

Assessment & Accountability Comprehensive Center  
**Resources Guide**

June 2007



## About This Guide

The Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center (AACC) Resource Guide is a summary of resources analyzed by the AACC Resource review committee using a set of rigorous criteria. The purpose of this Guide is to enhance state, district, and school assessment systems supporting the goals of No Child Left Behind.

Resources were reviewed for their quality, utility, and evidence of effectiveness. A copy of the Rating Form is provided at the end of this Guide. The Rating Form and a comprehensive glossary used by the committee to rate the resources are available on the AACC web site, <http://www.aacompcenter.org>. The AACC Rating Form was developed in collaboration across all five content comprehensive centers funded by the U.S. Department of Education.

The resources included in this Guide reached the appropriate threshold for placement onto the AACC web site. In those few cases where a reviewer may have been involved in the development process of a resource, an independent reviewer took the original reviewer's place. Resources were reviewed between July 2006-June 2007.

**Resources are categorized into three key components of the AACC program:**

- Assessment of Special Population Students
- Data-Use
- State Support

## *Other AACC Resources*

The AACC is committed to helping assessment users expand their accountability knowledge. In addition to this guide, the AACC has a comprehensive web site supporting data use in states and schools. Please view the AACC web site, Data Use for Continuous Quality Improvement at <http://datause.cse.ucla.edu/>.

Questions or comments about this Guide should be sent to Ron Dietel, [dietel@cse.ucla.edu](mailto:dietel@cse.ucla.edu) or 310-794-9168.

## Resources Reviewed

### ASSESSMENT OF SPECIAL POPULATION STUDENTS

#### **Language Accommodations for English Language Learners in Large-Scale Assessments: Bilingual Dictionaries and Linguistic Modification**

**Author/Provider:** Abedi, J., Courtney, M., Mirocha, J., Leon, S., & Goldberg, J., *CRESST*

**Resource Type:** Knowledge

**Cost:** \$8.00

**Length:** 77 pages

**Website:** <http://www.cse.ucla.edu/products/reports/r666.pdf>

**Resource Summary:** In this study, Jamal Abedi and other researchers explore the effectiveness of bilingual dictionaries and linguistic modification on assessment measures. These common language accommodations have been thought to help lower the achievement gap amongst students with language differences.

**Full Citation:** Abedi, J., Courtney, M., Mirocha, J., Leon, S., & Goldberg, J. (2005). *Language Accommodations for English Language Learners in Large-Scale Assessments: Bilingual Dictionaries and Linguistic Modification* (CSE Report No. 666). Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “This document highlights current issues for providing accommodations for ELL students.”

### DATA-USE

#### **Data Wise: A step-by-step guide to using assessment to improve teaching and learning.**

**Author/Provider:** Boudett, K.P., City E.A., & Murnane, R.J., *Harvard Education Publishing Group*

**Resource Type:** Product or Tool

**Cost:** \$29.95

**Length:** 212 pages

**Resource Summary:** Data Wise provides a toolbox of information pertaining to data-use and assessment practice. Following the “Data Wise Improvement Process,” the book provides strategies to help schools organize and use data to improve student learning.

The strategy can help organize assessment projects for people with various levels of experience with the topic (p. 5).

**Full Citation:** Boudett, K.P., City E.A., & Murnane, R.J. (Eds.). (2005). *Data wise: A step-by-step guide to using assessment to improve teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “Very accessible, full of extremely valuable information. Is definitely a step-by-step resource that can be used to build capacity for data use at the local level.”

### **Effective Use of Electronic Data Systems**

**Author/Provider:** Learning Points Associates and the Educational Service Alliance (ESA) of the Midwest

**Resource Type:** Product or Tool

**Cost:** Free

**Length:** 43 Pages

**Resource Summary:** This resource provides guidance for school and district leaders to use electronic data systems. There are three sections to the tool: “(1) Tools for District and School Leaders, (2) Tools for Facilitators, and (3) Resources” (p. 4). The document organizes the tools for school level electronic data systems “around eight discussion elements—Will, Scope, Risk, Readiness, Information Quality, System Quality, Impact, and Cost” (p. 4). Also provides a catalog of available data sources.

**Full Citation:** Learning Points Associates & the Educational Service Alliance (ESA) of the Midwest. (2006). *Effective Use of Electronic Data Systems: A Readiness Guide for School and District Leaders*. Naperville, IL.: Learning Point Associates.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “This is a useful tool which will be helpful to districts and schools in planning to use data tools.”

### **Electronic Learning Assessment Resources**

**Author/Provider:** Cradler, J. *California Learning Resource Network*

**Resource Type:** Product or Tool

**Cost:** Free

**Length:** N/A

**Website:** <http://www.clrn.org/elar>

**Resource Summary:** Focusing on data-driven decision-making and data literacy, this website facilitates searching for appropriate electronic learning assessment resources. The website reviews: data warehouses, data analysis and reporting systems, curriculum management systems, instruction and practice systems, and assessment and diagnostic systems (website).

**Full Citation:** Cradler, J. (2006). *Electronic Learning Assessment Resources (ELAR): California Learning Resource Network*. Retrieved July 25, 2006, from <http://www.clrn.org/elar>.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “As SEA and district personnel become more interested in electronic learning assessment resources related to local accountability, diagnostic and benchmark assessments, this site coordinates the most information I have seen to date in one location”

### **State Education Data Systems That Increase Learning and Improve Accountability**

**Author/Provider:** Palaich, R.M., Good, D.G., & van der Ploeg, A., *Learning Points Associates*  
**Resource Type:** Guidance  
**Cost:** Free  
**Length:** 11 Pages  
**Website:** <http://www2.learningpt.org/catalog/item.asp?SessionID=578268124&productID=144>

**Resource Summary:** This policy brief provides suggestions for dealing with data systems for state education systems. Three key recommendations of this study are: “address the key tasks associated with effective use of education data, create an education data oversight commission in each state, and develop common data standards, data-collection, guidelines, and data-management practices” (p. 9-10).

**Full Citation:** Palaich, R.M., Good, D.G., & van der Ploeg, A. (2004, June). State Education Data Systems that Increase Learning and Improve Accountability. *Learning Points Associates' Policy Issues*, 16, 1-11.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “This guidance is useful in developing effective state-wide data systems.”

### **Using Data Workshop**

**Author/Provider:** TERC  
**Resource Type:** Service  
**Cost:** \$750 per person  
**Length:** n/a  
**Website:** <http://usingdata.terc.edu/toplevel/home.cfm>

**Resource Summary:** Emphasizes the use of data to help educators take the best advantage of the resources available. The developers announce that: “the project has developed a comprehensive, long-term professional development program and supporting materials designed for data facilitators” (website).

**Full Citation:** TERC. *Using Data Workshops from the Using Data Project*. Retrieved on April 24, 2007 from <http://usingdata.terc.edu/toplevel/home.cfm>.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “This service offers sustained professional development to build capacity.”

## STATE SUPPORT

### **Assessment Continuum of Schoolwide Improvement Outcomes**

**Author/Provider:** Allen, W., Beltran Avery, M., Matsumoto, C., Hamilton, S., Worthley, D., Russell Ciardi, M., & Allen-Malley, M. *New England Comprehensive Assistance Center*

**Resource Type:** Product or Tool

**Cost:** \$49.95

**Length:** 130 pages

**Website:** <http://www2.edc.org/necac/resources/pubs/continuum.htm>

**Resource Summary:** As their website describes: “The New England Comprehensive Assistance Center offers you a dynamic guide to self-assess, monitor, and engage in continual, systemic improvement for increased student achievement.” The tool contains several features to help school systems develop assessments to reinforce improvement.

**Full Citation:** Allen, W., Beltran Avery, M., Matsumoto, C., Hamilton, S., Worthley, D., Russell Ciardi, M., & Allen-Malley, M. (2002). *Assessment Continuum of Schoolwide Improvement Outcomes*. New England Comprehensive Assistance Center.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “This resource is a means to facilitate the move toward interagency and community collaboration in order to improve school wide student achievement. The directions are straightforward and uncomplicated, as well as the forms (both short and long forms) themselves.”

“This tool would be helpful to schools undergoing comprehensive school reform.”

### **Designing School Accountability Systems: Towards a Framework and Process**

**Author/Provider:** Gong, B., Blank, R.K., & Manise, J.G. *Council of Chief State School Officers*

**Resource Type:** Guidance

**Cost:** Free

**Length:** 32 Pages

**Website:** [http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/designing\\_school\\_acct\\_syst.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/designing_school_acct_syst.pdf)

**Resource Summary:** The objective of the study, as described by the authors, is to “assist states in making decisions about designs for accountability systems” (p.1). Furthermore, the resource shows “three different views of accountability design to address states needs” (p.2).

- “an elaborated framework with questions, criteria, and comments, intended to provide a structure for helping states move through the process of designing a school accountability system” (p.2).

- “a concise checklist of characteristics to help states evaluate the consistency and coherence of existing programs” (p.2).
- “examples of the actual state experience with design features that might be considered and why” (p.2).

**Full Citation:** Gong, B., Blank, R.K., & Manise, J.G. (2002). *Designing School Accountability Systems: Towards framework and process*. Washington D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “This document would be especially helpful for those states that do not have a solid foundation or those that lack experience in effective systems. This guidance would also be useful for professional development purposes (in-services, workshops, conferences), as it provides the reader with a fundamental understanding of accountability systems.”

### **Designing Schoolwide Programs: Non-Regulatory Guidance**

**Author/Provider:** U.S. Department of Education

**Resource Type:** Guidance

**Cost:** Free

**Length:** 52 Pages

**Website:** [www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/designingswpguid.doc](http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/designingswpguid.doc)

**Resource Summary:** This document was meant to complement the No Child Left Behind Act and serve as a “technical assistance resource” for schools (p. 2). This resource contains guidance for “the comprehensive needs assessment, the comprehensive plan, and the annual program evaluation” for schools (p. 2).

**Full Citation:** U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *Designing school wide programs: Non-regulatory guidance*. Retrieved August 16, 2006, from: [www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/designingswpguid.doc](http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/designingswpguid.doc).

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “Very useful resource—clear, well written and relevant to all schools.”

“For schools and districts evaluating data software to meet their needs, this site seems very helpful.”

### **Foundations for Success: Case Studies of How Urban School Systems Improve Student Achievement**

**Author/Provider:** Snipes, J., Doolittle, F., & Herilihy, C. *Council of Great City Schools*

**Resource Type:** Knowledge

**Cost:** Free

**Length:** 7 pages

**Website:** <http://www.mdrc.org/publications/47/execsum.html>

**Resource Summary:** This study provides case studies of certain urban school districts that focus “on the potential role of the school district as an initiator and sustainer of academic improvement” (p. 1).

**Full Citation:** Snipes, J., Doolittle, F., & Herlihy, C. (2002). *Foundations for success: Case Studies of how urban school systems improve student achievement*. Washington, DC: Council of the Great City Schools.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “Very useful resource, well written and raises many issues that are relevant to NCLB goals.”

“This is a useful research report that highlights many of the things that successful school districts do or should be doing to increase student achievement.”

### **Mapping a Course for Improved Student Learning**

**Author/Provider:** Supovitz, J.A. & Klein, V., *Consortium for Policy Research in Education: University of Pennsylvania*

**Resource Type:** Knowledge

**Cost:** Free

**Length:** 49 Pages

**Website:**

<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/ELAN/TR/KnowledgeCategories/ImprovingConditions/UseOfData/MappingaCourseforImprovedStudentLearning.htm>

**Resource Summary:** The authors describe this study as: “about building better roadmaps for teachers and school leaders in order to guide their instructional decision-making” (p. 1). They “seek to develop a framework to help education leaders develop more robust systems for collecting, synthesizing, and analyzing student performance data in a variety of forms in order to improve teaching and learning” (p. 2).

**Full Citation:** Supovitz, J.A. & Klein, V. (2003). *Mapping a course for improved student learning: How innovative schools systematically use student performance data to guide improvement*. University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education: Center on Reinventing Public Education.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** “This study is descriptive and informative. [The] evidence provided in this study may support work or improvement of other schools.”

“This is a practical resource for leaders who are beginning to use data systematically. Those who are sophisticated in data use will likely find the report to be fairly basic in terms of describing a system for data use but districts just starting out should find it useful.”

### **National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment (Annual Conference)**

**Author/Provider:** Council of Chief State School Officers

**Resource Type:** Service

**Cost:** About \$400 for registration fees

**Length:** n/a

**Website:** [http://www.ccsso.org/projects/national\\_conference\\_on\\_large\\_scale\\_assessment/8399.cfm](http://www.ccsso.org/projects/national_conference_on_large_scale_assessment/8399.cfm)

**Resource Summary:** This annual conference covers a broad range of topics pertaining large-scale assessment. Usually held in June, the conference includes more than 100 sessions.

**Full Citation:** This year's conference is in Nashville, Tennessee, June 17-20, 2007. A draft agenda is on the CCSSO website. <http://www.ccsso.org/>.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** "This web-based link to presentation materials from the 2006 CCSSO Conference on Large Scale Assessment provides valuable resources for addressing numerous topics related to large scale assessments."

"This conference is a valuable opportunity for state representatives and also researchers to learn about work in the research arena and in state departments of education around large scale assessment."

### **Similar Students, Different Results: Why Do Some Schools Do Better?**

**Author/Provider:** Williams, T., Kirst, M., Haertel, E., et al., *Ed Source*

**Resource Type:** Knowledge

**Cost:** Yes

**Length:** Variable

**Website:** [http://www.edsource.org/pub\\_abs\\_simstu05.cfm](http://www.edsource.org/pub_abs_simstu05.cfm)

**Resource Summary:** Using a sample of school districts from California, the researchers looked for reasons that similar schools had different scores on the California Academic Performance Index.

**Full Citation:** Williams, T., Kirst, M., Haertel, E., et al. (2005) *Similar Students, different results: Why do some schools do better? A large-scale survey of California elementary schools serving low-income students*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource.

**Selected Reviewer Comments:** "This study was conducted by highly respected researchers. The study provides good information on factors that contribute to student achievement."

--end--

# Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center

## National Content Centers RESOURCE REVIEW FORM

### Full Citation of the Resource:

---

---

### Publisher of Resource:

---

Funded by the U.S. Department of Education, the five Comprehensive Content Centers are responsible for providing in-depth knowledge, expertise, and analyses to regional centers and the states served by the regional centers. Content centers disseminate knowledge on scientifically based research on effective practice and research-based products in their area of specialty. The five content centers have collaborated to develop this Resource Review Form to provide states and regional centers with high quality resources to meet NCLB goals. **Each content center may require additional criteria in its review process or use minor variations of this form.**

Although resources may fall into more than one specific category, each resource is classified into one of the following categories:

- **Resource 1 – Knowledge**, usually research findings as found in a journal, research report, or similar document approved through a peer review process. Because of the potential widespread use or recognition of *knowledge* resources, they should generally be among the highest quality resources.
- **Resource 2 – Product or tool**, includes training materials, PowerPoint presentations, or publications that prescribe a specific process to follow or method to employ. Ideally, most products or tools in this category will have been reviewed externally and evidence will be provided that the product or tool has improved learning or achieved its goals.
- **Resource 3 – Guidance**, generally a written document that provides expert advice to improve instruction, is based on current theory or research; is state of the art knowledge; and has a substantial evidence base. The following would generally be considered *guidance*: congressional testimony, policy or issue briefs, field guides, fact sheets, criteria for good data use or criteria for high quality instruction.
- **Resource 4 – Services**, includes resources such as workshops, conferences, or expert technical assistance that are not practical for a peer review process, but that nonetheless are likely to be useful in helping states meet NCLB expectations. Services should include an evaluation component and have evidence of high quality such as established reputation of the source or use of materials based on rigorous evidence.

**Category of Resource Reviewed** (see preceding resource descriptions for examples)

- Knowledge       Product or Tool       Guidance       Service

### Prescreening Criteria

In order for a resource to be reviewed, the resource must meet the following 3 prescreening criteria.

Relevance to No Child Left Behind	
<b>1) Advances the goals of No Child Left Behind: Does the resource support at least one objective of No Child Left Behind?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Encourages high standards for all students	<input type="checkbox"/> Supports reduction in achievement gaps
<input type="checkbox"/> Promotes improved teaching or student learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Improves quality of assessments
<input type="checkbox"/> Builds district or school capacity for stronger accountability	<input type="checkbox"/> Improves quality of accountability systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Supports adequate yearly progress	<input type="checkbox"/> Encourages proven educational methods
<b>2) Current: Is the content current (1990-present)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>If earlier than 1990, why should this resource be reviewed? State supporting evidence.</b>	
<hr/> <hr/>	

Relevance to the Comprehensive Content Center	
<b>3) Is the resource relevant to at least one of the topics in the approved scope of work for this content center?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>If yes, which<sup>[a]</sup>? (See work plan for the appropriate center)</b>	
<b>Does the resource meet the 3 prescreening criteria?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>If No, stop here.</b> The resource does not advance to the Comprehensive Screening Criteria section.	

# Comprehensive Screening Criteria

## Content Screening Criteria

Please fill out the highlighted areas. Include comments to support your rating.

Rating Scale: 0 = Weak or not at all, 1 = Fair, 2 = Good, 3 = Excellent, NA= Not Applicable

Content Quality	Rating	Comments
<i>Goals:</i> The resource clearly states, covers, and meets its objectives.		
<i>Standards:</i> The resource was developed using well-accepted literature, standards, research, or theory.		
<i>Methods:</i> The resource design is based on what we know to be best practices in developing that resource (e.g., rigorous scientific methods for a research study).		
<i>Completeness:</i> All important steps, sequences or practices are included.		
<i>Accuracy:</i> The information and/or data presented are accurate and free of bias.		
<i>Plausibility:</i> Content, conclusions, and recommendations are supported by a preponderance of evidence and/or other research.		
<i>Value:</i> The resource adds value to the field.		
<b>Average Content Quality Score:</b>		
Communications Quality	Rating	Comments
<i>Organization:</i> The information is well organized and follows a logical sequence.		
<i>Language:</i> The author/s avoid jargon and communicate well with users.		
<i>Length:</i> The length of a resource is enough to cover its objectives, but concise.		
<i>Visuals:</i> The resource provides visual support for important or technical information as appropriate.		
<b>Average Communications Quality Score</b>		
Utility	Rating	Comments
<i>Audience Relevance:</i> The resource is relevant and significant for its intended audience.		
<i>Timely:</i> This resource can be used or implemented in a timely manner.		
<i>Cost-Benefit:</i> The expected improvement from this resource merits the required investment.		

<i>Resource Requirements: Adequate resources are available for implementation. Compatible with ongoing successful efforts.</i>		
<i>Supplemental Resources: This resource provides references or links to other useful resources.</i>		
<b>Average Utility Score</b>		
<b>Evidence of Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<i>Impact: Based on current research, this resource has had or is likely to have a positive effect on learning.</i>		
<i>Generalizability: The research that underpins this resource strongly suggests that this resource is or will be effective in many settings.</i>		
<b>Average Evidence of Effectiveness Score</b>		

To be filled out by Reviewer:

*Average of Content Quality* \_\_\_\_\_  
*Average of Communications Quality* \_\_\_\_\_  
*Average of Utility* \_\_\_\_\_  
*Average of Evidence of Effectiveness:* \_\_\_\_\_  
  
*Final Average (Average of Four Sections):* \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Resources averaging 2.0 across all raters have met standards.)*

In thinking about the quality, utility, and effectiveness of this resource, how likely are you to recommend it to a colleague on a scale of 1-5?

1 (Not at all)     
 2     
 3     
 4     
 5 (Definitely)

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Is the product free?       Yes       No

If not, what is the associated cost? \_\_\_\_\_ (for example, per item, per school, or per use)

Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_       Internal       External

Reviewer's Organizational Affiliation (if any): \_\_\_\_\_