1										
A.4.	68:1	69:1	70:2	71:1	72:2	91:1	98:1	100:1	101:1	102:1	103:1			
A.5.	43:1	71:1	96:1											
A.6.	37:2	38:2	39:2	40:2	41:2	42:2	44:2	45:1	46:2	48:1	52:2	54:2	56:2	
	57:2	60:2	61:2	62:2	63:2	64:2	65:2	66:2	67:2	70:1	74:2	81:2	83:2	
	84:1	85:2	86:2	87:2	88:2	89:2	90:2	92:2	93:1	97:2				
A.7.														
A.8.														
A.9.	70:1	95:1												
A.10	49:1	50:1												
.														
A.11														
.														
B.														
B.1.														
B.2.	75:1	78:2	79:1	80:2	82:1	84:1								
B.3.														
B.4.	73:1	76:1	77:2	79:1	82:1									
B.5.	43:2	73:1	74:1	76:1	78:1	79:1	80:1	81:1	84:1	100:1				
B.6.														
B.7.														
B.8.														
B.9.														
B.10														
.														
B.11	75:1													
.														
C.														
C.1.														
C.2.														
C.3.														
C.4.														
C.5.														

Table 9.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)

Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

C.6.													
C.7.													
C.8.													
D.													
D.1.	34:1												
D.2.	94:1	96:1	98:1	99:1	101:1								
D.3.													
D.4.	6:1	20:1	21:1	41:1	44:1	45:1	47:1	48:1	49:1	50:1	58:1	91:1	93:1
	99:1	102:1											
D.5.	42:2	45:1	47:1	48:1	49:2	50:2	51:2	53:2	55:1	57:2	58:1	59:2	68:2
	69:2	72:1	91:1	94:1	95:2	96:1	97:1	99:1	100:2	101:1	102:1	103:2	
D.6.													
E.													
E.1.													
E.2.	116:1	117:1											
E.3.	1:32	106:1	107:1										
E.4.	6:1												
F.	5:2	8:2	9:1	12:1	15:2	16:2	20:2	21:1	24:2	26:1	29:2	30:1	104:1
	109:1	113:1											
F.1.1	9:1	13:2	14:2	18:2	19:2	23:2	25:2	26:1	27:2	28:1	33:1	54:1	105:1
	106:1	107:1	108:2	109:1	110:2	111:1	112:1	113:1	117:1				
F.1.2	2:2	3:2	5:2	10:2	11:1	12:1	17:2	22:2	28:1	31:1	32:2	33:2	35:1
	104:1	105:1	111:1	114:1	115:2	117:1							
F.1.3													
F.1.4	2:2	3:1	7:2	10:2	20:1	104:1	112:1	114:1	116:1				
F.1.5	4:2	30:1	31:1										
F.2.	11:1	106:1											
F.3.													

Table 9.11

*Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points*

G.			
G.1.			
G.2.	36:1	105:1	
G.3.	104:1	106:1	
G.4.			
G.5.	1:32	36:1	94:1
G.6.	34:1	35:2	52:1
G.7.			
G.8.	72:1		
G.9.	34:2	36:1	
G.10	31:1	32:2	
.			
G.11			
.			
H.			
H.1.			
H.2.			
H.3.			
H.4.			
H.5.			
H.6.			
H.7.			
H.8.			
H.9.			
H.10			
.			
H.11			
.			
H.12			
.			

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

Low DOK		Matched DOK		High DOK
1		1		2

A.														
[3]:														
A.1.	73:1													
[3]:	[2]													
A.2.														
[3]:														
A.3.	55:1	75:1	76:1	98:1										
[3]:	[3]	[3]	[2]	[2]										
A.4.	68:1	69:1	70:2	71:1	72:2	91:1	98:1	100:	101:	102:	103:			
[2]:	[2]	[2]	[2.5]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	1[2]	1[2]	1[2]	1[2]			
A.5.	43:1	71:1	96:1											
[3]:	[3]	[3]	[2]											
A.6.	37:2	38:2	39:2	40:2	41:2	42:2	44:2	45:1	46:2	48:1	52:2	54:2	56:2	
[2]:	[3]	[1]	[3]	[1.5]	[1.5]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[1.5]	[3]	[2.5]	[1.5]	[2]	
	57:2	60:2	61:2	62:2	63:2	64:2	65:2	66:2	67:2	70:1	74:2	81:2	83:2	
	[1.5]	[2]	[3]	[1.5]	[2]	[3]	[2]	[3]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[1.5]	
	84:1	85:2	86:2	87:2	88:2	89:2	90:2	92:2	93:1	97:2				
	[2]	[1.5]	[2]	[1.5]	[3]	[3]	[1.5]	[2]	[1]	[2.5]				
A.7.														
[2]:														
A.8.														
[1]:														
A.9.	70:1	95:1												
[3]:	[3]	[3]												
A.10	49:1	50:1												
[3]:	[3]	[3]												
A.11														
[2]:														
B.														
[3]:														
B.1.														
[3]:														
B.2.	75:1	78:2	79:1	80:2	82:1	84:1								
[2]:	[2]	[2.5]	[2]	[2.5]	[2]	[2]								
B.3.														
[3]:														
B.4.	73:1	76:1	77:2	79:1	82:1									

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

[2]:	[2]	[2]	[2.5]	[2]	[2]									
B.5. [3]:	43:2 [2.5]	73:1 [3]	74:1 [2]	76:1 [2]	78:1 [2]	79:1 [2]	80:1 [3]	81:1 [2]	84:1 [3]	100: 1[3]				
B.6. [2]:														
B.7. [4]:														
B.8. [4]:														
B.9. [3]:														
B.10 [3]:														
B.11 [3]:	75:1 [2]													
C. [3]:														
C.1. [4]:														
C.2. [3]:														
C.3. [3]:														
C.4. [3]:														
C.5. [2]:														
C.6. [1]:														
C.7. [3]:														
C.8. [2]:														
D. [3]:														
D.1. [1]:	34:1 [2]													
D.2. [2]:	94:1 [2]	96:1 [2]	98:1 [2]	99:1 [2]	101: 1[2]									
D.3. [4]:														
D.4.	6:1[20:1	21:1	41:1	44:1	45:1	47:1	48:1	49:1	50:1	58:1	91:1	93:1	

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

[2]:	2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[2]	[3]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
	99:1 [2]	102: 1[2]											
D.5. [3]:	42:2 [3]	45:1 [3]	47:1 [2]	48:1 [2]	49:2 [3]	50:2 [2.5]	51:2 [2]	53:2 [2.5]	55:1 [2]	57:2 [1.5]	58:1 [2]	59:2 [2]	68:2 [2.5]
	69:2 [2]	72:1 [2]	91:1 [3]	94:1 [3]	95:2 [2.5]	96:1 [2]	97:1 [2]	99:1 [2]	100: 2[2. 5]	101: 1[2]	102: 1[3]	103: 2[2]	
D.6. [4]:													
E. [4]:													
E.1. [4]:													
E.2. [4]:	116: 1[2]	117: 1[3]											
E.3. [3]:	1:32 [3]	106: 1[2]	107: 1[2]										
E.4. [4]:	6:1[2]												
F. [2]:	5:2[2]	8:2[1.5]	9:1[2]	12:1 [1]	15:2 [1.5]	16:2 [1.5]	20:2 [2]	21:1 [1]	24:2 [1.5]	26:1 [2]	29:2 [1.5]	30:1 [2]	104: 1[2]
	109: 1[2]	113: 1[2]											
F.1. 1 [2]:	9:1[2]	13:2 [1.5]	14:2 [2]	18:2 [1.5]	19:2 [1.5]	23:2 [2]	25:2 [1.5]	26:1 [2]	27:2 [2]	28:1 [2]	33:1 [2]	54:1 [1]	105: 1[2]
	106: 1[2]	107: 1[2]	108: 2[2]	109: 1[2]	110: 2[2]	111: 1[2]	112: 1[2]	113: 1[2]	117: 1[2]				
F.1. 2 [3]:	2:2[2]	3:2[2]	5:2[2]	10:2 [1.5]	11:1 [2]	12:1 [2]	17:2 [2]	22:2 [2]	28:1 [2]	31:1 [2]	32:2 [2]	33:2 [2]	35:1 [2]
	104: 1[2]	105: 1[2]	111: 1[2]	114: 1[2]	115: 2[2]	117: 1[3]							
F.1. 3 [1]:													
F.1. 4 [2]:	2:2[2]	3:1[2]	7:2[1.5]	10:2 [1.5]	20:1 [2]	104: 1[2]	112: 1[2]	114: 1[2]	116: 1[2]				
F.1. 5 [2]:	4:2[2]	30:1 [2]	31:1 [2]										

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

F.2. [3]:	11:1 [2]	106: 1[2]	
F.3. [4]:			
G. [3]:			
G.1. [3]:			
G.2. [3]:	36:1 [3]	105: 1[2]	
G.3. [2]:	104: 1[2]	106: 1[2]	
G.4. [3]:			
G.5. [3]:	1:32 [3]	36:1 [2]	94:1 [2]
G.6. [2]:	34:1 [2]	35:2 [2]	52:1 [2]
G.7. [3]:			
G.8. [3]:	72:1 [2]		
G.9. [2]:	34:2 [2]	36:1 [2]	
G.10 [2]:	31:1 [2]	32:2 [2]	
G.11 [4]:			
H. [2]:			
H.1. [2]:			
H.2. [1]:			
H.3. [4]:			
H.4. [1]:			
H.5. [2]:			
H.6. [2]:			

Table 9.12

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Maine Grade 9 Language Arts--Part 2: Writing Sample Weighted 16 Points

H.7. [2]:
H.8. [2]:
H.9. [3]:
H.10 . [3]:
H.11 . [3]:
H.12 . [4]:

