

North Dakota Standards and Assessment Development Protocols

November, 2002

**North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
Dr. Wayne G. Sanstead, State Superintendent
600 East Boulevard
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440**

**North Dakota Standards and Assessments
Development Protocols**

Contents

I. Introduction	4
II. Process Protocols for Content and Achievement Standards	6
A. Standards Development Governance	6
B. Writing Team Supervision	9
C. Writing Team Membership	10
III. Content Protocols for Content and Achievement Standards	11
State Content Standards	
A. Title	11
B. Authorship	11
C. Revision Date	11
D. Department of Public Instruction Seal	11
E. Copyright Notification	11
F. Identification of Project Director, Consultants, Staff	12
G. Publication Availability	12
H. Table of Contents	12
I. Preface	12
J. Intended Audience	13
K. Definitions	13
L. Standards Listing	14
M. Content Standards Structure	15
N. Content Standards Format	15
O. Standards and Benchmarks Summary	17
P. Equity	17
Q. Features	17
State Achievement Standards	17
A. Performance Levels	17
B. Reporting References	17
C. Achievement Standards Forms	17

IV. Process Protocols for Assessments	19
A. Assessment Development Governance	19
B. Assessment Development Supervision.....	19
C. Assessment Development Team Membership.....	20
D. Legal and Technical Requirements.....	21
E. Design Criteria	21
F. Assessed Subjects.....	22
G. Testing Schedule	22
H. State Accountability System.....	23
V. Appendix	
A. Development Schedule for Content and Achievement Standards, All Subjects, Grades 4, 8, and 12.....	25
B. Development Schedule Grade-level Content Expectations, Mathematics and English Language Arts, Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7	26
C. Development Schedule for Achievement Standards, Mathematics and English Language Arts, Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7	28
D. Development Schedule for Grade-level Content Expectations, Science, Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7	30
E. Development Schedule for Achievement Standards, Science, Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.....	32
F. Development and Implementation Schedule for State Assessments, Mathematics, Reading/English Language Arts, and Science, Grades 3-8 and 12	34
G. Development Schedule for Assessment Options For English Language Learners	38
H. Development Schedule for State Alternate Assessment.....	39
I. North Dakota State Assessment Waiver Agreement Plan, Implementation Schedule, 2001-03.....	40
J. Content Standards Formats by Grade (a) and Subtopic (b).....	53
K. Budget Framework	55
L. Technical Assistance Reference Guides	57

North Dakota Standards and Assessments Development Protocols

I. Introduction

As a matter of both philosophy and policy, the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction believes that public education stakeholders need to agree upon “what students should know and be able to do.” State law (NDCC 15.1-04-03) places responsibility for the writing of state academic standards with the State Superintendent. State law (NDCC 15.1-04-04; 15.1-21-08) also places responsibility with the State Superintendent for the supervision of State assessments that are based on the State’s academic standards. To this end, the Department assumes the responsibility to engage the State’s stakeholders, through a clearly articulated process, in developing academic standards and aligned assessments that reflect what-is-worth-learning and, thus, what-is-worth-teaching in North Dakota classrooms.

The North Dakota State content and achievement standards offer guidance in core curriculum areas while, at the same time, they allow for, indeed *encourage*, a dynamic and living curriculum created at the local school district level. To assure educational relevance, the North Dakota State content and achievement standards are based on academic standards developed nationally by professional education associations, periodically *revised* as suggested by classroom and community experiences and expectations, and widely *supported* by state and national education policymakers.

While the North Dakota State content and achievement standards represent an official, statewide reference point for content and proficiency, local school districts are encouraged to use the State’s academic standards as guides in the development of local, homegrown, or customized curriculum in the core content areas. Put another way, standards-based education requires that a community agree upon what a worthwhile K-12 educational experience should look like in the classroom and what skills and abilities students should have upon leaving high school. This is what a standards-based education means.

State academic standards assure that school districts will offer all their students a comparably challenging education. Assuring comparable educational opportunity is a primary responsibility of a State education system. To hold schools accountable for the educational services they offer, the State has developed an assessment system that is designed to measure student performance in terms of these State standards. The Department seeks to engage stakeholders in the development and performance reporting of a valid and reliable assessment system. To ensure that the State’s accountability system engenders confidence among all constituents, the Department has established a system of prescribed activities that are designed to assure procedural validity and reliability, product quality, and systemic integrity. The Department, with the assistance of professional educators from across the State, has developed these

process and content protocols to articulate the governing rules for the development of State academic standards and assessments.

In the sections outlined below, the *North Dakota Standards and Assessment Development Protocols* identify what Department staff and design teams will follow regarding the staffing, design process, formatting, and content of all documents. To the extent that protocols define, clarify, assure consistency and quality, and engender confidence in a process and its products, there lies the ultimate value and success of the document.

II. Process Protocols for Content and Achievement Standards

- A. *Standards Development Governance.* The *Standards, Assessments, Learning and Teaching (SALT) Team* advises the Department of Public Instruction regarding the initiation, funding, monitoring, evaluation, and approval of all State content and achievement standards (hereafter referred to as standards). The Department of Public Instruction (hereafter referred to as Department) supervises all activities related to the development and implementation of all standards, with the consultation of the SALT Team. The State Superintendent approves the funding of all standards activity and the final acceptance of all standards documents.
1. *Subject-area Development.* The SALT Team will review any proposal to develop subject standards and recommend a plan of action to the Department. The Department will review the SALT Team recommendation, conduct an independent review, and make a final determination. The Department will supervise the drafting and implementation of any project plan.

The Department will develop standards in the subject areas listed below:

- a. The Arts
 - (1) Dance
 - (2) Drama
 - (3) Music
 - (4) Visual Arts
- b. English language arts
- c. Foreign languages
- d. Health
- e. Library/Technology literacy
- f. Mathematics
- g. Physical Education
- h. Science
- i. Social Studies/Sciences
 - (1) History
 - (2) Political Science
 - (3) Economics
 - (4) Social Studies Resources
 - (5) Civics
 - (6) Geography
 - (7) Culture
 - (8) Sociology and Psychology
 - (9) Tribal Sovereignty

While various professional education groups representing subject areas may publish their own standards or curriculum guidelines, these documents will not bear the seal of approval of the State Superintendent.

In the event that a standards design team believes that current protocols are inappropriate or appear not to accommodate a particular content area, the SALT Team will make a recommendation to the Department regarding variances from the established protocols. The Department will review the SALT Team recommendation, conduct an independent review, and make a final determination. The Department will draft a revised development plan.

After a draft of a standards document is received from a standards design team, the SALT Team will review the document and prepare a recommendation regarding acceptance, rejection, or revision to the Department. The Department will review the SALT Team recommendation, conduct an independent review, and make a final determination. The State Superintendent will approve any final draft of a standards document.

2. *Grade-level Development.* The Department will establish State-defined content and achievement standards for grades K-8 and 12.
3. *Development Cycle.* All standards will evolve through a three-phase development cycle including activities related to drafting, dissemination, implementation, professional development, and feedback.
 - (a) *Development and Dissemination.* Within the first phase of the project the following activities are conducted:
 - (1) the project is proposed;
 - (2) the project director is appointed;
 - (3) the design team is selected, contracted, convened and trained. Training will include an overview of the State's development protocols, expectations of team members and an introduction to the structure, format, and content of State content and achievement standards;
 - (4) the initial drafts are written, reviewed, revised, and distributed to stakeholder groups for review and comment;

- (5) the final draft is prepared for approval and placement on the Department website.
 - (b) *Approval and Implementation.* Within the approval and implementation phase, the following activities are conducted:
 - (1) the State Superintendent approves the final standards document;
 - (2) the standards document is disseminated electronically to all school districts, libraries, universities, and other essential organizations;
 - (3) the Department offers technical assistance to school districts regarding the use of the standards document;
 - (4) the school districts begin the process of drafting local standards and curriculum that are aligned to the State standards document.
 - (c) *Professional Development and Feedback.* Within the professional development and feedback phase, the following activities are conducted:
 - (1) teachers and administrators use the standards document as the basis for standards-based professional development as required by federal and state law and best practice;
 - (2) teachers and administrators incorporate the standards documents into their improvement planning;
 - (3) teachers and administrators submit recommendations to the Department regarding improvements for future standards document drafting. Continual feedback on the effectiveness of the standards document will be ongoing through regional and statewide education conferences, graduate programs, and long-term local curriculum mapping and development initiatives.
4. *Budget Resources.* The Department will fund all approved standards development activity.
 5. *Recommendations for Approval.* All SALT Team recommendations regarding the final acceptance of a standards document will be forwarded to the State Superintendent for approval.

6. *Project Supervision.* The Department assumes full responsibility for the supervision and administration of all standards writing projects.

The SALT Team will monitor the progress, focus, balance of effort, and budget of any writing team's work. The SALT Team may recommend specific technical assistance be provided to any writing team deemed in need to further the integrity of the writing process. The SALT Team may recommend changes in funding levels, including the termination of funding with sufficient cause.

The Department will review and determine all SALT Team recommendations. The Department assumes full responsibility for all writing projects.

- B. *Writing Team Supervision.* The Department is responsible for the supervision of all standards projects. The SALT Team will advise the Department regarding the formation and selection of writing team members, the project director, the content specialist and the project evaluator.

1. *Project Director.* The Department will appoint a project director to supervise the standards project's activities.
2. *Content Specialist.* The Department will contract with a content specialist to assist the project director and writing team regarding content and formatting matters.
3. *Project Evaluator.* The Department will contract with an independent external evaluator to review the content and formatting of the standards document to assure subject-matter competence and adherence to State protocols.

- C. *Writing Team Membership.* The SALT Team, the Department, and the project director will apply the following principles in the formation of a subject writing team's membership.

1. *Size.* The size of writing teams should be sufficient to ensure approximately 8-10 individuals per grade level.
2. *Balanced Representation.* General consideration will be given for a balanced representation of interests, including:
 - a. School size
 - b. Gender
 - c. Geographic representation

- d. Public school/private school (K-12 and post-secondary)
 - e. Special education
 - f. Cultural diversity
 - g. Library/technology literacy
 - h. Higher education teacher preparation programs
 - i. Post-secondary content specialists
 - j. Non-educator, field content practitioner
3. *Contracts.* The Department will issue contracts to all members of a standards writing team. The project director will supervise the team members. All team members will be held accountable to the provisions of the contract and may be dismissed for failure to meet these provisions. The contract will specify the following:
- a. *Project Responsibilities and Expectations.* All activities, professional development, expectations, time demands, the level of participation, and restrictions required of the team member;
 - b. *Expenses.* All expenses of writing team members incurred related to the work of the project, including substitute teacher costs, will be reimbursed at State rates;
 - c. *Stipends.* Stipends for writing team members will be provided at State rates;
 - d. *Project Accountability.* All attributes of a team member required, including adherence to State protocols, respect for team members and the writing process, and project director expectations.

III. Content Protocols for Content Standards

In order to achieve uniformity of content and format, the following items will be included in any content standard developed.

State Content Standards

A. *Title*

All standards documents will be titled to align closely to the following model: *North Dakota (Subject Listed Here) Content and Achievement Standards*. An example of a standards document would read: *North Dakota English Language Arts Content and Achievement Standards*.

B. *Authorship*

The State Superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction authorizes all standards. As such, all standards will include notation as follows: *North Dakota Department of Public Instruction; (State Superintendent's name), State Superintendent; Bismarck, North Dakota*.

C. *Revision Date*

All standards should clearly list the latest revision date. The revision date will identify all subsequent writing revisions. Once a standards document is replaced with a newer revision, the older draft must be archived and all dissemination of the older draft must cease.

D. *Department of Public Instruction Seal*

To further identify the authorship of a standard document, the seal of the Department of Public Instruction will be placed on the cover of all standards documents.

E. *Copyright Notification*

All standards documents will include the following copyright notation:

Copyright (Year) by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, 600 East Boulevard Avenue, Bismarck, ND 58505-0440

Permission to reproduce this material is granted for home, classroom, and workshop use. For all other purposes, please request permission in writing from the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.

This project was funded wholly or in part by (cite funding source here). Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of (cite funding source here), or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

No person shall, on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, religion, age or handicapping condition, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

F. *Identification of Project Director, Content Specialist, Staff, and Writing Team Members, and Consultants.*

All standards documents will identify the project director, content specialist, project evaluator, and all contracted consultants. The standards document also will identify all Department staff that contributed in a substantial manner by name and title.

G. *Publication Availability*

All standards documents are available online at the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction website:
<http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/standards>.

H. *Table of Contents*

All standards documents will list a table of contents, which outlines in sufficient detail the contents of the document. All items listed below should be included within the document, unless content dictates otherwise and the Department, based on SALT Team recommendation, approves its omission.

I. *Preface*

All standards documents should contain a preface, which presents an overview of the document's purpose, supporting state initiatives, or other background information. A statement of purpose develops the fundamental concepts which best describe the rationale, goals, or purpose developed within the standards document. Such comments might address any of the following or additional items as seems appropriate: (1) develop student knowledge and skills; (2) design curriculum and guide instructional resource selection; (3) and equity.

In the event that a new standards document format or structure is introduced, the preface should overview the need and rationale for any changes that might be introduced. Effort should be made to underscore the evolutionary nature of standards and to evidence continuity between

past practice and future use.

All standards documents will indicate national documents or reports, other states' documents or reports, or other studies or reports referenced in the opening sections of the standards document that establish the vision and define the conceptual foundation for the standards, and that cite legislation/funding initiatives.

J. *Intended Audience*

All standards documents serve a dedicated purpose and address a dedicated audience of educators. Reference should be made to the different types of readers who will be using the document. Identify the groups that the standards were designed most directly to inform, assist, or advise. These groups include (1) teachers in all subjects and in all grades or special settings; (2) school and district curriculum planners, designers, or writers; (3) school administrators at school sites and central office levels. Identify also secondary users who may reference the standards document to gain information on policy regarding curriculum and standards setting, e.g., school board members and the public. Address each respective audience to clarify the purpose of the document in relevant terms.

K. *Definitions*

All standards documents should define a list of terms used throughout the document, which are technical in nature or carry important distinctions. If a term might be further clarified with an example, one should be supplied.

Terms defined in a glossary will be indicated by an asterisk (*) the first time the term appears in the text of a particular standards document. Writing Teams should keep technical or specialized terms to a minimum.

Although additional terms may be added, the following terms should be included in the content standards and achievement standards documents following the Table of Contents.

CONTENT STANDARDS DEFINITIONS

- **Content Standard.** *A description of what students should know and be able to do within a particular content discipline or subject.*
- **Subtopic.** *A category within a content standard that aids in the organization of benchmark expectations and that may carry across grade levels.*

- **Benchmark Expectation.** *A translation of a standard into what students should know and be able to do at developmentally appropriate levels or grade levels. A statement that clearly specifies and itemizes the content of a standard at a specific grade level.*
- **Proficiency Descriptor.** *A definition of what a student knows and can do to demonstrate proficiency for each benchmark expectation.*

The standards, topics, and benchmark expectations will be numbered (coded) for purposes of reference, and not necessarily in importance of rank. See M below.

ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS DEFINITIONS

- **Achievement Standard.** *A description of what a student knows and can do to demonstrate proficiency on a content standard. An achievement standard is also known as a performance standard. Descriptors for achievement are set at four levels and are defined as follows:*
 1. **Advanced Proficient.** *Demonstrates exemplary understanding and exceeds expected level of performance.*
 2. **Proficient.** *Demonstrates understanding and meets expected level of performance.*
 3. **Partially Proficient.** *Demonstrates an emerging or developing level of understanding and performance.*
 4. **Novice.** *Attempt made; however, lack of understanding and performance evident.*
- **Exemplars.** *Examples of student work that illustrate the range of performance in a content area within each performance level.*
- **Cut Scores.** *Scale score points on an assessment that separate one level of achievement from another.*

L. Standards Listing.

All standards documents should present a summary listing of the

standards developed in the document, without reference to benchmark expectations. This listing should appear following the definitions and prior to the actual standards development.

M. *Content Standards Structure*

All content standards documents should present each content standard, benchmark expectations, and proficiency descriptors.

Content Standards. Content standards should be composed in simple declarative statements. A content standard's level of specificity is variable based on the subject area; nevertheless, effort should be made to maintain a parity or balance among all subject areas. Accordingly, each standards document should have sufficient standards so that students and teachers can realistically meet the expectations required within a particular content area.

Subtopics. The selection of subtopics, as an organizational tool, should be determined by the content specialist and the writing team members. The selection of subtopics should be based on research conducted on external documents and past State standards.

Benchmark Expectations. Benchmark expectations should itemize and be inclusive of all knowledge and skills to be taught. Since benchmark expectations will be the primary reference for future assessment development, benchmark expectations should be extensive and exhaustive of content that should be taught and thus potentially assessed.

Proficiency Descriptor. All benchmarks should include a general proficiency descriptor to define expected student achievement.

Refer to Appendix J to identify the components of a content standard and the proper placement and formatting of each component. Given the complexity and variability encountered in the writing process, writing teams should consult the reference guides listed within Appendix L for guidance and editing rules.

N. *Content Standards Format.* A content standard will be drafted in the following format.

1. *Heading.* A standard will be introduced by an overall page heading that identifies the standard's number within the subject and a short descriptive title (e.g., "*Standard 8: History and Nature of Science*").

2. *Content Standards Description.* The standard will be described succinctly in terms of students' expected knowledge or skill (e.g., "Students understand the history and nature of science").
3. *Numbering.* Each standard and benchmark expectation will conform to a prescribed numbering system.
 - a. *Standard.* A standard will be identified uniquely by a prescribed two-digit nomenclature (e.g., "8.8"). The first digit refers to the grade level (e.g., *grade 8*). The second digit refers to the standard's listing within the subject (e.g., *the eighth standard*).
 - b. *Benchmark.* A benchmark will be identified uniquely by a prescribed three-digit nomenclature (e.g., "8.8.2"). The first digit refers to the grade level (e.g., *grade 8*). The second digit refers to the standard's listing within the subject (e.g., *the eighth standard*). The third digit refers to the benchmark's listing within the standard (e.g., *the second benchmark within the eighth standard*).
 - c. *Subtopics.* Since subtopics only organize benchmark expectations within a standard and identify no specific knowledge or skill, subtopics will carry no uniquely identifiable number.
4. *Significant Disabilities Modifications.* All students are to be taught to the State's challenging standards. In the course of instruction and assessment, it may be appropriate to modify benchmark expectations for students with significant disabilities. Modification is not a proper activity for students without significant disabilities. Teachers, other support staff, and parents may design unique benchmark expectation modifications that would be beneficial for students with significant disabilities. Any such modifications and other appropriate accommodations must be referenced within the student's individual education plan. The North Dakota Alternate Assessment for students with significant disabilities will accommodate these modifications as an element of the student's standards-based State Assessment.

As a matter of policy, no State standards writing team may develop or include modified benchmark expectations within a State content standards document. The modification of any benchmark expectation is the proper role of a local individual education plan committee only.

Each State content standards document must include a section that outlines the responsibilities of local IEP teams in modifying benchmark expectations for students with significant disabilities. This section should specifically restrict any modifications to students with significant disabilities, develop the reasons for modifying benchmark expectations, and direct local IEP teams to proper supports for the drafting modifications.

O. *Standards Summary*

All standards documents should present a summary of all standards and their benchmark statements immediately following the standards development section. This summary will allow readers to grasp the comprehensive overview of the material they previously studied in smaller units. If subtopics are used, standards documents will present the standards by grade level first then present a summary of standards by subtopic to allow for a comprehensive overview of benchmarks within a subtopic.

P. *Equity*

All standards documents should indicate, either within the standards document or through a supplemental guidebook, ways the standards address race/ethnicity, gender equity, LEP status, migrant status, economic disadvantage, inclusiveness, students with disabilities, and attentiveness to handicapping or bias conditions within the curriculum.

Q. *Features*

All standards documents should indicate, either within the standards document or through a supplemental guidebook, the methods of presenting and communicating content that are used throughout the document to illustrate the recommended curriculum content or pedagogical practices. Such features might include: (1) technology; (2) vignettes; (3) models or examples of instructional practice; (4) examples of achievement standards and assessment tasks; (5) activities and/or instructional practices; (6) diagrams, graphics, photographs.

State Achievement Standards.

State achievement standards will be established for each content standard. Achievement standards will be developed according to the following guidelines.

- A. *Achievement levels.* State achievement standards will be identified in four categories of student proficiency: (1) *novice*, (2) *partially proficient*, (3) *proficient*, (4) *advanced*. The *proficient* level represents how well a student should demonstrate achievement within a subject at a particular grade level.

- B. *Reporting references.* All State assessments will report overall student achievement, school achievement, district achievement, and statewide achievement in terms of the four achievement standard levels.
- C. *Achievement standards forms.* State achievement standards will be developed according to related forms.
 - 1. *Achievement standards descriptors.* State writing teams will draft narrative achievement standards that describe the characteristics of the four proficiency levels for all content standards.
 - 2. *Cut-point alignment.* The Department, in collaboration with its contractor and State writing teams, will supervise the setting of cut-points within the State's assessment tools. These cut-points will align with the State's achievement standard narratives. Cut-points are the marking of numerical scale score ranges to match the level of achievement described within the achievement standards narrative.

IV. Process and Content Protocols for State Assessments

A. *Assessment Development Governance.* The *Standards, Assessments, Learning and Teaching (SALT) Team* advises the Department regarding the initiation, funding, monitoring, evaluation, and approval of all State assessments. The Department of Public Instruction supervises all activities related to the development and implementation of all State assessments, with the consultation of the SALT Team. The State Superintendent approves the funding of all State assessment activity and the final acceptance of all assessment materials.

1. *Budget Resources.* The Department will fund all approved assessment development activity.
2. *Recommendations for Approval.* All SALT Team recommendations regarding the final acceptance of a State assessment project or product will be forwarded to the State Superintendent for approval. The State Superintendent alone approves any State standards document.
3. *Project Supervision.* The Department assumes full responsibility for the supervision and administration of all State assessment projects.

The SALT Team will monitor the progress, focus, balance of effort, and budget of any State assessment project. The SALT Team may recommend specific technical assistance be provided to any development team deemed in need to further the integrity of the development process. The SALT Team may recommend changes in funding levels, including the termination of funding with sufficient cause.

The Department will review and determine all SALT Team recommendations. The Department assumes full responsibility for all State assessment projects.

B. *Assessment Development Supervision.* The Department is responsible for the supervision of all assessment development projects. The SALT Team will advise the Department regarding the formation and selection of development team members, the project director, and the project evaluator.

1. *Project Director.* The Department will appoint a project director to supervise the assessment development project's activities.
2. *Project Contractor.* The Department will contract with an

assessment contractor through an RFP process to administer the development, implementation, reporting, and technical assurances of a State assessment. The roles, relationships, and conditions of contract will be defined according to procedures identified within the *Model Contractor Technical Requirements Guidance for State Assessments*, (Education Leaders Council, 2002).

3. *Technical Advisor.* The Department may contract with an independent technical advisor to assist the project director and development team regarding content and formatting matters.
 4. *Project Evaluator.* The Department may contract with an independent external evaluator to review the content and formatting of the assessment development project to assure subject-matter competence and adherence to State protocols and recognized assessment standards.
- C. *Assessment Development Team Membership.* Teams of teachers from across the State will be formed to conduct assessment development activities, including the alignment of State standards to assessment test items, the development of new test items, the development of scoring manuals and calibration packs, and the conduct of proficiency cut-point activities. The SALT Team, the Department, and the project director will apply the following principles in the formation of an assessment development team's membership.
1. *Size.* The size of writing teams should be sufficient to ensure approximately 15-20 individuals per grade level.
 2. *Balanced Representation.* General consideration will be given for a balanced representation of interests, including:
 - a. School size
 - b. Gender
 - c. Elementary, middle school, and senior high
 - d. Geographic representation
 - e. Public school/private school (K-12 and post-secondary)
 - f. Special education
 - g. Cultural diversity
 - h. Library/technology literacy
 - i. Higher education teacher preparation programs
 - j. Post-secondary education specialists
 - k. Limited English Proficiency expertise
 3. *Contracts.* The Department will issue contracts to all members of

an assessment development team. The project director will supervise the team members. All team members will be held accountable to the provisions of the contract and may be dismissed for failure to meet these provisions. The contract will specify the following:

- a. *Project Responsibilities and Expectations.* All activities, expectations, time demands, the level of participation, and restrictions required of the team member;
- b. *Expenses.* All expenses of writing team members incurred related to the work of the project, including substitute teacher costs, will be reimbursed at State rates;
- c. *Stipends.* Stipends for writing team members will be provided at State rates;
- d. *Project Accountability.* All attributes of a team member required, including adherence to State protocols, respect for team members and the development process, and project director expectations.

D. Legal and Technical Requirements.

Any instrument developed or adopted to assess student proficiency by the State will meet the legal and technical requirements set forth in the following sources:

1. *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Section 1111 and supplemental regulations within 34 CFR Part 200 (May 6, 2002);*
2. *North Dakota Century Code 15.1-21-08 through 15.1-21-14;*
3. *Submitting Evidence of Final Assessment System under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, United States Department of Education;*
4. *North Dakota State Assessment Waiver Agreement Plan (refer to Appendix I) required for the United States Department of Education;*
5. *Model Contractor Standards & State Responsibilities for State Testing Programs, (Education Leaders Council, 2002).*

E. Design Criteria

Any instrument developed to assess student proficiency by the State will be designed to meet the following criteria:

1. be used to assess achievement of all students;
2. be aligned with state academic standards;
3. be valid, reliable and consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical standards;
4. provide for reasonable accommodations and alternate assessments;
5. provide individual reports that are interpretive and diagnostic;
6. provide disaggregated reports for sub-populations;
7. protect privacy and family values;
8. enable itemized score analysis for assessing student needs;
9. meet the requirements set forth within *Model Contractor Standards & State Responsibilities for State Testing Programs, (Education Leaders Council, 2002)*.

F. Assessed Subjects.

Assessments are to be developed and implemented in the following subjects:

1. mathematics, effective immediately;
2. reading or English language arts, effective immediately;
3. science, effective 2007-08 school year;
4. alternate assessments for students with significant disabilities in the areas of mathematics and reading, effective immediately;
5. limited English language proficiency assessment option, effective immediately.

G. Testing schedule.

Assessments are to be administered according to the following schedule.

1. Effective immediately, assessments are to be administered annually at:
 - a. grade 4;
 - b. grade 8;
 - c. grade 12.
2. Effective the 2005-06 school year, additional assessments in mathematics and reading or English language arts will be administered annually in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.
3. Effective the 2007-2008 school year, assessments in science will be administered annual in grades 4, 8, and 12. The State of North

Dakota will voluntarily administer science assessments in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7, as well.

4. Effective immediately, the state will participate in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) with complete federal funding. The NAEP will serve as a calibration tool to monitor the validity of the state's selected assessment tool.

H. State Accountability System.

The state will develop and implement high-quality, yearly student assessments as a means to establish a single, statewide, comprehensive accountability system, based on student achievement of proficiency in terms of the state's challenging standards. The accountability system will be evidenced by the following components.

1. Adequate Yearly Progress.

Effective immediately, the state will demonstrate that adequate yearly progress is determined based on state assessments and defines progress in a manner that:

- a. applies academic standards as basis for determining proficiency;
- b. is statistically valid and reliable;
- c. results in continuous and substantial improvements for students;
- d. measures progress of public schools toward proficiency;
- e. measures improvements of all students, with consideration for gender, ethnicity, disability, limited English proficiency, migrant status and the economically disadvantaged;
- f. includes graduation rates and one other state-defined indicator.

2. State Report Card.

Effective immediately, the state will develop and disseminate an annual report card that includes the following:

- a. concise, understandable, and uniform formatting;
- b. aggregate student achievement at each proficiency level;
- c. disaggregated student achievement for each category;
- d. comparison of student achievement for each category;
- e. percentage of students not tested by category;
- f. the most recent 2-year trend of student performance;
- g. aggregate information on any other indicators used to

- h. determine adequate yearly progress;
- i. graduation rates for secondary students;
- j. performance of schools regarding making adequate yearly progress;
- k. professional qualifications of teachers in state, including percentages of emergency credentials, less-qualified teachers;
- l. any optional information, including school attendance rates, average class size by grade, school violence, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, student suspensions, student expulsions, levels of parental involvement, advanced placement participation and scores, proficiency rates for limited English proficient students.

APPENDIX A

Development Schedule for Content and Achievement Standards All Subjects, Grades 4, 8, and 12 2002-2007

Simultaneous Development of Content and Achievement Standards

Subject	Start Date	First Draft	Validation Edit Second Draft	Statewide Review	Final Draft
English Language Arts	7/1/02	11/1/02	11/1/02 – 3/1/03	4/1/03 – 7/1/03	11/1/03
Health	7/1/02	11/1/02	11/1/02 – 3/1/03	4/1/03 – 7/1/03	11/1/03
Mathematics	7/1/02	11/1/02	11/1/02 – 3/1/03	4/1/03 – 7/1/03	11/1/03
Science	7/1/02	3/1/03	3/1/03 – 6/1/03	6/1/03 – 9/1/03	1/1/04
Social Studies	7/1/03	3/1/04	3/1/04 – 6/1/04	6/1/04 – 9/1/04	1/1/05
The Arts	7/1/03	3/1/04	3/1/04 – 6/1/04	6/1/04 – 9/1/04	1/1/05
Foreign Languages	7/1/04	3/1/05	3/1/05 – 6/1/05	6/1/05 – 9/1/05	1/1/06
Physical Education	7/1/04	3/1/05	3/1/05 – 6/1/05	6/1/05 – 9/1/05	1/1/06
Library/Technology Literacy	7/1/05	3/1/06	3/1/06 – 6/1/06	6/1/06 – 9/1/06	1/1/07

APPENDIX B

Development Schedule for Mathematics and Reading/English Language Grade-Level Content Expectations, Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7		
Date	Activity	Evidence
June, 2002	<i>North Dakota DPI Standards and Assessment Development Protocols</i> revised by state SALT Team to accommodate development of grade-level expectations and to update standards and assessment procedures.	General release of protocols to schools and the public and the placement of document on State website.
June, 2002	Initiate formation of grade-level expectations drafting committees in accordance with State protocols. Committees to develop expectations for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 to align developmentally to state content standards at grades 4, 8, and 12.	Contract signed from prospective committee members. Placement of committee membership on State website.
July, 2002	Initiate development process steps to develop grade-level expectations for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in accordance with State protocols.	Development documentation required to confirm adherence to State protocols.
July–October, 2002	Grade-level expectations drafting committees meet to construct first draft of expectations.	First draft of grade-level expectations constructed in accordance with State protocols.
October, 2002	First draft of grade-level expectations formatted in accordance with State protocols and released to public for comment.	First draft placed on State website. Call for revisions forwarded to schools and the public according to State protocols.
December, 2002	Public comments compiled and disseminated to grade-level expectations drafting committee for review.	Public comments compiled and placed on State website. Summary documentation forwarded to committee membership.
January-February, 2003	Second draft of grade-level expectations drafted by committee membership. Draft forwarded to SALT Team for review in accordance with State protocols.	Second draft placed on State website. Draft reviewed and marked-up by SALT Team.
February-March, 2003	Grade-level expectations committee reviews SALT Team's recommendations. Committee prepares third draft of grade-level expectations.	Third draft placed on State website.
March- April, 2003	SALT Team reviews third draft for adherence to State protocols. SALT Team	Third draft reviewed and revised by SALT Team in

	offers recommendation for adoption/rejection of grade-level expectations to State Superintendent.	accordance to protocols. SALT Team drafts final proposal of acceptance/rejection.
April, 2003	ND Department of Public Instruction prepares final draft of grade-level expectations for review by State Superintendent and offers independent recommendation for acceptance/rejection of document.	Final draft format completed.
May, 2003	State Superintendent approves/rejects final draft of grade-level expectations.	Letter of finding and approval/rejection by the State Superintendent.

North Dakota will continue to use adopted content standards as the basis for statewide assessments at grades 4, 8, and 12 in accordance with section 1111(b)(1). In addition, North Dakota will expand its statewide assessments into grades 3, 5, 6, and 7, in accordance with section 1111(b)(1) by 2005-06, based on state-defined, grade-level content expectations in reading/English language arts and mathematics. These grade-level content expectations will be developed and adopted in accordance with North Dakota's standards development protocols.

North Dakota proposes to accomplish these aims based on the preceding development schedule.

At the completion of this process, North Dakota will have adopted academic content standards in mathematics and reading/English language arts at grades 4, 8, and 12, and grade-level content expectations at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.

APPENDIX C

Development Schedule for Mathematics and Reading/English Language Achievement Standards, Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7		
Date	Activity	Evidence
June, 2002	<i>North Dakota Standards and Assessment Development Protocols</i> revised by state SALT Team to accommodate development of achievement standards and to update standards and assessment procedures.	General release of protocols to schools and the public and the placement of document on State website.
June, 2002	Initiate formation of grade-level expectations drafting committees in accordance with State protocols. Committees will draft both grade-level content expectations and achievement standards. Committees to develop achievement standards for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 to align developmentally to State achievement standards at grades 4, 8, and 12.	Contract signed from prospective committee members. Placement of committee membership on State website.
July, 2002	Initiate development process steps to develop achievement standards for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in accordance with State protocols.	Development documentation required to confirm adherence to State protocols.
July–October, 2002	Drafting committees meet to construct first draft of expectations and achievement standards.	First draft of grade-level achievement standards constructed in accordance with State protocols.
October, 2002	First draft of achievement standards formatted in accordance with State protocols and released to public for comment.	First draft placed on State website. Call for revisions forwarded to schools and the public according to State protocols.
December, 2002	Public comments compiled and disseminated to drafting committee for review.	Public comments compiled and placed on State website. Summary documentation forwarded to committee membership.
January-February, 2003	Second draft of achievement standards drafted by committee membership. Draft forwarded to SALT Team for review in accordance with State protocols.	Second draft placed on State website. Draft reviewed and marked-up by SALT Team.
February-March, 2003	Drafting committee reviews SALT Team's recommendations. Committee prepares third draft of achievement standards.	Third draft placed on State website.
March- April, 2003	SALT Team reviews third draft for adherence to State protocols. SALT Team	Third draft reviewed and revised by SALT Team in

	offers recommendation for adoption/rejection of achievement standards to State Superintendent.	accordance to protocols. SALT Team drafts final proposal of acceptance/rejection.
April, 2003	ND Department of Public Instruction prepares final draft of achievement standards for review by State Superintendent and offers independent recommendation for acceptance/rejection of document.	Final draft format completed.
May, 2003	State Superintendent approves/rejects final draft of achievement standards narrative.	Letter of finding and approval/rejection by the State Superintendent.
July, 2005, following first administration of state assessments in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7, in March, 2005	Cut-point standards setting committee translates narrative achievement standards into equivalent cut-point scale scores, in accordance with State protocols. Cut-points determine proficiency levels that correspond with narrative achievement standards. Cut-points determined on actual student test data. Descriptions of achievement level reference State achievement standards narrative. Descriptions are aligned to actual cut-points set to actual student data.	Cut-point documentation required within State bookmark standards setting procedures.

North Dakota will continue to use adopted achievement standards as the basis for statewide assessments at grades 4, 8, and 12 in accordance with section 1111(b)(1). In addition, North Dakota will expand its statewide assessments into grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in mathematics and reading/English language arts, in accordance with section 1111(b)(1) by 2005-06, based on State-defined, grade-level achievement standards. Additionally, North Dakota will expand its statewide assessments, voluntarily, into grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in science by 2007-2008, based on State-defined, achievement standards. All achievement standards at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 will be aligned with North Dakota's corresponding grade-level content expectations. These achievement standards will be developed and adopted in accordance with North Dakota's standards development protocols.

North Dakota proposes to develop narrative achievement standards at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 contemporaneously with the development of grade-level content expectations. The content expectation committees will also draft the narrative achievement standards. These narrative achievement standards will act as the primary calibration tool for the cut-point standards setting performed to align the State assessment scale scores to State achievement standards.

APPENDIX D

Development Schedule for Science Grade-Level Content Expectations, Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7		
Date	Activity	Evidence
June, 2003	<i>North Dakota Standards and Assessment Development Protocols</i> revised by state SALT Team to accommodate development of grade-level expectations and to update standards and assessment procedures.	General release of protocols to schools and the public and the placement of document on State website.
June, 2003	Initiate formation of grade-level expectations drafting committees in accordance with State protocols. Committees to develop expectations for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 to align developmentally to state content standards at grades 4, 8, and 12.	Contract signed from prospective committee members. Placement of committee membership on State website.
July, 2003	Initiate development process steps to develop grade-level expectations for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in accordance with State protocols.	Development documentation required to confirm adherence to State protocols.
July– October, 2003	Grade-level expectations drafting committees meet to construct first draft of expectations.	First draft of grade-level expectations constructed in accordance with State protocols.
October, 2003	First draft of grade-level expectations formatted in accordance with State protocols and released to public for comment.	First draft placed on State website. Call for revisions forwarded to schools and the public according to State protocols.
December, 2003	Public comments compiled and disseminated to grade-level expectations drafting committee for review.	Public comments compiled and placed on State website. Summary documentation forwarded to committee membership.
January- February, 2004	Second draft of grade-level expectations drafted by committee membership. Draft forwarded to SALT Team for review in accordance with State protocols.	Second draft placed on State website. Draft reviewed and marked-up by SALT Team.
February- March, 2004	Grade-level expectations committee reviews SALT Team's recommendations. Committee prepares third draft of grade-level expectations.	Third draft placed on State website.
March- April, 2004	SALT Team reviews third draft for adherence to State protocols. SALT Team offers recommendation for adoption/rejection of grade-level expectations to State Superintendent.	Third draft reviewed and revised by SALT Team in accordance to protocols. SALT Team drafts final proposal of

		acceptance/rejection.
April, 2004	ND Department of Public Instruction prepares final draft of grade-level expectations for review by State Superintendent and offers independent recommendation for acceptance/rejection of document.	Final draft format completed.
May, 2004	State Superintendent approves/rejects final draft of grade-level expectations.	Letter of finding and approval/rejection by the State Superintendent.

North Dakota will align its science assessment to the adopted State science content standards at grades 4, 8, and 12 in accordance with section 1111(b)(1). In addition, North Dakota will plan to expand, voluntarily, its statewide science assessments into grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 by 2007-2008, based on State-defined, grade-level content expectations. These grade-level content expectations will be developed and adopted in accordance with the North Dakota Standards and Assessment Development Protocols. Adherence to the protocols will assure that the science and grade-level content expectations will apply to all students, including LEP students and students with disabilities. Protocols require the broad-based involvement of all stakeholders and statewide dissemination to all LEAS and schools.

North Dakota proposes to accomplish these aims based on the preceding development schedule.

At the completion of this process, North Dakota will have adopted academic content standards in science at grades 4, 8, and 12, and grade-level expectations at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.

APPENDIX E

Development Schedule for Science Achievement Standards, Grades 3, 5, 6, and 7		
Date	Activity	Evidence
June, 2003	<i>North Dakota Standards and Assessment Development Protocols</i> revised by state SALT Team to accommodate development of achievement standards and to update standards and assessment procedures.	General release of protocols to schools and the public and the placement of document on State website.
June, 2003	Initiate formation of grade-level expectations drafting committees in accordance with State protocols. Committees will draft both grade-level content expectations and achievement standards. Committees to develop achievement standards for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 to align developmentally to state achievement standards at grades 4, 8, and 12.	Contract signed from prospective committee members. Placement of committee membership on State website.
July, 2003	Initiate development process steps to develop achievement standards for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in accordance with State protocols.	Development documentation required to confirm adherence to State protocols.
July– October, 2003	Drafting committees meet to construct first draft of expectations and achievement standards.	First draft of grade-level achievement standards constructed in accordance with State protocols.
October, 2003	First draft of achievement standards formatted in accordance with State protocols and released to public for comment.	First draft placed on State website. Call for revisions forwarded to schools and the public according to State protocols.
December, 2003	Public comments compiled and disseminated to drafting committee for review.	Public comments compiled and placed on State website. Summary documentation forwarded to committee membership.
January- February, 2004	Second draft of achievement standards drafted by committee membership. Draft forwarded to SALT Team for review in accordance with State protocols.	Second draft placed on State website. Draft reviewed and marked-up by SALT Team.
February- March, 2004	Drafting committee reviews SALT Team's recommendations. Committee prepares third draft of achievement standards.	Third draft placed on State website.
March- April, 2004	SALT Team reviews third draft for adherence to State protocols. SALT Team offers recommendation for	Third draft reviewed and revised by SALT Team in accordance to protocols.

	adoption/rejection of achievement standards to State Superintendent.	SALT Team drafts final proposal of acceptance/rejection.
April, 2004	ND Department of Public Instruction prepares final draft of achievement standards for review by State Superintendent and offers independent recommendation for acceptance/rejection of document.	Final draft format completed.
May, 2004	State Superintendent approves/rejects final draft of achievement standards.	Letter of finding and approval/rejection by the State Superintendent.
July, 2006, following first administration of State assessments in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7, in March, 2006.	Cut-point standards setting committee translates narrative achievement standards into equivalent cut-point scale scores, in accordance with State protocols. Cut-points determine proficiency levels that correspond with narrative achievement standards. Cut-points determined on actual student test data. Descriptions of achievement level reference State achievement standards narrative. Descriptions are aligned to actual cut-points set to actual student data.	Cut-point documentation required within State bookmark standards setting procedures.

North Dakota will continue to use adopted achievement standards as the basis for statewide assessments at grades 4, 8, and 12 in accordance with section 1111(b)(1). In addition, North Dakota will expand its statewide assessments into grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in mathematics and reading/English language arts, in accordance with section 1111(b)(1) by 2005-06, based on State-defined, grade-level achievement standards. Additionally, North Dakota will expand its statewide assessments, voluntarily, into grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in science by 2007-2008, based on State-defined, achievement standards. All achievement standards at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 will be aligned with North Dakota's corresponding grade-level content expectations. These achievement standards will be developed and adopted in accordance with North Dakota's standards development protocols.

North Dakota proposes to develop narrative achievement standards at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 contemporaneously with the development of grade-level content expectations. The content expectation committees will also draft the narrative achievement standards. These narrative achievement standards will act as the primary calibration tool for the cut-point standards setting performed to align the State assessment scale scores to State achievement standards.

At the completion of this process, North Dakota will have adopted academic achievement standards in science at grades 3 through 8 and 12.

APPENDIX F

Development and Implementation Schedule For State Assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts, and Science, Grades 3-8, and 12		
Date	Activity	Evidence
June, 2002	The Department of Public Instruction submits a detailed progress report to the U.S. Department of Education regarding the State's progress in achieving full compliance with section 1111 assessment requirements.	Submission of evidence regarding funding level commitments, contractor technical quality assurances, administration scheduling.
June, 2002	SALT Team revises State assessment protocols to accommodate assessment development based on alignment to grade-level content expectations.	Revised State protocols placed on Department of Public Instruction website.
June, 2002- August, 2003	The State performs all assessment activities identified within assessment waiver agreement with U.S. Department of Education.	Evidence of completion identified within the State assessment waiver agreement plan with U.S. Department of Education.
October, 2002	Following completion of development activities, State adopts achievement standards in science, grades 4, 8, and 12.	State Superintendent letter of approval. Placement of achievement standards on website.
May, 2003	Following completion of development activities, State adopts grade-level content expectations within mathematics and English language arts for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.	State Superintendent letter of approval. Placement of grade-level content expectations on website.
May, 2003	Following completion of development activities, State adopts achievement standards within mathematics and English language arts for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.	State Superintendent letter of approval. Placement of achievement standards on website.
March, 2003- May, 2003	Department of Public Instruction prepares RFP documentation for mathematics and reading/language arts assessments, including overview of type of test to be developed, outline of test blueprint, requirements that test items be field tested/piloted, field testing procedures documented, administrators' manual developed, and technical manual developed. RFP released for competitive bid process.	NDDPI RFP documentation with alignment to State Assessment Development Protocols.
June, 2003	State reviews all RFP bids and contracts with assessment vendor. Vendor and State begin process to align	Signed contract between the Department of Public Instruction and selected

	test items to State grade-level content expectations in mathematics and reading/language arts at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Process follows State assessment development protocols.	vendor. Tentative list of aligned items for review by State.
June, 2003- May 2004	Assessment alignment committee formed from nominated pool of teachers statewide to select and align test items to State content expectations for mathematics and reading/language arts assessment. Generations of working drafts reviewed and updated to assure sufficient alignment to and coverage of grade-level content expectations.	Contracts for each committee member. Working drafts of standards alignment and coverage.
May, 2004	Following completion of development activities, State adopts achievement standards within science for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7.	State Superintendent letter of approval. Placement of achievement standards on website.
June, 2004	Department of Public Instruction reviews final alignment activity for mathematics and reading/language arts and proposes adoption/rejection of alignment to State Superintendent.	Findings and recommendation memorandum to State Superintendent.
June- December, 2004	Assessment vendor prepares assessments in anticipation of first assessment administration for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in mathematics and reading/language arts.	Preparation of all assessment, training, and administration materials.
March, 2004- May, 2004	Department of Public Instruction prepares RFP documentation for science assessments, including overview of type of test to be developed, outline of test blueprint, requirements that test items be field tested/piloted, field testing procedures documented, administrators' manual developed, and technical manual developed. RFP released for competitive bid process.	NDDPI RFP documentation with alignment to State Assessment Development Protocols.
June, 2004	State reviews all bids and contracts with assessment vendor to begin process to align test items to State grade-level content expectations in science at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Process follows State assessment development protocols.	Signed contract between the Department of Public Instruction and selected vendor. Tentative list of aligned items for review by State.
June, 2004- May 2005	Assessment alignment committee formed from nominated pool of teachers statewide to select and align test items to State content expectations for science assessment. Generations of	Contracts for each committee member. Working drafts of standards alignment and coverage.

	working drafts reviewed and updated to assure sufficient alignment to and coverage of grade-level content expectations.	
June-December, 2005	Assessment vendor prepares assessments in anticipation of first assessment administration for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in science.	Preparation of all assessment, training, and administration materials.
January, 2005	State conducts series of assessment administration training sessions to overview State assessment and accountability system for mathematics and reading/language arts.	Statewide and regional training sessions. Dissemination of support materials. Placement of all materials on website.
March, 2005	First administration of statewide assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts, grades 3-8. Grade 12 assessment conducted in November, 2004.	Submission of all assessments for scoring and reporting. Grade 12 assessment scoring and reporting conducted in December, 2004.
July, 2005	March 2005 student assessment data in mathematics and reading/language arts undergoes cut-point standards setting. Achievement standards determined based on process. Adequate yearly progress markers set.	Cut-point activities conducted according to State protocols. Results used for student and accountability system reports.
May, 2005	Performance reports issued on results of 2005 assessment administration. Results disseminated to all parties.	Release of results to students and parents. Release of school, district, and state results.
May-August, 2005	Adequate yearly progress determination conducted. Results published.	Published results of student performance and adequate yearly progress reports.
September, 2005- May, 2006	State conducts second year of statewide assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts at grades 3-8 and 12. State meets all requirements for mathematics and reading/language arts assessments in accordance with section 1111(b)(1).	Production of all materials and publication of all results as identified within State protocols.
January, 2006	State conducts series of assessment administration training sessions to overview State assessment and accountability system for science.	Statewide and regional training sessions. Dissemination of support materials. Placement of all materials on website.
March, 2006	First administration of statewide assessments in science, grades 3-8. Grade 12 assessment conducted in November, 2005.	Submission of all assessments for scoring and reporting. Grade 12 assessment scoring and reporting conducted in December 2005.
July, 2006	March 2006 student assessment data in science undergoes cut-point standards setting. Achievement standards	Cut-point activities conducted according to State protocols. Results used for student and

	determined based on process. Adequate yearly progress markers set.	accountability system reports.
May, 2006	Performance reports issued on results of 2006 assessment administration. Results disseminated to all parties.	Release of results to students and parents. Release of school, district, and state results.
May-August, 2006	Adequate yearly progress determination conducted. Results published.	Published results of student performance and adequate yearly progress reports.
September, 2006- May, 2007	State conducts second year of statewide assessments in science at grades 3-8 and 12. State meets all requirements for science assessments in accordance with section 1111(b)(1).	Production of all materials and publication of all results as identified within State protocols.

North Dakota will proceed to develop state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts at grades 3 through 8 and 12 by 2005-2006 in accordance with State protocols and section 1111(b)(1) requirements. North Dakota will proceed to develop state assessments in science at grades 4, 8, and 12 by 2007-2008 in accordance with State protocols and section 1111(b)(1) requirements. Additionally, North Dakota will expand its science assessment, voluntarily, at grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 by 2007-2008 in accordance with State protocols and section 1111(b)(1) standards.

At the completion of this process, North Dakota will have completed the development and implementation of State assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science at grades 3 through 8 and 12 one year in advance of federal requirements. The State assessments will have met all requirements set within State assessment development protocols and section 1111(b)(1).

APPENDIX G

Development Schedule for Assessment Options For English Language Learners	
Year	Activities
2002 – 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools will assess language proficiency of LEP students using one of the state recommended language proficiency tests along with information from state wide achievement/assessment program if available; • The State will convene a task force to review assessments and develop assessment system aligned with state standards and benchmarks; • Task Force will consult with national organizations and technical assistance centers on assessment systems; • Solicit input from field on assessment system
2003 – 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete development of assessment system including guidelines for implementation; • Provide training to school districts on assessment system and guidelines; • Collect data on assessment system.
2004 – 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement assessment system; • Collect data on assessment system.
2005 – 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement assessment system; • Collect data on assessment system.

APPENDIX H

Development and Implementation Schedule for State Alternate Assessment

APPENDIX I

North Dakota Assessment Waiver Agreement Plan Implementation Schedule 2001-2003

1.0 Development and implementation of standards-based assessment.

- 1.01 *Request for Proposals.* Request for proposals published to solicit bids from assessment firms. RFPs will outline the development and implementation of statewide, standards-based assessments in reading and mathematics to meet Title I requirements. Assessments will be conducted at grades 4, 8, and 12.
- Evidence: Request for Proposal document outlining all aspects of assessment project. RFP developed and disseminated by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.
- Timeline: March 1, 2001.
- 1.02 *Application process concluded.* Assessment proposals accepted from applicants and bidding process closed. Committee of reviewers from local districts, state associations, and the Department of Public Instruction are assembled and trained to review proposals. All proposals are reviewed in terms of the original RFP criteria and scored against established scoring rubric. Responsibility for the coordination of all review activities lies with the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.
- Evidence: Proposals submitted by assessment firms. Nomination list of qualified reviewers gathered from local districts and associations. Nomination letter to prospective reviewers issued by the State Superintendent. Scoring rubric prepared by the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.
- Timeline: April 1, 2001
- 1.03 *Confirmation of state funding.* Following the conclusion of the 2001 North Dakota Legislative Session, on or about May 1, 2001, the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction will submit to the United States Department of Education a report on the funding authorized by the legislative assembly for the administration of state-wide, standards-based assessments during the 2001-2003 biennium. The report will include the original budget requested by the Department of Public Instruction, the

Governor's executive recommendation, the legislative assembly's final appropriation. In the event of any variance with the original budget proposal, the report will overview any supplemental funding options that may be required by the Department of Public Instruction.

Evidence: Report on the North Dakota Legislative Assembly's appropriation for statewide, standards-based assessments submitted to the U.S. Department of Education by the Department of Public Instruction.

Timeline: May 1, 2001

- 1.04 *Application review process conducted.* Following the verification of the legislative appropriation, expected on or about May 1, the application review committee will submit to the State Superintendent its recommendation on the best bid application in terms of meeting set criteria and funding levels. The State Superintendent will review the recommendation in terms of the original criteria and budget and either accept the proposal or request the application committee to consider other alternatives.

Evidence: Application committee recommendation report to the State Superintendent.

Timeline: May 15, 2001

- 1.05 *Final bid accepted.* Following a review of the application committee's final recommendation, the State Superintendent will accept the best bid to administer and implement the statewide, standards-based assessment. The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction will proceed with the drafting of a contract with the approved vendor.

Evidence: The State Superintendent will draft a memo of bid approval including approval to proceed with the drafting of a contract.

Timeline: May 21, 2001

- 1.06 *Contract signed.* Following negotiations and legal review, the Department of Public Instruction will sign a contract with the approved vendor to develop and administer the statewide, standards-based assessment according to approved protocols. The Department of Public Instruction will forward a copy of the contract to the U.S. Department of Education to confirm assessment plan progress.

Evidence: Contract between North Dakota Department of Public Instruction and the approved vendor submitted to the U.S.

Department of Education.

Timeline: June 1, 2001

- 1.07 *Standards alignment committee formed.* State Superintendent appoints qualified teachers from across the state to form a standards alignment committee. The committee is responsible for working with the assessment vendor to assure the following: (1) all state standards in reading and mathematics are covered appropriately in the developed assessment tool, (2) appropriate multiple measure items, including challenging constructive response items are included in the assessment tool, (3) appropriate safeguards are incorporated into the process to secure a valid and reliable assessment tool, (4) performance standards and cut-points are established to secure an appropriate and challenging level of expectation. Committee members will be drawn from the pool of teachers who participated in the development of the state's previous standards-based assessment projects in English language arts and mathematics.

Evidence: Committee list and appointment letters to qualified teachers.

Timeline: June 1, 2001

- 1.08 *Standards alignment activities conducted.* Standards alignment committee meets with assessment vendor to establish test parameters. Test items are reviewed for proper alignment and challenging nature to meet requirements of the statewide, standards-based assessment. A balance of coverage of all standards is assured. A balance of multiple measure items, including selective and constructive items, is established. Committee works with vendor to confirm that all technical quality assurances identified within the U.S. Department of Education assessment guidance are incorporated. Reporting requirements are reviewed to assure agreement with test items and protocols. State assessment protocols and vendor assessment protocols are reconciled and incorporated into a single assessment protocol that becomes the blueprint for the assessment project.

Evidence: State assessment protocols and vendor assessment protocols.

Timeline: June 1 – July 31, 2001

- 1.09 *Assessment vendor develops assessment tool.* Assessment vendor incorporates findings of standards alignment activities into a working design for the assessment tool. Vendor works from this design to develop a prototype assessment from its pool of pre-tested items. Items are

insured for validity and reliability. Scoring keys for selective responses are compiled. Scoring rubrics for constructive responses are compiled and revised. All items are combined for all grade levels. Draft reports are developed to report student performance in terms of the state standards at the following levels: student, classroom, school, district, and state. Draft disaggregation reports are developed to report student performance in terms of the state standards in terms of the follow categories: gender, ethnicity, service status, assessment status, and poverty.

Evidence: Vendor produces the following items: project design, prototype assessment tools at each grade level, scoring keys, scoring rubrics, draft student reports, draft disaggregation reports.

Timeline: June 1 – September 15, 2001

- 1.10 *Standards alignment committee review prototype assessments and reports.* Assessment vendor presents test administrator manual, assessment prototype tool and reports to the standards alignment committee. Committee reviews products in terms of the project protocols. Committee offers recommendations to State Superintendent regarding acceptability of products or any additional revisions that might be required.

Evidence: Recommendation report submitted to State Superintendent by standards review committee.

Timeline: September 21, 2001

- 1.11 *State superintendent reports on acceptability of assessment.* State Superintendent reviews the recommendations report from the standards alignment committee. Superintendent issues request to revise any elements of the assessment tools or reports to the vendor with identified performance indicators that constitute acceptability.

Evidence: Report from State Superintendent with performance indicators identified.

Timeline: October 1, 2001

- 1.12 *Vendor submits revisions.* Vendor completes any required revision to the assessment and reports as stipulated by the State Superintendent. Revisions are forwarded to the State Superintendent for final review.

Evidence: Report of revised items submitted to State Superintendent.

Timeline: October 21, 2001

- 1.13 *Final assessment package approved.* State Superintendent reviews the revision report from the vendor for acceptability. If revisions meet the quality assurances sought in the performance indicators, the revisions are acceptable. State Superintendent issues a letter of acceptance to the vendor.

Evidence: Letter of acceptance to the vendor.

Timeline: November 1, 2001

- 1.14 *Vendor finalizes assessment packages and reports.* Vendor proceeds with final layout designs of the state assessment and reports. All quality control measures are reviewed. Vendor prints sufficient quantity of assessments at all grade levels. Assessments are packaged for shipment to all schools statewide.

Evidence: Printed assessments and bundled packages to all schools.

Timeline: November 1, 2001 to February 15, 2002

- 1.15 *Vendor ships assessments to schools.* Vendor confirms shipment details and proceeds with shipment of assessments to all schools statewide.

Evidence: Shipment forms

Timeline: January 15, 2002

- 1.16 *Assessments administered in all schools statewide.* According to rules set forth by the Department of Public Instruction regarding the proper administration and timing of assessments, schools statewide conduct the standards-based assessments. Schools package and ship all completed assessments to the vendor.

Evidence: Completed assessments for all students within each school, according to test administration rules.

Timeline: March 1-15, 2002

- 1.17 *Assessments scored.* Vendor receives packages of assessments from all schools. Packages disassembled and scan-scored for selective items. Tests scored manually for constructive items. Assessment scores compiled and prepared for performance standards setting.

Evidence: Compiled scoring results for all students at all grades.

Timeline: March 15 – April 30, 2002

- 1.18 *Performance standards set.* Vendor and standards alignment committee meet to analyze overall scores at all grade levels. Vendor facilitates deliberation process with alignment committee regarding the setting of performance standards and cut-points. Committee sets cut-point standards to reflect state performance standards levels.

Evidence: Cut-score points established and published for vendor reporting.

Timeline: June 1, 2002

- 1.19 *Vendor disseminates reports.* Vendor incorporates cut-point scores into report generators and prepares reports according to assessment rules. Reports are forwarded to schools, districts, and the state.

Evidence: Reports to students, classrooms, schools, districts, and the state. Disaggregated reports regarding gender, ethnicity, service status, assessment status, and poverty.

Timeline: August 31, 2002

- 1.20 *Assessment interpretation guides disseminated.* Guides for the interpretation of all assessment results are made available to schools, district, and the public via the Department of Public Instruction web site. Printed copies made available upon request. Interpretation workshops and technical assistance opportunities set for fall.

Evidence: Web-based interpretation guide, printed copies, interpretation workshops, and technical assistance developed by the Department of Public Instruction.

Timeline: August 1, 2002

- 1.21 *Assessment scheduling for 2002-03 school year set.* The Department of Public Instruction and the vendor agree to a timetable to administer assessments during the 2002-03 school year. All technical quality assurances apply during the second year; however, no additional development activities will occur. The year one test will apply within year two.

Evidence: Memorandum of agreement for assessment administration.

Timeline: September 30, 2002

- 1.22 *Standards alignment committee reviews year one results.* Standards alignment committee reviews all first year activities for adherence to protocols, analysis of results, and recommendations for improvement. Committee generates a report outlining findings and proposals for improvement.
- Evidence: Analysis report of year one activities and recommendations.
- Timeline: October 31, 2002
- 1.23 *State Superintendent reviews committee recommendations.* State Superintendent reviews findings and recommendations from standards alignment committee and approves any provisions. State Superintendent communicates provisions to the vendor for possible year two improvements to assessment products. State Superintendent implements improvements that affect the Department of Public Instruction. Longer term improvements are recorded for future assessment contracts.
- Evidence: Memorandum of improvement to vendor and Department of Public Instruction.
- Timeline: November 15, 2002
- 1.24 *Department of Public Instruction disseminates updated assessment practices.* Department of Public Instruction publishes all approved improvements to assessment system and disseminates information to all school districts and the public. Information includes scheduling updates, revised procedures for training, and any revised reports.
- Evidence: Published updates distributed to schools and school districts. Publication of findings on Department web site.
- Timeline: December 15, 2002
- 1.25 *Statewide trainings conducted to update school personnel on improvements to assessment system.* Department of Public Instruction conducts statewide training sessions via regional meetings and interactive television to inform schools of the improvements to the assessment system as identified within the revised publications. Content will include the revised assessment schedules, scoring events, revised interpretation guides, and reporting requirements.
- Evidence: Statewide training sessions.

Timeline: January 30, 2003

- 1.26 *Second round administration of statewide assessments.* Following the approved revisions to the assessment system schedule and protocols, schools and school districts administer the second round of the statewide assessments. Procedures will follow all practices approved by the State Superintendent and managed by the assessment vendor. The Department of Public Instruction will monitor all administration practices for adherence to the approved protocols.

Evidence: Completed assessments for all students within each school, according to test administration rules.

Timeline: March 1-15, 2003 (anticipated)

- 1.27 *Assessments scored.* Vendor receives packages of assessments from all schools. Packages disassembled and scan-scored for selective items. Tests scored manually for constructive items. Assessment scores compiled and prepared for performance standards setting, if required following the review of year one procedures.

Evidence: Compiled scoring results for all students at all grades.

Timeline: March 15-April 30, 2003 (anticipated)

- 1.28 *Performance standards amended, if required following the review of year one procedures.* In the event that the year one review requires additional amendments to the performance standards cut-scores, the vendor and standards alignment committee meet to analyze overall scores at all grade levels. Vendor facilitates deliberation process with alignment committee regarding the setting of performance standards and cut-points. Committee amends cut-point standards to reflect state performance standards levels.

Evidence: Cut-score points amended and published for vendor reporting, only if identified by year one review findings.

Timeline: June 1, 2003

- 1.29 *Vendor disseminates reports.* Vendor incorporates cut-point scores into report generators and prepares reports according to assessment rules. Reports are forwarded to schools, districts, and the state.

Evidence: Reports to students, classrooms, schools, districts, and the state. Disaggregated reports regarding gender, ethnicity, service status, assessment status, and poverty.

Timeline: August 1, 2003

- 1.30 *Standards alignment committee reviews year two results.* Standards alignment committee reviews all second year activities for adherence to updated protocols, analysis of results, and recommendations for improvement. Committee generates final report outlining findings and proposals for improvement.

Evidence: Final analysis report of year two activities and recommendations for improvements.

Timeline: August 15, 2003

- 1.31 *State Superintendent reviews committee recommendations for final amendments to assessment system.* State Superintendent reviews findings and recommendations from standards alignment committee and approves any provisions. State Superintendent communicates provisions to the vendor for future improvements to assessment products. State Superintendent implements improvements that affect the Department of Public Instruction. Longer term improvements are recorded for future assessment contracts.

Evidence: Memorandum of improvement to vendor and Department of Public Instruction.

Timeline: August 31, 2003

2.0 State Assessment Plan Accountability Provisions

- 2.01 *State submits revised full assessment report.* The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction will submit a revised report on the state's full assessment system. Included within this revised report will be the following components required by the U.S. Department of Education:

- A. *Documentation of sufficient authority and funding.* The Department will submit as outlined in 1.03 above confirmation of legislative approval to fully fund the state's standards-based assessment system.

Evidence: Report on the North Dakota Legislative Assembly's appropriation for statewide, standards-based assessments submitted to the U.S. Department of

Education by the Department of Public Instruction.

Timeline: May 1, 2001

- B. *Documentation of aligned performance standards.* The Department of Public Instruction will provide evidence of performance standards aligned to content standards for the standards-based components of the state assessment system. The documentation used will include the system protocols used by the state and vendor and the product of alignment conducted by the standards alignment committee.

Evidence: State assessment protocols and vendor assessment protocols. Performance standards cut-points.

- C. *Assessment policies for students with disabilities and LEP students.* The Department of Public Instruction will provide documentation of the revised policies for students with disabilities and limited English proficient students. The documentation will include a statement of policy and the materials used within the test instruction and interpretation guides.

Evidence: State guidance on test administration, including instruction on exemptions, accommodations, and alternate assessment.

- D. *Assessment participation data.* The Department of Public Instruction will provide complete participation data for students with disabilities and LEP students so that the state's inclusion policies, assessment, reporting, and accountability can be evaluated to confirm how these students are performing relative to state standards for the standard-based assessment when it is administered, and the alternate assessments. This data will be based on the first year's implementation (2001-02).

Evidence: Aggregated and disaggregated data according to all reporting categories and grade level.

- E. *Assessment technical quality assurances.* The Department of Public Instruction will provide a complete report on the assurances taken to ground the assessment's technical quality. This report will be prepared by the vendor regarding all steps take to secure validity and reliability of the assessment.

Evidence: Vendor drafted and state validated technical quality assurance document.

- F. *Assessment student reports.* The Department of Public Instruction will report on all student performance data at the state level. Additionally, the Department will submit the report forms used to report student performance by standard at the student-level, classroom-level, school-level, district-level, and state-level.

Evidence: Actual aggregated statewide student performance data by standard. Report forms that capture student performance for a student, class, school, district, and the state.

- G. *Assessment disaggregated data.* The Department of Public Instruction will report on all disaggregated student performance data, according to gender, ethnicity, service status, testing status, and economic status. Additionally, the Department will submit the report forms used to report student performance by standard within the categories of gender, ethnicity, service status, testing status, and economic status.

Evidence: Actual disaggregated statewide student performance data by standard, according to gender, ethnicity, service status, testing status, and economic status. Report forms that capture student performance for a school and district according to gender, ethnicity, service status, testing status, and economic status.

- H. *District profiles.* The Department of Public Instruction will present illustrations of the district profiles used to communicate district and school performance in a variety of areas, including student performance. The profile will include data summarizing student performance by standard and disaggregation category.

Evidence: District and school profiles.

- I. *School improvement identification and planning.* The Department of Public Instruction will report on the methodology used to identify school improvement sites and the assistance provided to support school improvement sites in achieving acceptable student performance gains.

Evidence: Adequate Yearly Progress methodology. Program improvement support activities.

Timeline: Timeline for all 2.00 activities is September 1, 2002

2.02 *State submits revised full assessment report following a complete review of year two activities.* The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction will submit a revised report on the state's full assessment system. Included within this revised report will be the following components required by the U.S. Department of Education:

A. *Documentation of aligned performance standards.* The Department of Public Instruction will provide evidence of performance standards aligned to content standards for the standards-based components of the state assessment system. The documentation used will include the system protocols used by the state and vendor and the product of alignment conducted by the standards alignment committee.

Evidence: State assessment protocols and vendor assessment protocols. Performance standards cut-points.

B. *Assessment policies for students with disabilities and LEP students.* The Department of Public Instruction will provide documentation of the revised policies for students with disabilities and limited English proficient students. The documentation will include a statement of policy and the materials used within the test instruction and interpretation guides.

Evidence: State guidance on test administration, including instruction on exemptions, accommodations, and alternate assessment.

C. *Assessment participation data.* The Department of Public Instruction will provide complete participation data for students with disabilities and LEP students so that the state's inclusion policies, assessment, reporting, and accountability can be evaluated to confirm how these students are performing relative to state standards for the standard-based assessment when it is administered, and the alternate assessments. This data will be based on the first year's implementation (2001-02).

Evidence: Aggregated and disaggregated data according to all reporting categories and grade level.

D. *Assessment technical quality assurances.* The Department of

Public Instruction will provide a complete report on the assurances taken to ground the assessment's technical quality. This report will be prepared by the vendor regarding all steps take to secure validity and reliability of the assessment.

Evidence: Vendor drafted and state validated technical quality assurance document.

- E. *Assessment student reports.* The Department of Public Instruction will report on all student performance data at the state level. Additionally, the Department will submit the report forms used to report student performance by standard at the student-level, classroom-level, school-level, district-level, and state-level.

Evidence: Actual aggregated statewide student performance data by standard. Report forms that capture student performance for a student, class, school, district, and the state.

- F. *Assessment disaggregated data.* The Department of Public Instruction will report on all disaggregated student performance data, according to gender, ethnicity, service status, testing status, and economic status. Additionally, the Department will submit the report forms used to report student performance by standard within the categories of gender, ethnicity, service status, testing status, and economic status.

Evidence: Actual disaggregated statewide student performance data by standard, according to gender, ethnicity, service status, testing status, and economic status. Report forms that capture student performance for a school and district according to gender, ethnicity, service status, testing status, and economic status.

- G. *District profiles.* The Department of Public Instruction will present illustrations of the district profiles used to communicate district and school performance in a variety of areas, including student performance. The profile will include data summarizing student performance by standard and disaggregation category.

Evidence: District and school profiles.

- H. *School improvement identification and planning.* The Department of Public Instruction will report on the methodology used to identify school improvement sites and the assistance provided to support

school improvement sites in achieving acceptable student performance gains.

Evidence: Adequate Yearly Progress methodology. Program improvement support activities.

Timeline: Timeline for all 2.02 activities is August 31, 2003.

APPENDIX J(a)

**Content Standard Format
Presented by Subtopic**

Standard x.x: [Standard Title]

Standard x.x: [Standard Description]	
BENCHMARK EXPECTATION	PROFICIENCY DESCRIPTOR
<i>Subtopic a</i>	
<i>Kindergarten</i>	
K.x.x [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[K.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]
K.x.y [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[K.x.y Proficiency Descriptor]
K.x.z [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[K.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]
<i>Grade 1</i>	
1.x.x [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[1.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]
1.x.y [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[1.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]
1.x.z [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[1.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]
.	
.	
.	
<i>Grade 12</i>	
12.x.x [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[12.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]

APPENDIX J(b)

**Content Standard Format
Presented by Grade**

Standard x.x: [Standard Title]

Standard x.x: [Standard Description]	
BENCHMARK EXPECTATION	PROFICIENCY DESCRIPTOR
<i>Kindergarten</i>	
<i>Subtopic a</i>	
K.x.x [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[K.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]
K.x.y [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[K.x.y Proficiency Descriptor]
<i>Subtopic b</i>	
K.x.z [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[K.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]
<i>Grade 1</i>	
<i>Subtopic a</i>	
1.x.x [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[1.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]
1.x.y [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[1.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]
<i>Subtopic b</i>	
1.x.z [Benchmark Expectation descriptor with itemized knowledge and skill list]	[1.x.x Proficiency Descriptor]

APPENDIX K

Budget Framework: State Standards and Assessment Development And Implementation

Activity	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Standards Development Activities:				
1. Math Content Standards, 4, 8, 12				
2. Math Content Expectations, 3, 5, 6, 7				
3. Math Achievement Standards, narrative				
3. ELA Content Standards, 4, 8, 12				
4. ELA Content Expectations, 3, 5, 6, 7				
4. ELA Achievement Standards, narrative				
5. Health Content Standards, 4, 8, 12				
6. Science Content Standards, 4, 8, 12				
7. Science Content Expectations, 3, 5, 6, 7				
8. Science Achievement Standards, narrative				
 Assessment Development Activities:				
Math Test Alignment, 4, 8, 12				
Math Test New Item Development, 4, 8, 12				
Math Test Alignment, 3, 5, 6, 7				
Math Test New Item Development, 3, 5, 6, 7				
Math Test Administration, 4, 8, 12				
Math Test Administration, 3, 5, 6, 7				
Math Test Cut-point Standards Setting				
ELA Test Alignment, 4, 8, 12				
ELA Test New Item Development 4, 8, 12				
ELA Test Alignment, 4, 8, 12				
ELA Test New Item Development, 3, 5, 6, 7				
ELA Test Administration, 4, 8, 12				
ELA Test Administration, 3, 5, 6, 7				
ELA Test Cut-point Standards Setting				
Science Test Alignment, 3-8, 12				
Science Test New Item Development, 3-8, 12				
Science Test Administration, 3-8, 12				

Science Test Cut-point Standards Setting

State Accountability Initiatives

Data Linkage and Analysis Application

State Report Card Application

State TA and Professional Development

IBM Learning Village

Total

APPENDIX L

Technical Assistance Reference Guides

Technical Studies

A Distillation of Subject-Matter Content for the Subject Areas of Geography and History, McREL.

A Distillation of Subject-Matter Content for the Subject Areas of Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science, McREL.

A Technical Guide for Revising or Developing Standards and Benchmarks, McREL.

Content Knowledge: A Compendium of Standards and Benchmarks for K-12 Education, 3rd Edition, 2000, McREL.

Model Contractor Technical Requirements Guidance for State Assessments, Education Leaders Council.

General Reference and Implementation Strategies

Reference www.mcrel.org/products/standards/index.asp.