

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202-5335



OSEP FY '06 General Supervision Enhancement Grant Final Report
CFDA # 84.326X
PR/Award # H326X040041-05
Budget Period: Final
Report Type: Final Performance

OMB No. 1890-0004, Expiration Date: 07/31/2007

****Table of Contents****

Page

3	Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B) -
4	Executive Summary
8-12	Project Status
13	Grant Performance Report (ED 524B) Budget
14-17	Attachment 1
18 -23	Attachment 2

CD Submission's

- CD A- Early Learning Guidelines
- CD B- Grade Level Expectations
- CD C- Computer Task Group (CTG) report



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B)

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

Check only one box per Program Office instruction.

Annual Performance Report Final Performance Report

General Information

1. PR/ Number #: **H326X040041-05**

2. NCES ID#: _____

(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 Characters.)

(See Instructions - Up to 12 Characters.)

3 Project Title:IDEA General Supervision Enhancement Grant

(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)

4. Grantee Name *(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification)*: Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

5. Grantee Address *(See Instructions.)*

6. Project Director Name: Sharon Schumacher

Title: Program Manager

Ph #: (907) 465-2824 Ext: ()

Fax #: (907) 465-2806

Email Address: sharon_schumacher@eed.state.ak.us

Reporting Period Information *(See Instructions.)*

7. Reporting Period: From: 10/01/2004 To: 9/30/2006 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Budget Expenditures *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)*

8. Budget Expenditures

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds <i>(Match/Cost Share)</i>
a. Previous Budget Period	10/01/2004-02/28/2005	
b. Current Budget Period	03/01/2005-09/30/2006	
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>	10/01/2004-09/30/2006 (Ext.)	

Indirect Cost Information *(To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)*

9. Indirect Costs

a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? Yes No

b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government? Yes No

c. If yes, provide the following information:

 Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 07/ 01/2004 To: 06/30/2007 (mm/dd/yyyy)

 Approving Federal agency: ED Other *(Please specify)*: _____

 Type of Rate *(For Final Performance Reports Only)*: Provisional Final Other *(Please specify)* _____

d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:

Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?

Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

Human Subjects *(See Instructions.)*

10. Annual Certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval? Yes No N/A

Performance Measures Status and Certification *(See Instructions.)*

11. Performance Measures Status

a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? Yes No

b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? ___/___/___ (mm/dd/yyyy)

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Name of Authorized Representative:

Title: Commisioner

Signature:

Date: ___/___/___



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Executive Summary

OMB No. 1890 - 0004
Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award #:
H326X040041-05

The State of Alaska is extremely pleased with all of the accomplishments of this General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG), Increasing Educational Accountability in Alaska. During the course of this grant many steps were made to increase the quality of education for all students in our state. We have done this by providing many supports and resources to educator's and families.

The Goals for this grant were:

1. Develop standards and outcome indicators for children birth to 21.
2. Increase Department of Education and Early Development (EED) and DHSS capacity to capture and analyze data to measure the outcomes of children with disabilities.
3. Ensure Alaska's developmental profile and alternate assessments are effective tools.
4. Develop statewide model for disseminating research-based promising practices.

Activities for Goals 1 & 4

In order to meet the goals of the grant, the Alaska Office of Special Education invited a diverse group of stakeholders and content experts across various content domains to participate in a series of five, two-day work sessions. The first of these meetings was held in Juneau, Alaska on April 27th and 28th of 2005. The second meeting occurred in Anchorage on July 13th and 14th, the third meeting was again in Juneau on August 18th and 19th, and the fourth and fifth meetings were conducted in Anchorage on October 19th and 20th, 2005 and April 19th and 20th, 2006 respectively. Invited participants were both assigned and recruited to participate in three, specific workgroups that addressed differing goals of the GSEG project.

Each of the workgroups narrowed their objectives and focused their efforts during the course of the project. The Infants and Toddlers group worked to develop a set of child and family outcomes for children ranging in age from zero to three who have developmental disabilities or are at risk of such. In addition, they sought to adopt a set a program standards for the Part C system, draft plans for the measurement of outcomes and standards, and work to align Infant and Toddler outcomes to those for children 3 to 18.

The Preschool workgroup developed Alaska's Early Learning Guidelines for all children birth through age five and worked with members of the Early Learning Guidelines group to accomplish these tasks. The Early Learning Guidelines group was constituted through an earlier initiative to address very similar goals, the GSEG leadership sought to build on

their work in a spirit of cooperation and continuity rather than replicate efforts and produce competing sets of standards. The Early Learning Guidelines spell out what we want young children to know, understand, and be able to do at the end of four stages of development, within five domain areas. Those four stages of development are:

1. **Birth to 18 Months**
2. **18 to 36 months**
3. **36 to 60 months**
4. **60 months to Kindergarten entry**

The five domain areas are:

1. **Physical Well-Being, Health, and Motor Development.** This domain encompasses children's physical health and ability to engage in daily activities.
2. **Social and Emotional Development.** This domain addresses the emotional competence and ability to form positive relationships that give meaning to children's experiences in the home, school, and larger community.
3. **Approaches To Learning.** This domain refers to a child's disposition, rather than skill, for becoming involved in learning and acquiring knowledge.
4. **Cognition and General Knowledge.** This domain includes children's ability to understand and think about the physical and social worlds. In particular, this domain focuses on children's development of specific cognitive functions, knowledge of objects and people in the world around them, their reasoning and mathematical knowledge, their knowledge of agreed-upon social conventions such as numbers and colors, and their understanding and appreciation of the arts in their lives.
5. **Communication, Language, and Literacy.** This domain encompasses children's understanding and use of language, emerging reading and writing skills, and ability to communicate effectively.

The domains are then broken into sub-domains, domain components, and goal statements. Below each goal statement are examples of indicators for each age group that show when and how a child may express success in attaining that goal. Below the indicators in each age group are examples of strategies for caregivers to use when a child is not yet successful in attaining these goals. The complete Early Learning Guidelines document contains 74 specific goals within 50 domain components organized into the five domains expressed above. These guidelines inform parents, caregivers, community members and leaders about expectations for children's development and learning. They give specific strategies and sample activities to use to enhance children's development in each domain. They can be useful to program, school, community and state leadership as they address their early childhood education needs.

While the guidelines are not an exhaustive guide to child development, a curriculum, or an assessment instrument, and should not be used as such they are a framework that can be used to guide decision making around the development and use of early childhood education curricula and assessment as well as driving the professional development needs of the early childhood education workforce. In June 2006 they were given to the State Board of Education and after a period of public comment, the Board endorsed them on

September 28, 2006. A CD copy has also been provided with submission.(CD Labeled A) http://www.eed.state.ak.us/news/elg_guidelines.pdf

The third group, the Primary workgroup, through the GSEG grant developed Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) for Kindergarten-Grade Two for reading, writing, and math were funded by the GSEG. The committee developed draft K-Gr. 2 GLEs to accompany the state's existing Gr. 3-10 GLEs. The GLEs for Kindergarten-Grade 2 articulate the skills students need to learn in those grades in order to be able to demonstrate proficiency in grade 3 on the state assessments for reading, writing, and math. On April 19-20, 2006, a review committee of 30 educators from around the state reviewed and revised the draft GLEs. In June 2006 they were given to the State Board of Education and after a period of public comment, the Board adopted them on September 28, 2006. The State of Alaska previously developed Grade Level Expectations for grades three through graduation. The Primary workgroup reviewed content and performance standards in Reading, Writing, and Math while also aligning them to the Early Learning Guidelines in order to draft Grade Level Expectations for grade levels kindergarten through grade two. A CD copy has also been provided with submission. (CD Labeled B) <http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/GradeLevelExpectations/K-2/FinalBookletSeptember2006.pdf>.

Participants

The Core Planning Team changed slightly in composition during the course of the project. Participants on the Core Planning Team consisted of members from the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, Technical Assistance representatives from National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), the Early Child Outcomes Center (ECO), team leaders from the various workgroups, and project management from the Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC). General participants consisted of special education teachers, early childhood educators, regular Education teachers, Infant Learning Providers and a wide range of stakeholders. A core group within the general body of participants remained static during the process, and other participants were invited at strategic times for their oversight, review, and revision of documents developed by participants in the earlier work sessions.

(See Attachment 1)

Activities for Goal 3

Beginning in the fall of 2004, Gerald Tindal of the University of Oregon conducted a reliability/validity study and an alignment analysis of Alaska's Alternate Assessment Portfolio. At that time, Alaska's alternate assessment consisted of a datafolio for grades 4, 5, 7, 9, and 10 and a portfolio for grades 3, 6, 8, with an option to assess grade 11. The final report submitted in June 2005 consists of sections of analysis as follows:

- Procedural Evidence on Administration of Alternate Assessments,
- Analysis of the Internal Structure and Process of Alternate Assessments,
- Content Analysis of Portfolios and Datafolios,
- Datafolio Reliability Analysis,
- Reliability and Validity Evidence from Portfolio Analysis,

- Alignment Analysis,
- Themes and Issues from a Teacher Survey, and
- Universal Design of Alternate Assessment.

While the general report notes many successful aspects of the existing portfolio assessment, the Executive Summary reviews several problematic areas and offers recommendations. An important recommendation notes that the portfolio requires a substantial amount of restructuring to address some of its inherent problems, including incorporating performance tasks to stabilize the evidence portion of the portfolio, or move the system completely to a performance task model of assessment. Other recommendations conclude that the state should continue training and supporting teachers in good alternate assessment administration and reorganize the alignment between the assessment and the content standards.

In the spring of 2005 Gerald Tindal of the University of Oregon did an analysis of the Kindergarten Developmental Profile consisting of four parts, Procedural Evidence and Outcomes, Reliability Analyses, Validity Analyses, and a Teacher Survey. Tindal's most significant recommendation in his report to the Department is to provide teachers more detailed descriptions about the environments being used to observe students, the manner in which other individuals are to be interviewed, or the products and work samples being collected. The dimensions that are targeted also need to be more clearly articulated so teachers know what they are rating. Presently, the definitions are very abbreviated. **(See Attachment 2)**

Activities for Goal 2

When EED started implementing the design of the Unity Warehouse, Oracle was the only cost-effective solution available on the market. In November 2005, EED learned it was a recipient of an IES Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems Grant. Around the same time, December 2005, Microsoft announced the release of its new Microsoft Business Intelligence solution. Coupled with the new Microsoft Business Intelligence Solution release, the State of Alaska entered into a statewide enterprise license agreement with Microsoft. This allowed EED to purchase the new Microsoft Business Intelligence Solution at a third of the cost of the Oracle 10g Business Intelligence solution. Another win with using the Microsoft solution, is EED staff is already trained and knowledgeable on Microsoft products. Due to this switch of systems part of the training and developing is still in progress under different funding sources.

EED contracted with Computer task Group (CTG, Anchorage) to assess compliance monitoring tool and assets. A CD copy of the full report is provided with the submission. **(See CD C)**

III Project Status

GSEG ACTIVITY TIMELINES

Abbreviations: EED – Alaska Department of Education & Early Development, Part C – DHSS - Department of Health & Social Services; LEA’s – Local Education Agency; WRRC – Western Regional Resource Center, University of Oregon; CHD – Center for Human Development, University of Alaska Anchorage.

Status Codes: 1 = Completed 2 = In Progress 3 = Not Started

Goal 1: Develop standards and outcome indicators for children birth to 21.			
Objectives	Activities	Status	Summary
1.1. Develop performance standards for children birth to second grade, including children with disabilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workgroups & Stakeholder Review Committee established. ➤ Travel & participation stipends are provided. ➤ Subcontracts in place w/contractors ➤ Performance standards drafted for age groups. 	1	<p>Groups defined, range of interests represented, begun work. Have completed 5 of 5 scheduled meetings.</p> <p>Established final draft of Grade Level Expectations (CD B) and Early Learning Guidelines (CD A)</p> <p>Assessed Preliminary Evaluation Findings</p>
1.2: Revise and expand outcome indicators for Alaska’s children with disabilities.	<p>Additional outcome indicators established for Part C, Early Childhood, and school-aged students.</p> <p>Outcome indicators reviewed by Stakeholder Review Committee and feedback provided.</p> <p>Final draft of outcome indicators completed.</p>	1	<p>Part C has established/identified outcome indicators. Currently piloting child outcomes data using a modified Child Outcome summary tool based on the tool created by the ECO center. Part C will report pilot data in FY06 APR.</p> <p>Established a Broad based stakeholder group to design, define, revise and expand outcome indicators. Established final draft of Grade Level Expectations K-2 grade and Early Learning Guidelines Birth -5.</p>

Goal 2: Increase EED & DHSS capacity to capture and analyze data to measure the outcomes of children with disabilities.			
Objectives	Activities	Status	Summary
2.1 Integrate Part C recipients and components into EED's accountability system.	➤ Part C recipients enrolled in Student ID System	3	In FY 05 Part C does not intend to enroll recipients in the Student ID System.
	➤ Part C web-based information management system selected.	2	DHSS staff received an overview in October, 2004, by the Goal View vendor of EED's web-based information management system for possible inclusion. Issues of appropriateness, modification and cost were discussed. Following this presentation, internal discussions occurred at DHSS, with the resulting decision to internally design a Part C web-based information management system for its participants. The web-based information management system has been progressing with the assistance of a stakeholder group. The GSEG grant provided financial assistance in the development of this system ion FY2005. It is anticipated that the web-based system will be pilot tested beginning in the Fall of 2006.
2.2 Expand the capacity of web-based management systems to provide outcome data for children with disabilities.	Optional Assessment added GoalView.	2	Part B: All districts have a web-based systems for IEPs.
	Install 1-click capacity for web-based systems. Web based systems adapted to capture additional data for measuring outcome indicators.	1	Part C: Indicator measurements were developed and are being integrated into the ILP web database system. Pilot testing of this data system and the measurement of child/family outcomes and indicators is anticipated to take place in 2006 (March 2006-November 2006).

<p>2.3: Enhance EED and DHSS IDEA compliance monitoring systems to improve collection of outcome data for children with disabilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ EED & DHSS monitoring systems revised to measure outcome indicators. ➤ EED & DHSS monitoring schedule revised. ➤ Training/support provided to LEA's & providers. 	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Part B: Contract with Computer task Group (CTG, Anchorage) to assess compliance monitoring tool and assets. (CD C)</p> <p>EED staff have aligned the current special education monitoring tool (standards) to IDEA 2004.</p> <p>CTG Report was developed to help enhance the monitoring system.</p> <p>Part C: New monitoring system was piloted and is currently being revised to include the collection of outcome data for children with disabilities and overall improved Part C general supervision.</p>
<p>2.4: Increase capacity of EED Oracle Unity data warehouse to measure outcome indicators.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Oracle Oracle Unity Warehouse training provided to EED/DHSS staff ➤ Web based data uploaded into EED Unity Warehouse system. ➤ WEB access portals created. ➤ Multi-media training on Data Warehouse provided for state staff, LEAs, and providers. 	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Unity Warehouse training in progress –due to the switch of systems training completed by Jan. 07.</p> <p>DHSS determined that Oracle could not be supported by current hardware and software in use in the department.</p> <p>Work on the design of the required software for Part B will occur by Jan. 07.</p> <p>Since EED data staff received training in Unity Warehouse (Microsoft Business Intelligence Solution) programming, will be able to develop and implement a working and successful portal</p> <p>CTG Report has been developed. A full report is available on CD C.</p>

Goal 3: Ensure Alaska's Developmental Profile and Alternate Assessment are effective assessment tools.			
Objectives	Activities	Status	Summary
3.1: Evaluate the effectiveness of the developmental Profile.	Reliability and validity studies completed	1	Developmental Profile completed (Gerald Tindal, Dillard Research Associates - see attachment 2) Tindal's most significant recommendation in his report to the Department is to provide teachers more detailed descriptions about the environments being used to observe students, the manner in which other individuals are to be interviewed, or the products and work samples being collected. The dimensions that are targeted also need to be more clearly articulated so teachers know what they are rating. Presently, the definitions are very abbreviated.
	Subcontract with consultant completed.	1	
	Suggested changes, including integration of Universal Design	1	
3.2: Evaluate the effectiveness of Alaska's Alternate Assessment.	Subcontract with consultant completed.	1	Studies with Recommendations completed (Gerald Tindal, Dillard Research Associates - see attachment 2) While the general report notes many successful aspects of the existing portfolio assessment, the Executive Summary reviews several problematic areas and offers recommendations. An important recommendation notes that the portfolio requires a substantial amount of restructuring to address some of its inherent problems, including incorporating performance tasks to stabilize the evidence portion of the portfolio, or move the system completely to a performance task model of assessment. Other recommendations conclude that the state should continue training and supporting teachers in good alternate assessment administration and reorganize the alignment between the assessment and the content standards.
	Reliability and validity studies completed	1	
	Suggested changes, including integration of Universal Design, completed.	1	

Goal 4: Develop Statewide Model for Disseminating Research-Based Promising Practices.			
Objectives	Activities	Status	Summary
4.1: Collect statewide data on dissemination sources for LEAs and Part C providers.	<p>Dissemination needs assessment completed.</p> <p>Inventory of statewide resources completed.</p> <p>Summary of models from other states completed.</p>	1	<p>ELG's distributed to all LEA's and Head Start's and posted on website</p> <p>GLE's distributed to all LEA's and posted on website</p> <p>Numerous presentations to various stakeholder groups .</p> <p>Head Start Director's</p> <p>Special Education Director's Conf.</p> <p>Alaska State Special Education Conference</p> <p>Pre-K Summit</p> <p>Early Intervention Committee</p> <p>Special Education Advisory Panel</p> <p>Regional Association for the Education of Young Children</p> <p>ILP Providers</p>
4.2: Develop effective statewide research dissemination process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Proposed Dissemination model developed. ➤ Stakeholder Review feedback. ➤ Implementation plan established. 	1	<p>ELG's distributed to all LEA's and Head Start's and posted on website</p> <p>GLE's distributed to all LEA's and posted on website</p> <p>Numerous presentations to various stakeholder groups .</p> <p>Head Start Director's</p> <p>Special Education Director's Conf.</p> <p>Alaska State Special Education Conference</p> <p>Pre-K Summit</p> <p>Early Intervention Committee</p> <p>Special Education Advisory Panel</p> <p>Regional Association for the Education of Young Children</p> <p>ILP Providers</p> <p>See Attachment 1</p>



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1890 - 0004
Expiration: 10-31-2007

PR/Award #:
H326X040041-05

SECTION B - Budget Information

5075000 FD-IDEA SUP ENHANCEM
COA:2007

ENTITY NUMBER - DESCRIPTION

ITD NET
AUTH

ITD
ACTUAL

-----	-----	-----
S** 70000 TOTAL EXPENDITURES	484000	484000
S** 70009 TOT EXPS-PRECLOSING	484000	484000
S** 70008 OPERATING ACCT TOTAL	484000	484000
S** 70200 GROUP CTRL - OTHER	484000	484000
S** 70201 GC-OTHER-NONGRANT	484000	484000
S** 72000 TRAVEL	24000	11359
S** 73000 SERVICES	460000	472482
S** 74000 COMMODITIES	0	158

Attachment 1

METHODOLOGY

A formative evaluation of GSEG meeting processes was conducted for each of the five meeting sessions. The evaluation consisted of participants responding to a number of items on a post-meeting questionnaire. The questionnaire was introduced on the first day of the meetings in order to prime participants to critically evaluate the process as they experienced it. A time was identified in each of the meeting agendas at the end of the second day to administer the questionnaire. Results from the questionnaire were tabulated and returned to the Core Planning Team to help guide the design, process, and implementation of subsequent meetings. A number of the questions prompted respondents to offer open-ended suggestions for process improvements. These responses seemed to impact the Core Planning Team’s approach to future meetings.

RESULTS

Questionnaire responses appear below, aggregated across the five meetings. The questionnaires did not contain the all of the same questions from meeting to meeting.

Table 1. Participation By Meeting

	Meeting 1*	Meeting 2	Meeting 3	Meeting 4	Meeting 5
Infant and Toddler	-	11	10	9	-**
Preschool	-	19	13	16	9
Primary	-	10	8	6	28
Early Learning Guidelines Group	-	4	2	1	2
Missing		-	1	3	-
Total	26	44	34	35	39

* Counts of participants in workgroups not available for Meeting 1.

** Infant and Toddler workgroup had completed their tasks and did not attend Meeting 5.

Task Comprehension

Participants were asked, “Do you understand your task for your age group?” They reported an increasing level of understanding over time concerning the tasks with which

they were charged. A significant amount of time was spent in the initial meetings reviewing the purpose of the GSEG, clarifying terminology, and articulating objectives. While this approach rankled some participants who were eager to move ahead, it afforded new participants some perception of the historical context in which they would be working.

Table 2. Task Comprehension

Meeting	Response Options				
	1 I do not understand	2	3 I somewhat understand	4	5 I completely understand
Meeting 5 - Anchorage	-	-	-	15.4%	84.6%
Meeting 4 - Anchorage	-	-	-	17.1%	82.9%
Meeting 3 - Juneau	-	-	-	23.5%	76.5%
Meeting 2 - Anchorage	-	-	2.3%	43.2%	54.5%
Meeting 1 - Juneau	-	-	11.5%	50%	38.5%

Perception of Accomplishment

Participants were asked, “How much progress do you feel your workgroup made toward accomplishing the stated outcomes?” All participants across time rated their progress toward accomplishing goals as ‘adequate’ or more than adequate. In meetings four and five approximate 95% of participants reported making better than adequate or exceptional progress. This question did not appear on the questionnaire for the first meeting.

Table 3. Perception of Accomplishment

Meeting	Response Options				
	1 no progress at all	2	3 adequate progress	4	5 exceptional progress
Meeting 5 - Anchorage	-	-	5.1%	35.9%	59.0%
Meeting 4 - Anchorage	-	-	2.9%	28.6%	68.6%
Meeting 3 - Juneau	-	-	8.8%	44.1%	47.1%
Meeting 2 - Anchorage	-	-	31.8%	34.1%	34.1%

Meeting 1 - Juneau	-	-	-	-	-
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Organization of Meetings

Participants were asked to rate the organization of the GSEG meetings. The perceived organization of the GSEG meetings increased over the course of the project.

Table 4. Organization of Meetings

Meeting	Response Options				
	1 very poor	2	3 fair	4	5 exceptional
Meeting 5 - Anchorage	-	-	5.1%	35.9%	59.0%
Meeting 4 - Anchorage	-	-	14.3%	48.6%	37.1%
Meeting 3 - Juneau	-	-	17.6%	61.8%	20.6%
Meeting 2 - Anchorage	-	2.3%	20.5%	47.7%	29.5%
Meeting 1 - Juneau	-	-	-	-	-

Quality of Meetings

Participants were asked to rate the quality of the GSEG meetings. The participant perception of meeting quality improved over time.

Table 5. Quality of Meetings

Meeting	Response Options				
	1 very poor	2	3 fair	4	5 exceptional
Meeting 5 - Anchorage	-	-	5.1%	33.3%	61.5%
Meeting 4 - Anchorage	-	-	11.8%	38.2%	50.0%
Meeting 3 - Juneau	-	-	8.8%	58.8%	32.4%
Meeting 2 - Anchorage	-	2.3%	15.9%	59.1%	22.7%
Meeting 1 - Juneau	-	-	-	-	-

Relevance of Meetings

Participants were asked to rate the relevance of the GSEG meetings as they addressed the stated meeting outcomes. All meetings were rated relatively high with increased higher ratings as the project progressed.

Table 6. Relevance of Meetings

Meeting	Response Options				
	1 very poor	2	3 fair	4	5 exceptional
Meeting 5 - Anchorage	-	-	-	30.8%	69.2%
Meeting 4 - Anchorage	-	-	2.9%	42.9%	54.3%
Meeting 3 - Juneau	-	-	8.8%	47.1%	44.1%
Meeting 2 - Anchorage	-	-	11.4%	56.8%	31.8%
Meeting 1 - Juneau	-	-	-	-	-

Participant Satisfaction with Process

Participants were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with integrating workgroup process and product with overall group decision-making. This item appeared on the evaluation questionnaire for the fourth and fifth meetings. An analysis of respondent comments provided some clarification for this distribution of answers in meeting four. Respondents expected to make more progress toward aligning the outcome indicators between the groups.

Table 7. Participant Satisfaction with Process

Meeting	Response Options				
	1 Very Disappointed	2 Less than Satisfied	3 Satisfied	4 More than Satisfied	5 Very Pleased
Meeting 5 - Anchorage	-	-	15.4%	30.8%	53.8%

Meeting 4 - Anchorage - 22.9% 20.0% 34.3% 22.9%

Participant Satisfaction with Specific Workgroup

Participants were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with specific workgroup (Infant Toddler, Preschool, Primary) processes. This question only appeared on the evaluation questionnaire for the fourth and fifth meetings. See Appendix B for participant comments.

Table 8. Participant Satisfaction with Specific Workgroup

Meeting	Response Options				
	1 Very Disappointed	2 Less than Satisfied	3 Satisfied	4 More than Satisfied	5 Very Pleased
Meeting 5 - Anchorage	-	-	2.6%	28.2%	66.7%*
Meeting 4 - Anchorage	-	5.7%	8.6%	25.7%	57.1%

* Percentages do not equal 100%, one missing response does not appear in the percentages.

Participant Satisfaction with Core Planning Team

Participants were asked, “Did the overall process and structure of the advisory team(s) work the way you wanted it to?” This question appeared only on the questionnaire used to evaluate meeting four. Over 65% of participants indicated the overall process and structure of the advisory teams worked the way they wanted it to, while 25% said they were ‘unsure.’ Many clarifying comments revealed that respondents were not sure what was meant by the ‘advisory teams’ in the question as it could have been interpreted as the core planning group, participants providing Technical Assistance, or those facilitating workgroups.

Table 9. Participant Satisfaction with Core Planning Team

Response Options	Frequency	Percent
Yes	23	65.7
No	0	0.0
Unsure	9	25.7
Total	32	91.4

	Missing	3	8.6
	Total	35	100.0

Process Results Compared to Expectations

Participants were asked, “After about one year of work, did you wind up where you thought you would?” This question appeared on the evaluation questionnaire for meeting four. Slightly over 68% of participants indicated the process concluded where they thought it would, with approximately 23% responding with ‘no’ or ‘unsure.’

Respondents qualified some answers of ‘no’ and ‘unsure’ by stating they did not have clear expectations. Other respondents pointed out an error in the question in that the group process was only six months long.

Table 10. Process Results Compared to Expectations

Response Options	Frequency	Percent
Yes	24	68.6
No	4	11.4
Unsure	4	11.4
Total	32	91.4
Missing	3	8.6
Total	35	100.0

Willingness for Continued Participation

Participants were asked, “If future GSEG meetings are held, would you be willing to participate?” This question appeared in the fourth and fifth meeting evaluation questionnaires to gauge desire and interest for continued work on GSEG objectives. Participants were nearly unanimous in their desire to continue the work.

Table 11. Willingness for Continued Participation

Meeting	Response Options			
	Yes	No	Unsure	Missing
Meeting 5 - Anchorage	97.4%	-	-	2.6%
Meeting 4 - Anchorage	94.3%	-	2.9%	2.9%

Attachment 2

Final Summary and Recommendations for the Alaska Alternate Assessment Gerald Tindal – June 30, 2005

In the evaluation of the Alaska Alternate assessment, five major problems were noted, some of them intractable and built into the system. In this final summary, each of these problems is noted with highlights drawn from the full technical report submitted earlier.

Portfolio approach to assessment. This approach to assessment has a number of problems inherently built into it and may be the primary reason for the difficulty in achieving technical adequacy. A list of the problems with portfolio assessment is attached to this summary. Most of these problems can be successfully resolved only by radically structuring the manner in which student work samples are solicited, documented, and scored. In the end, the amount of effort and cost probably is likely to still result in an inadequate system for use in a large-scale assessment system. Portfolios are excellent approaches to assessment for teachers to use in structuring information for instruction; they are inadequate for documenting outcomes as part of a statewide assessment system.

Procedural evidence that supports the technical adequacy. The strongest component of the Alaska Alternate Assessment is the support provided to teachers describing all of the mechanics for implementing the assessment system. Manual clearly displayed the steps, memoranda were sent out at critical times to clarify procedures, scoring guides clarified the dimensions and values for evaluating documents, and forms were clearly laid out and accompanied by explanatory procedures. This procedural evidence made the evaluation much easier to conduct and the conclusions more certain.

Empirical and statistical evidence. A number of analyses were completed on the data sets that addressed both the reliability and the validity of measures and decisions capable of being made. Although the process for assessment was designed to capture stable judgments of student behavior in which there was great agreement, most often this was not attained. Judges disagreed in every way possible. Although student behavior was designed to reflect important goals from the Individualized Education Program (IEP) relative to the standards, often the measures failed to be useful for either (IEPs or accountability).

Alignment between the alternate assessment and content standards. The manner in which the assessment was interleaved with specific standards across the grade levels resulted in a very incomplete alignment and created difficulty in tracking the growth of students over time (across grades). This strategy resulted in very poor alignment with the range of knowledge and a spurious inflation of balance of representation. In other words, each assessment presented a great amount of information (but not all of which was useful) on a narrow slice of the standards.

Technical documentation and reporting. Of course, the purpose of this report is to begin the process of documentation. The data sets available were extremely well laid out and

appeared to provide very clean data. They appeared to reflect great care in development and organization. Nevertheless, the data sets also were likely to require a great amount of time to develop; the analyses conducted as part of this evaluation also required a great deal of time. Therefore, as a system, it is unlikely that technical documentation can never be used formatively as the demands for organizing and analyzing the data far exceed the time lines needed to make changes useful.

As a function of each of the issues above, the following recommendations are proposed.

1. Change the approach to assessment by either radically restructuring the portfolios so they are more standardized or move directly to a performance assessment system. The goal of alternate assessments must match the goal of general education assessments: accountability on achievement of state standards.
2. Continue to invest in support for teachers, guiding them in alternate assessment implementation. Of course, with a change in approach, the actual content of this support needs to change. Nevertheless, the department has established a clear presence with expertise in this area.
3. Establish more clarity from the beginning about the decisions that need to be made from the assessment system and organize the empirical evidence to support these decisions. Decide a priori on the kinds of analyses that need to be completed.
4. In designing an alternate assessment, begin with an alignment focus from the start and evaluate its alignment formatively with content experts early in its life cycle.
5. Create a data throughput that is easier to maintain (requires less staff time), more automatic, and pre-structured to provide reports that can be used to evaluate outcomes.

Problems with Portfolios

Data reporting – Teachers varied greatly in the graphic and tabular data that were reported in the portfolios. This variation occurred in the type of data, the format for reporting, the clarity and interpretability of the data, and the integration of the data within the case. On occasion data were missing that would have helped convey clear interpretations; on the other hand, data were included that were extraneous to the outcomes being highlighted.

Form and function of evidence – When teachers included various sorts of evidence, others reviewing it were uncertain about the form and function. For example, pictures and graphs may have been viewed as interchangeable (different forms) and yielding similar (supplemental) functions (pictures presented student on a task along with a graph of performance on the task). In contrast, other portfolios were designed with entries using one form (e.g., a picture) to show performance on a task and other forms (e.g., work samples or a graph) to show functional improvement.

Sufficiency of evidence – In the portfolio review discussions, teachers struggled with how much evidence was enough. Though sufficiency is a function of clarity, it also poses a unique problem in itself. The portfolio entries were designed to reflect what the student

was learning yet it was difficult to ascertain a trajectory with limited sampling to be convincing.

Proficiency of performance – The entries in the portfolios were designed to reflect how well a student could perform though often that performance was within a structured interaction with stipulated prompts. Therefore, without qualifying information (historical as well as contextual), it was difficult to make judgments of proficiency. Although multiple settings were considered in the eventual evaluation of portfolios, the information supporting proficiency was confounded with settings in unclear ways.

Consistency of evidence and forms – The forms excluded some information that was in the portfolio and included some information that was not summarized on the form. Teachers therefore had to spend time reconciling the evidential basis and taking an inventory of available pieces of evidence: how they fit and where they were located.

Sampling plans for data collection – Few teachers included information on the way that stimulus materials were identified, sampled, formatted, or scored. The same lack of detail generally pervaded all collections of evidence. Without pictures or video, no capturing information was included to contextualize the documents. With work samples, no details were included about the skill focus or the administration conditions. With graphs or tables, few labels were apparent either in defining the components of the graph (the axes, the key, the scale, etc.) or the meaning of the data.

Clarity of teacher rating rubrics – The forms for evaluating the portfolios contained rubrics that teachers found somewhat confusing. These rubrics were designed to be used across the full range of standards and collections of evidence (all grades as well as standards in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, and Skills for Healthy Living). At the same time, each collection contained unique features that were difficult to consider with the same rubric. This application ignores many dimensions of behavior topography, assessment conditions, and relationship with the IEP goals.

***Discrepancy of static nature of product with process analysis* – Teachers noted issues and opportunities in the data collection process but in the end had to make judgments on the products only. Frequently they had to anchor the process with their previous experience with students having similar disabilities or on cues that were suggestive but not explicit in the evidence. With many students, the manner in which the assessment is conducted is as or more important than the outcome achieved. For example, if latency, duration, or topography of behavior is important as part of independence training, then the process is the product.**

Assumptions to proceed – In the absence of explicitly clear information, teachers had to make some assumptions and proceed with their review of the student's portfolio. For example, with a picture of a student being helped (prompted) to work with chips distributed on a table and a box next to them, teachers had to infer whether the student was working on communication (putting and taking chips in and out of the box,

respectively) or fine motor behavior (grasping chips). Interpretations of outcomes could only be made if teachers understood program goals.

Functional contingencies – Many of the behaviors evaluated for students were part of complex behavioral chains in which functional contingencies were involved in the evocation of the behavior. Powerful discriminative stimuli and reinforcement patterns using any number of different schedules were part of the assessment process. Yet, the portfolio focused only on the behavior not the contingencies. Much of the change in behavior may have been more importantly documented with respect to the schedule than the topography of the behavior.

