

CONTINUATION SHEET

January 31, 2001

Chairman Umbarger introduced Steve Adams, Department of Education who gave an overview of the Kansas Quality Performance Accreditation. (Attachment 1)

During committee discussion, Mr. Adams stated that a school that had been accredited conditionally has one year to provide evidence that problems have been corrected. The visiting team comes back and makes recommendations to the state board either to accredit or not to accredit the school. The state board takes final action. So far all schools have been accredited. Mr. Adams described accreditation of a school as a school earning a badge of quality so that parents can have some assurance that their kids will receive a quality education against standards that the board has determined.

Chairman Umbarger introduced Dr. Mary Devin, Superintendent, Geary County United School District 475. She spoke about the Accreditation Study Task Force. (Attachment 2)

Chairman Umbarger introduced Dr. Robert Goodwin, Chairman of QPA Advisory Committee and Superintendent of Schools, Southeast of Saline School District. Dr. Goodwin gave a report on QPA issues that impact the effectiveness of QPA and spoke about identifying strategies to correct the problems. (Attachment 3) and (Attachment 4)

The meeting was adjourned. The next meeting is scheduled February 1, 2001.

12-31-01

To: Kansas Senate Education Committee

From: Steve Adams, School Improvement and Accreditation Team Leader, Kansas State Department of Education

Re: Overview of Kansas Quality Performance Accreditation

Kansas Quality Performance Accreditation has been in existence for nearly a decade. In 1988 Governor Mike Hayden assembled the Committee on Accountability to formulate recommendations for an accreditation system with greater accountability. The committee recommended the development of an outcomes-based accreditation system that moved from measuring school quality by inputs to measuring outputs. Shortly thereafter, the Outcomes Accreditation Task Force was formed to develop recommendations to the Kansas State Board of Education for what an outcomes-based accreditation system should be. Quality Performance Accreditation grew from their recommendations in 1992.

Quality Performance Accreditation is a continuous improvement model. It shifted the focus of accrediting schools based on input factors to measuring the results of student learning. Examples of input factors are number of books in the library, number of days in session, and certification of staff. While this philosophical shift sounds simple enough, it represented a major shift in the ways schools do business. Practices that preserve and protect the status quo were to be replaced with school improvement plans that expand practice to maximize student learning. Schools became accountable to demonstrate results with multiple forms of assessment data.

There are currently 1658 public and private schools that participate in the Quality Performance Accreditation process. All schools were phased into the new accreditation system over a five-year period. Each school has completed at least one cycle of Quality Performance Accreditation.

In June of 2000, the Kansas State Board of Education formed and charged the Accreditation Study Task Force to conduct a study of Quality Performance Accreditation. The group is specifically charged with identifying what has been successful, what has been less than successful, what other states are doing, how the process can be streamlined, and what are the recommendations to improve Quality Performance Accreditation? The task force will submit their recommendations to the Kansas State Board of Education in August of 2001.

Attached is a summary of the five-year Quality Performance Accreditation cycle.

Senate Education
1-31-01
Attachment 1

Quality Performance Accreditation Cycle at a Glance

Year 1	Revise school mission Collect baseline data Review recommendations from the last accreditation visit development a school profile Review data and engage staff in selection of target areas Select a visiting team Complete annual report
Year 2	Agree on target areas and instructional strategies for the school improvement plan Agree on a results-based staff development plan to be included in the school improvement plan Host the first on-site visit to review the school improvement plan and implementation strategies Update the school profile Complete annual report
Year 3	Implement the School improvement plan and collect data Monitor student data and adjust the school improvement plan as needed Update the school profile Complete annual report
Year 4	Update the school profile Monitor student data and adjust the school improvement plan as needed Complete annual report
Year 5	Update the school profile Monitor student data and adjust the school improvement plan as needed Host the accreditation visit Complete annual report

ACCREDITATION STUDY TASK FORCE

A. Purpose

Original Charge - June 28, 2000

The State Board of Education charge to this committee is as follows:

- What is working well in the current system? (Things that were put in the system that have served us.)
- What is not working well nor needed within our current accreditation system? (There may be things that the committee decides no longer make sense or are taking too much time.)
- What can we learn from other states that might assist us in making improvements in our accreditation system? (Other states have caught up with us. Is there something out there that we can learn from other states?)
- What improvements should be made to the current system?
- Focus on streamlining and simplifying the system
- Seek input from throughout the state

B. Summary of Accreditation Study Task Force Work To Date

The Task Force consists of 27 members from all geographic areas, including parents, Board members, site council members, special educators, teachers & administrators from all levels. Our work has involved

- 6 full day meetings (June 28, July 12-13, August 31, September 28, January 18, 2001)
- Study Topics
 - ✓ History of school accreditation in Kansas
 - ✓ Profile of Kansas districts
 - ✓ Student performance in Kansas
 - ✓ Cases of conditional accreditation
 - ✓ Schedule for revising curriculum standards
 - ✓ Schedule for State Assessments
 - ✓ What other states are doing
 - ✓ Previous surveys/studies of QPA

Based on this input

- We worked with KSDE Research Division to develop a survey to assess perceptions toward QPA held by various stakeholder groups:
 - ✓ 50 Likert scale response questions
 - ✓ 11 possible strategies to prioritize impact
 - ✓ Measure of perceived degree of involvement of administrators and teachers in the process.
- Results are now being analyzed. We will receive final report at our next meeting – February 22-23, 2001.
- We organized the information about QPA into 5 themes and divided ourselves into 5 sub groups to address each.
 - ✓ Group I Training
 - ✓ Group II Site Visits
 - ✓ Group III District/ Board Responsibility
 - ✓ Group IV Accreditation Criteria
 - ✓ Group V KSDE Support

Senate Education Committee
1-31-01
Attachment 2

ACCREDITATION STUDY TASK FORCE

C. Time Line Update

September 28	Explore strategies; activate small work groups
January	Receive research report and Small group reports
February/March	Reach preliminary conclusions Finalize plans for sharing first draft of recommendations
April	Share recommendations draft Possible options <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. QPA Advisory Council2. Superintendents' Council3. Break out session at Effective Schools Conference4. Commissioner Tompkins
May	Adjust conclusions based on input from groups
June/July	Finalize report
August	Report to Commissioner

For more information contact:

Dr. Mary Devin
Geary County Unified School District 475
P.O. Box 370
Junction City, KS 66441-0370
(785) 238-6184

Report on QPA Prepared for the Senate Education Committee
by
Robert D. Goodwin, Ph.D.
Supt. of Schools, Southeast of Saline School District

A. Introduction

B. Positive comments about QPA.

C. Issues that impact the effectiveness of QPA.

1. System is too Complex.

- a. "After being in this process from the beginning, I certainly do not want to eliminate the visiting teams. However, I no longer have the time to chair teams due to the complexity of the reporting mechanism. How do we simplify this, figure that one out and market it and you can retire early!" Mary Paul, Asst. Supt. USD 262, Valley Center Schools
- b. "The complexity and cynicism issues have been a constant reminder of how hard everyone needs to work to make school improvement the real issue. This came up in my board meeting this week as we were presenting information about our QPA/NCA visit. The question concerned whether teachers understood the process and whether they were taking part in it. State employees can help with the effort by making their staff development sessions interesting and worthwhile, keep to the timeline, don't "make fun" of our efforts or tell tales about districts' horror stories." Jane Anderson, Supt. USD 477, Ingalls

2. Increased Demands.

- a. "QPA paperwork, providing on-site personnel for the state department, curriculum issues and development, and assessment requirements have nearly doubled the job of the central office administration. I don't believe that powers to be realize what increased demands have been due to QPA." Bob Hightree, Supt. USD 361, Anthony
- b. "I, at the central office, do as much as is possible to help with the QPA process, but I am responsible for public relations, budget, staff development, purchasing, maintenance, Title programs, special education efforts, grant writing, school to career and tech prep initiatives, and working with the board." Beth Reust, Supt. USD 380, Vermillion

3. Too Many Changes.

- a. "There is a sense of skepticism regarding the state testing and the negation of data gathered from the earlier testing results. It is difficult to maintain staff

Senate Education Committee
1-31-01
Attachment 3

enthusiasm with the changing expectation from the state.” Bill Biggs, Supt. USD 488, Axtell

- b. “The ‘moving targets’ give too many excuses to people who do not want to make the appropriate changes or who choose to move slowly, hoping that another change will justify their lethargy.” Mike Rooney, Supt. USD 203, Piper

4. Widening Gap Between Regular Students and Students From a Low Socio-Economic Background.

- a. “The changing economy has brought more academically and economically needy students to our district. The gap for SES (socio-economic standards) and learning is changing because we are working with more students with academic needs. Along with changes in curriculum and QPA items, our staff is learning to teach differently because students are different than they were in this community 5 years ago. All of these issues combined lead to the confusion and cynicism when you start talking about QPA and accreditation. People are running out of energy.” Betty Summers, Supt. USD 305, St. Johns

- b. In Kansas City, we are very concerned about the widening gap between kids coming from low-income homes as compared to their wealthier peers. Ray Daniels, Supt. USD 500, Kansas City

5. Perceptions Concerning Issues Related to QPA - Attached is a listing of responses from administrators in 48 Kansas School Districts.

D. Identify strategies to correct the problems.

- 1. Issues one, two and three listed above can be folded together when discussing possible solutions. Continuous changes in the QPA program and format increase the level of complexity for educators trying to meet expectations set down within the system. Constant change results in a feeling of increased demand on peoples time in trying to understand and carry out the things that need to be done. The process has to be simplified.
- 2. Issue four concerning the gap in scores between regular ed. students and low ses students is one that may cost the state more money to fix. Most educators agree that early childhood education programs is one sure way to help students get an even start in school. They also agree that more resources for at-risk students, after school programs and summer school programs might also help narrow the gap. One solution I would suggest, that is not agreed upon by most of my colleagues is to make the tests meaningful to the students. In other words, especially at the secondary level, some method must be found to cause students to try to do well on the tests. The connection to low ses may not be direct, but I think you will find that students who are low ses are

often less bonded to their school and do not feel it is important to do well on tests to please their teachers or make the school look good. If they and other students find it is in their best interest to do well on the test then they will try harder.

Perceptions Concerning Issues Related to QPA

USD #	K-12 Enrollment	1 Increased Demands	2 Added Staff	3 Too Many Changes	4 Need \$ For At Risk	5 Positive Comments	6 Negative Support	7 Problems Ks Assmnts	8 More Trng Needed
USD 200	316	x	x						
USD 203	1307	x	x		x			x	
USD 208	536	x	x	x		x		x	
USD 213	102		x					x	
USD 220	278	x		x	x		x	x	
USD 223	503	x	x	x	x	x			
USD 248	1159	x			x	x			
USD 254	737		x			x		x	
USD 257	1646		x	x		x			
USD 262	2352			x	x	x			x
USD 266	5201	x	x	x				x	
USD 270	471	x	x						
USD 271	449	x	x	x				x	
USD 279	186	x						x	
USD 282	501		x			x		x	
USD 287	996		x	x		x			
USD 298	411	x							
USD 316	179		x				x	x	
USD 328	572	x	x	x	x				
USD 329	559					x			x
USD 337	898				x				
USD 338	470	x	x						
USD 340	958		x	x		x			
USD 345	3236					x			
USD 350	426	x	x	x		x		x	
USD 355	593		x					x	
USD 358	439				x	x			x
USD 361	1072	x		x				x	
USD 365	1162			x	x	x			
USD 371	221	x	x	x				x	
USD 380	642	x	x		x	x			x
USD 393	431	x							
USD 397	301	x	x						
USD 403	307	x					x		
USD 404	816	x	x	x					
USD 407	1130	x	x	x	x	x			x
USD 419	410	x	x	x			x		
USD 421	494		x	x	x	x			
USD 425	276	x	x			x		x	
USD 436	952	x		x		x			
USD 440	749		x		x				
USD 448	498		x				x	x	
USD 451	265	x	x				x	x	
USD 463	132	x		x				x	
USD 471	213							x	
USD 477	302	x		x	x	x			x
USD 488	351	x	x			x		x	
USD 500	20,188		x						x



August 2000

TO: Superintendents, Principals, Quality Performance Accreditation District Contacts, and Service Center Personnel

FROM: Steve Adams, Team Leader, School Improvement and Accreditation

SUBJECT: Local Performance Assessments

This memo is an attempt to provide clarity to the local performance assessment requirement. **Please disregard previous communications from KSDE as this is the most current interpretation of the Kansas State Board of Education's performance assessment requirement.**

Performance Assessment Definition:

A form of assessment based on observation and professional judgment which requires students to produce work or engage in direct demonstrations of their skills, understanding, or knowledge. Performance assessments require students to perform tasks with clearly defined criteria. Performance assessments are a direct measure of what students know and can do. Examples include, but are not limited to: Portfolios, direct writing assessments, projects, exhibitions, demonstrations, and simulations.

Clarifying Points

1. Local performance assessments are to be included as one of the three measures for a given target area of a school improvement plan. This statement is in line with the State Board of Education's decision in August of 1997 which stated: "Performance assessments in reading, mathematics, science, and social studies will be required at the local level as one of the local measures in the accreditation process but not aggregated at the state level."
2. The 1998-1999 school year is the "start up" year of the local performance assessments.
3. Each building accredited by KSBE must put in place and administer a local performance assessment in the academic areas targeted for improvement within the school improvement plan. Exceptions to this rule are buildings that are not required to administer the Kansas Assessment within the grade configuration of that building.
4. For curricular areas that are targeted in the school improvement plan, local performance assessments are to be given each year that the state assessment is administered for that curricular area. A school wanting to provide local performance assessments in non-targeted areas yearly can do so; but this decision rests solely with the district/school.

Performance Assessments

Page 2

August 2000

5. Local performance assessments in content areas **not targeted** for improvement in the school improvement plan are required to be given only during the year that the state assessment is administered for the particular curricular area. A school wanting to provide local performance assessments in non-targeted areas yearly can do so; but this decision rests solely with the district/school. The data obtained from these administrations should assist schools in completing the accreditation visit template sustained status screen. This screen is used to provide information on whether a school has improved, sustained, or declined on their local content area assessments.

6. School districts determine at each building the grade(s) at which the local performance assessment is to be administered. Kansas curricular standards grade spans should be used as a basis to determine the grade level(s) to be assessed. However, only one grade per building needs to be assessed per content area. The exception to this is the buildings combined for Quality Performance Accreditation purposes on the Annual Report. Combined schools are considered as "one building" and, therefore, are required to assess at only one grade within the combined configuration. School districts may choose to assess at more than one grade, but this is solely a district/school decision. **(Important Clarification: Schools that are configured in such a way that a Kansas State Assessment is not administered in that building per curricular area(s) do not have to administer a performance assessment in that (those) particular curricular area(s). Example: Kansas Assessments are not administered in a K-2 building. Therefore, a K-2 building is not required to administer a performance assessment. A K-2 building is free to select a third locally determined assessment for Quality Performance Accreditation purposes. KSDE does encourage all schools to consider adoption of performance assessments as best practice.)**



Kansas State Department of Education

120 S.E. 10th Avenue
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

DATE: August 2000

TO: Kansas Educators

FROM: Steve Adams, Team Leader, School Improvement and Accreditation

SUBJECT: Enclosed Materials

I have enclosed materials for your information. Some are new items concerning the upcoming Social Studies and Science Assessments. Some are materials previously sent to you, but we thought you would want the information available as you "gear up" for the coming school year.

The following are included in this packet:

- Second grade reading diagnostic assessment.
- Information on the indicators which will be included in the Spring Science Assessment. These indicators can be found in the complete Kansas Curricular Standards for Science.
- Information on the indicators which will be included in the Spring Social Studies Assessment. These indicators can be found in the complete Kansas Curricular Standards for Civics-Government, Economics, Geography and History.
- Information related to 2001 Assessments.
- Performance assessment requirements.
- Quality Performance Accreditation study information.
- Staff development and technical assistance meetings dates.
- Quality Performance Accreditation Chair/Team Training schedule.
- Information regarding recognition of excellent performance on the Kansas State Assessments.

School Improvement and Accreditation Team

785-296-4946 (phone)

785-296-3523 (fax)

785-296-6338 (TTY)

www.ksbe.state.ks.us

The University of Kansas

Center for Educational
Testing and Evaluation

Superintendents and Test Coordinators: This request is being sent to Principals in your district. Please encourage your colleagues to provide whatever assistance they can to assist us with this test development step. We have not included with this copy to you the response form. Thank you.

Memo to: Building Principals, All Kansas USDs

From: John Poggio and Doug Glasnapp

Date: September 14, 2000

J.P. -

RE: Request to participate in the Field Testing of the new Kansas Science, Social Studies and Plain English (ELL) Assessments

By way of introduction for new Kansas school administrators, our group at the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation (CETE) provides the assessment services (design, development, administration, scoring, reporting, etc.) associated with the Kansas mandated assessments. This school year will see new state assessments for spring 2001 administration in:

- Science (grades 4, 7 and 10),
- Social Studies (6, 8 and 11),
- “Modified” assessments in Reading (grades 5, 8 and 11) and Mathematics (grades 4, 7 and 10) for eligible students with learning difficulties, and
- English Language Learner assessment forms for Reading and Mathematics.

It is our goal to create and implement the assessment program that as often as possible completes test development activities seeking input and guidance from Kansas educators to reflect the best ideas and interests of the groups being served. This approach has served us well in our past assessment efforts; our hope and intention are no less for these new assessments.

Today we are writing to ask if your building is willing to participate in the *field testing* of these new assessments. The new assessments are under development, which will align with the recently revised Kansas Curriculum Standards in these content areas. To ready tests for administration this spring, an important step in development is the “field” testing of the new assessments. We invite and solicit your school’s participation in this important activity. We are in need of schools who are willing to invest one class period (45 minutes) between October 16 through October 27 to test at least one class of your students at grades 5 through 11 on at least one of the new assessments (field testing occurs at the grade *above* the actual grade to be tested this spring) to take a portion of one of the new tests. Participation by as many combinations of these grades and students is most welcomed and appreciated. Please indicate on the enclosed yellow form the grade(s) and the content area(s) where your school is willing to help. If you are willing to participate, we must have your response by September 28.

-over-

When we receive your completed form, we will then contact and coordinate the field testing activity with your district test coordinator, you and your school counselor. Returning the completed form is your commitment to participate, and we will then contact staff to work out the details for the field test (e.g., best dates, grades, procedures and quantities, shipping and return of materials, extent of the classes/students we will use, etc.). In some cases, members of our staff will come to your school to carry out the activity with your staff. In most cases, we will work through your staff, but will not come to schools during the field test. If you are willing to have your school participate in the field test, then discuss this decision with your teachers at the grades being volunteered, your school counselor, and your district test coordinator. Should you have questions about this activity, please contact us.

Participation by a representative and large sample of Kansas schools is essential toward assuring that fair tests are developed. The benefits associated by having a large and broadly representative pool of schools participate will go a long way to assuring valid assessments.

We look forward to working with you and your staff in the months ahead. If at any time we can be of assistance, please do not hesitate to call on us. Sincere best wishes for the school year.

Cc: District Superintendents
District Test Coordinators

FYI: Please note that the Center along with the entire School of Education at KU has moved to new offices in Pearson Hall (northwest corner of the campus, just north of the Chi Omega fountain on West Campus Road). The Center's new address is: 735 Pearson Hall. All else, phones, zipcode, email, etc., remains the same. When next you are on campus, stop by for a visit. For the record, it is wonderful!




Kansas State Department of Education

120 S.E. 10th Avenue
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

TO: Superintendents of Unified School Districts

FROM: Steve Adams, Team Leader
School Improvement and Accreditation

 Jeannette Nobo, Coordinator
School Improvement and Accreditation

DATE: September 15, 2000

SUBJECT: Web Applications for the First Onsite and Accreditation Reports

As you are aware, the First Onsite and Accreditation Reports have been submitted to KSDE using diskettes in the past. The Department has been working on a web-based application to enable school districts and private schools to submit these reports using the Internet. By doing this, it eliminates mailing diskettes and the technical problems associated with loading the software programs on your computer. The data will now be transmitted back to our office on-line and will save the schools the burden of mailing the diskettes to us.

It is the Agency's recommendation that these reports be completed on a Windows PC using Internet Explorer as the browser. Once you logon to the website, there is an established link that will allow you to download Internet Explorer FREE.

This web application was developed using a Windows platform with Internet Explorer as the browser. Please note this report can be completed using a Macintosh or Netscape as the browser; however, certain features may not be available, including the ability to print the document.

Enclosed you will find one manual including the First Onsite and the Accreditation Report information. The web applications name for the two reports will be called the Building Accreditation Section.

Also enclosed is a memo containing the User ID and Password for each attendance center to complete the First Onsite and the Final Accreditation Report. These passwords will be the same passwords for each web application. **It is at the discretion of the Superintendent to give out secured passwords.** It will be a local decision how passwords will be used with the visiting team chairs. Feel free to contact us if you have any questions.



Date: September 20, 2000
To: Superintendents, Principals, Test Coordinators, Special Education Directors, Curriculum Directors, and ELL Coordinators
From: *Cherie* Cherie Randall, Assessment Coordinator
Re: Assessment Update

This mailing will address several important issues pertinent to the 2000-2001 Kansas Assessments in reading, mathematics, science, social studies as well as the assessments with modifications and alternate assessment:

- ◆ Review of testing window, amount of time for testing, mail-in dates, etc.
- ◆ Information on registration.
- ◆ Information on procedures for testing all students.
- ◆ Announcement of building- and student-level performance standards.
- ◆ Announcement of training sessions on assessment.
- ◆ Assessment staff phone numbers and e-mail addresses.

Review of Assessment Timeline and Plans

Subject Areas, Test Structure, and Grade Levels Assessed --

- ◆ Mathematics, Grades 4, 7, 10 AND
Assessments with Modifications in Mathematics, Grades 4, 7, 10
- ◆ Reading, Grades 5, 8, 11 AND
Assessments with Modifications in Reading, Grades 5, 8, 11
- ◆ Science, Grades 4, 7, 10 AND
Pilot Assessments with Modifications in Science, Grades 4, 7, 10
- ◆ Social Studies, Grades 6, 8, 11 AND
Pilot Assessments with Modifications in Social Studies, Grades 6, 8, 11
- ◆ Alternate Assessment for students ages 10, 13, 16 by September 1, 2000

NOTE: THERE WILL BE NO STATE ASSESSMENTS IN WRITING THIS YEAR.

Time Needed for Testing

- ◆ Mathematics (general and modified) -- four 45-minute periods or two 90-minute periods within a two-week timeframe
- ◆ Reading (general)--four 45-minute periods or two 90-minute periods within a two-week timeframe
- ◆ Reading (modified)--varies depending upon level
- ◆ Science and Social Studies (general)-- three 45-minute periods or one 90-minute period and one 45-minute period within a two-week timeframe

The above times DO NOT include testing times for local performance assessments. For time requirements for your performance assessment, please call your assessment provider (Center for Educational Testing, testing company, service center, etc.).

*The above times DO include time for the "get-ready" activities. Remember that these assessments are NOT TIMED. These times are for classes. If individual students need more time, they should be given more time **immediately** following the testing session in question.*

- ◆ Alternate Assessment -- Data will be collected for evidence file throughout the school year. Evaluation interview will be conducted within the testing window and returned along with general education assessment materials.

2001 Testing Window

- ◆ Mathematics and Reading (general and modified) -- February 26 through March 30
- ◆ Science and Social Studies (general) -- March 12 through April 16
- ◆ Pilots for Assessments with Modifications in Science and Social Studies -- April
- ◆ Alternate Assessment -- February 26 through March 30 for interview, collection of data for evidence file throughout the school year

Mailing Dates

- ◆ Alternate Assessment Manuals -- in this mailing
- ◆ Reading, Mathematics (general and modified) --February 12
- ◆ Alternate Assessment Evaluation Interview and Related Materials -- February 12
- ◆ Science and Social Studies (general) -- February 26

If materials are postmarked back to CETE by April 17, the following results will be postmarked back to districts by May 15: student, building, and district reports in reading and mathematics (both general and modified), alternate assessment results, and indicator analysis in science and social studies. Student reports for science and social studies will be returned in August, 2001. State, district, and building reports in science and social studies will be returned in Fall, 2001.



THIS MEMO REPLACES THE MEMO DATED 10/16/00. IT CONTAINS UPDATED INFORMATION.

Date: November 1, 2000

To: Superintendents, Principals, Test Coordinators, and Special Education Directors

From: Cherie Randall, Assessment Coordinator

Re: **New Information -- Reading Assessment with Modifications**

There will be only two levels of the reading assessment with modifications available for students in Spring, 2001:

- ◆ **Level 1, Modified Reading Assessment available for Grades 5, 8 and 11, with a reading level of approximately 4.0 to 5.0**
- ◆ **Level 3, Modified Reading Assessment available to Grades 5, 8, and 11-- no reading passages, measures pre-reading skills**

The Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation will continue with plans to add operational assessments for levels 2A and 2B in Spring, 2002. Those assessments will be the same as those described in earlier communications with you.

In a previous mailing you received information about mathematics and reading assessments with modifications that will be administered in Spring, 2001. You were informed that there would be four levels of the modified reading assessment available for students in 2000-2001:

- ◆ Level 1, Modified Reading Assessment available for Grades 8 and 11, with a reading level of approximately 4.0 to 5.0
- ◆ Level 2A, Modified Reading Assessment available for Grades 5, 8, and 11, with a reading level of approximately 2.4 to 4.0
- ◆ Level 2B, Modified Reading Assessment available for Grades 5, 8, and 11, with a reading level of approximately 1.0 to 2.5
- ◆ Level 3, Modified Reading Assessment available to Grades 5, 8, and 11-- no reading passages, measures pre-reading skills

You were told that the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation (CETE) would be producing levels 1 and 3 this year (2000-2001), and that levels 2A and 2B would be "pulled off the shelf" for the Spring, 2001 administration. It was planned for CETE to build assessments for the Spring, 2002 administration that would then replace the "off-the-shelf" assessments.

Our agency advisory councils have convinced us that it would be better if no "off-the-shelf" instrument is used transitionally in Spring, 2001. **Rather, they have advised us to recommend that students targeted for the 2A modified assessment in reading take level 1, while the students targeted for the 2B modified assessment in reading take level 3.** It is thought that there will be less confusion in the long run if this approach is adopted for this year only.

If the IEP team met before the levels were identified in reading and/or math and only indicated that the student would take an assessment with modifications, OR if the IEP team met and indicated that the student would take either Level 2A or 2B, the IEP team does not need to meet again to indicate the appropriate level. Special and general education teachers may meet to determine the level. In the future, however, the IEP team will determine the level and indicate that in the IEP.

If you have any questions about this change, please phone me at 785.296.3996. Thank you.