Conducting an Alignment Study
for the Nebraska Statewide Writing Assessment

Report Prepared for the
Nebraska Department of Education

Brett P. Foley, M.S.
Kurt F. Geisinger, Ph.D.

Buros Institute for Assessment Consultation and Outreach

A Division of the
Oscar and Luella Buros Center for Testing
at the
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

March 2009

Questions concerning this report should be addressed to:
Brett P. Foley, M.S.
Buros Center for Testing
21 Teachers College Hall
University of Nebraska – Lincoln
Lincoln, NE, 68588-0353
bfoley2@unl.edu

Table of Contents

Introduction

Nebraska's Statewide Writing Assessment (SWA) was developed by the Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) to measure some of the expectations within the state's adopted writing content standards at Grades 4, 8, and 11. The assessment was modeled after the ESU #3 writing assessment system with some technical modifications including increasing the number of score points on the rubric and increasing the required level of scorer agreement to bolster the reliability of the scores on the assessment. The assessment measures writing skills as defined by the content standards. The content of the test includes one prompt (narrative, descriptive, or persuasive for Grades 4, 8, and 11, respectively) for which students compose a writing sample.

The assessment is administered over two consecutive days in blocks of 40 minutes each day. Each prompt is scored on a holistic 10-point scale (1, 1+, 2-, 2, 2+, 3-, 3, 3+, 4-, 4). Scores are reported as the sum of scores from two independent raters. Thus, the total scores for students range from 2 to 8. The holistic rubric (scoring guide) defines performance across six traits.

NDE contracted the Buros Institute for Assessment Consultation and Outreach (BIACO) to conduct this study in which the alignment between the SWA and the revised Nebraska writing content standards.

Procedures

Staff from BIACO, with logistics assistance from NDE, organized a meeting to conduct the alignment study that was held at the NDE offices in Lincoln, Nebraska on February 18, 2009.

Panelists

NDE staff recruited seventeen current and former educators who participated in the study. The goal was to have at least five participants for each grade level panel. One panel had five participants and two panels had six. The criteria for panelist eligibility were that panelists have both 1) content expertise and 2) familiarity with the population of students within their respective grade levels.

Panelists were selected from across the state and had extensive experience in education. Panel members reported an average of 17.7 years of teaching experience with a median of 16 years. Two panelists had bachelor's degrees as their highest degree attained, 14 panelists had master's degrees, and one panelist had an educational specialist degree. Eleven of the panelists had completed an additional 3 to 54 course credits. See Appendix A for more detailed panelist information.

Study Design and Alignment Criteria

The currently established methodologies for conducting alignment studies have been developed primarily for traditional, multiple-choice/short answer tests, rather than writing tests such as the SWA. With this in mind, BIACO staff worked with NDE to design a novel methodology based on the work of Webb (1997, 2002) and Frisbie (2003), but modified to fit the unique challenge of evaluating the SWA. Alignment studies usually consist of matching items to standards. In the case of the SWA, which consists of

students writing in response to a single prompt, the idea of multiple items is not possible and the process becomes more complex.

To overcome these difficulties, BIACO proposed that the SWA rubric (i.e. "Scoring Guide") be broken down into constituent components (i.e. "Scoring Guide Components"), and then treating each of these components like an "item." These Scoring Guide Components follow naturally from the Scoring Guide. For example, it is easy to identify a "Focus on prompt" component in the persuasive writing Scoring Guide. That is, the second bullet in the Ideas/Content section of the Scoring Guide, which ranges from "severe digressions from the prompt" to "is well-focused on the prompt." (Note: See Appendix B for the Scoring Guide Components used by the alignment panelists.) Since each of these components is considered (though not specifically scored) by raters when scoring the essay, we believe it is defensible to consider each of these components as an "item" whose alignment to the writing content standards may then be evaluated. In effect, each Scoring Guide Component contributes importantly to the test variance, and hence, is comparable to an item or a component of the overall test.

Nebraska organized its revised writing standards into multiple levels of content specificity. Using the language of the Nebraska standards, the broadest levels are *Standards*, which are common across grade levels. The *Standards* are divided into *Concepts* specific to grade levels. Subsumed within the Writing *Concepts* are specific *Curricular Indicators* that further detail expectations for students by grade levels. For the purposes of this study, panelists made alignment judgments at the level of the Curricular Indicators, and the results of this study evaluated at the Concept level.

Four criteria were used to evaluate alignment of the SWA:

- *Balance of Representation* – This criterion is used to indicate the extent to which Scoring Guide Components are evenly distributed

across Curricular Indicators. The alignment criterion for Balance of Representation is that Scoring Guide Components should be distributed among all of the Curricular Indicators within each Concept to at least to some degree. The criteria would be said to be met if the Balance Index (Webb, 2002) for that indicator is greater than or equal to .7. This index is defined as follows.

$$\text{Balance Index} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{S} \left| \frac{1}{S} - \frac{I_j}{N} \right|}{2}$$

S = The number of Curricular Indicators (with at least one Scoring Guide Components) for a Concept;

I_j = The number of Scoring Guide Components for Curricular Indicator j;

N = The total number of Scoring Guide Components measuring the Concept.

- *Range of Knowledge Correspondence*- This criterion is used to judge whether a comparable span of knowledge expected by a Concept corresponds to the span of knowledge that students need in order to do well on the Scoring Guide Components. The alignment criterion for Range of Knowledge is that 50% of the Curricular Indicators for a Concept have at least one related Scoring Guide Component.

- *Depth of Knowledge Consistency*- This criterion is used to judge if what is elicited from students on the assessment is as demanding cognitively as what students are expected to know and do as stated in the standards. The alignment criterion for Depth of Knowledge is that at least 50% of the

Scoring Guide Components corresponding to a Concept should be at or above the cognitive complexity level of the Curricular Indicator(s) to which the Scoring Guide Component matches.

- *Categorical Concurrence* - This criterion is used to judge if standards and assessments address the same content categories. The alignment criterion for Categorical Concurrence is that at least six Scoring Guide Components measuring content from each Concept are present.

Cognitive Complexity

In order to evaluate the Depth of Knowledge alignment criteria described above, it was necessary to obtain judgments of the cognitive complexity of both the Scoring Guide Components and the Curricular Indicators. Cognitive complexity refers to the thought processes which a student uses to perform a task and can be described in several different ways. For example, the cognitive complexity levels in Bloom's Taxonomy (a classification system with which many educators are familiar) include:

- Knowledge

- Comprehension

- Application

- Analysis

- Synthesis

- Evaluation

For this alignment study, NDE and BIACO chose cognitive complexity levels based on Frisbie's (2003) conception of three levels of cognitive complexity, which are defined as follows:

- **Low level (L)** – This level requires mainly recall, remembering factual information or definitions of terms, or the display of fairly routine skills. This level tends to deal with a single idea or procedure, require a display of concrete understanding, or ask for a demonstration of something learned directly from instruction. Previous panels of educators have considered this level of cognitive complexity to coincide primarily with the Knowledge level of Bloom's Taxonomy.

- **Moderate level (M)** – This level requires more intellectual skill than those characterized as "Low", but may seem like it is something less than "High." This level may require the application of rules that are practiced extensively in the classroom, but are now applied to a new situation. Previous panels of educators have considered this level of cognitive complexity to coincide primarily with the Comprehension and Application levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

- **High level (H)** – This level involves the application of ideas and procedures to solve problems or create new understandings. The situations are not habitual or routine; they are novel for most learners. Often multiple ideas are drawn upon or a high level of abstraction needs to be dealt with. Previous panels of educators have considered this level of cognitive complexity to coincide primarily with the Comprehension and Application levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

Panelists also were allowed to rate a Curricular Indicator "Unclassifiable" if it was worded so ambiguously or broadly that it was not possible to determine how students were expected to interact with the content. However, none of the Curricular Indicators received this rating.

Prior to the start of the meeting, panelists received a packet of materials that included an agenda, presentation notes, content standards that were specific to their respective grade levels, and alignment rating instructions. In addition, the packets contained the following forms: demographic, practice ratings, operational ratings, and a procedural evaluation.

The meeting began with a welcome from NDE and the BIACO staff. A BIACO facilitator conducted an orientation, and provided an overview of the method that the panelists would be using to assess the alignment of the SWA Scoring Guide Components to the state content standards. This method involved three sets of judgments. First, panelists would judge the cognitive complexity of each Curricular Indicator. Second, panelists would judge the cognitive complexity of the Scoring Guide Components. Finally, panelists would judge the fit between Scoring Guide Components and Curricular Indicators. This rating scale includes three varying levels of fit, as well as an option for panelists to indicate that an Scoring Guide Component did not fit with any Curricular Indicators. These rating levels are:

X – No fit. The Scoring Guide Component does not directly match the content of any Curricular Indicator.

S – Slight fit. There is some relationship between the Scoring Guide Component content and the content of the Curricular Indicator, but much more is needed do well on the scoring guide component. Perhaps only one of the several pieces of content required to do well on the Scoring Guide Component is stated in the Curricular Indicator. Alignment would probably be more complete with some other Curricular Indicator, or it might take several Curricular Indicators to cover the content of the Scoring Guide Component sufficiently. If a Scoring Guide Component has

a slight fit with one Curricular Indicator, it may have a slight fit with another as well.

P – **Partial fit**. A significant portion of the content required to do well on the Scoring Guide Component is embodied in the Curricular Indicator. But there is additional, significant understanding required that is represented by some other Curricular Indicator. If the student does well on the Scoring Guide Component, it is because the student has some other significant knowledge that is not part of this Curricular Indicator.

C – **Complete fit.** The main content required to do well on the Scoring Guide Component is contained in the Curricular Indicator. If the student does well on the scoring guide component, this fact is one relevant piece of information about the student's level of achievement of the content stated in the Curricular Indicator.

In analyzing the panelists ratings only Complete and Partial fits are treated as a match between a Scoring Guide Component and a Curricular Indicator.

Each Scoring Guide Component is defined across a full range of student performances. For example, the Grade 11 "Focus on prompt" component ranges from "severe digressions from the prompt" to "is well-focused on the prompt." It is reasonable to assume that students may be applying different skills and/or cognitive processes at the low end of this continuum than they would at the high end. To account for this difference, panelists were instructed to base their content and cognitive complexity ratings on a student "doing well" on the Scoring Guide Component. This instruction was defined operationally as a student scoring in the upper half of the scoring guide (i.e., scoring a 3-minus or higher).

After orientation to the alignment method, the panelists were divided into three groups by grade level (i.e., 4, 8 and 11). The first activity for each group was to review

the content standards, cognitive complexity rating scale, and content fit rating scale. Following this review, the panelists rated the cognitive complexity of the curricular indicators, first on their own, then coming to a group consensus. Next, panelists were given the opportunity to practice the rating process using a small subset of the Scoring Guide Components. In the practice activity, panelists made judgments about the cognitive complexity of the practice Components. Panelists then made their ratings about the content fit of the Scoring Guide Component to the Curricular Indicators. Panelists made their initial judgment independently. The independent ratings were then followed by discussion among the panelists, which resulted in a consensus recommendation about the alignment judgments. These consensus judgments were reported on separate rating forms from the independent judgments. Each group chose one of its members to record the group ratings on the separate consensus rating form. An example rating form is included in Appendix C.

Panelists then completed their operational ratings in a manner similar to the practice activity. Following the operational ratings, panelists completed evaluation forms to provide their perceptions of the process and evidence of procedural validity. Panelists were also given certificates to document their participation in this study. The meeting started the morning of February 18, 2009 and all activities were completed by 3:30 PM.

Results

Scoring Guide Components

Grade 4

Table 1 summarizes the alignment results for Grade 4 in terms of (1) the cognitive complexity judgments by Curricular Indicator, (2) the number of Scoring Guide Components that were judged to be aligned in terms of content, by Curricular Indicator and cognitive level, (3) the

Table1. Alignment results: Writing Grade 4

			Content Standard/Scoring Guide Component Information				Alignment Measures				
Concept	Curricular Indicator	Cognitive Complexity (CC) of Indicator[1]	Components matching content (by cognitive level)[2]			Total matches for Concept	Percent of matches[3]	Balance of Representation[4]	Range of Knowledge[5]	Depth of Knowledge[6]	Categorical Concurrence[7]
			L	M	H						
4.2.1	a	M	0	**1**	0	30	2%	Not Met	Met	Met	Met
	b	M	0	**12**	**4**		37%				
	c	H	0	5	**5**		23%				
	d	H	0	0	0		0%				
	e	M	0	**1**	1		5%				
	f	L	0	0	1		2%				
4.2.2	a	M	0	**1**	0	13	2%	Not Met	Met	Met	Met
	b	H	0	2	**5**		16%				
	c	H	0	0	**2**		5%				
	d	M	0	**3**	0		7%				
	e	H	0	0	0		0%				
		CC Totals	0	25	18	-					

Totals for Assessment		
Total Components	Component/ Indicator matches[8]	Number of non-matching components
21	43	0

[1] L = Low , M = Moderate, H = High. These cognitive levels can be loosely mapped to Bloom's Taxonomy levels as follow s: Low = Know ledge, Moderate = Comprehension and Application, High = Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation

[2] Bold numbers represent counts of Scoring Guide Components that are at or above the cognitive complexity of the Curricular Indicator.

[3] The percentage of all Scoring Guide Component/ Curricular Indicator matches. The values may not add to 100% because of rounding.

[4] The alignment criterion for Balance of Representation is that Scoring Guide Components should be distributed among all of the Curricular Indictors w ithin each Concept to at least to some degree. The criteria is said to be met if the Balance Index (Webb

[5] The alignment criterion for Range of Know ledge is that 50% of the Curricular Indictors for a Concept have at least one related Scoring Guide Component.

[6] The alignment criterion for Depth of Know ledge is that at least 50% of theScoring Guide Components corresponding to a Concept be at or above the cognitive complexity of the Curricular Indicator w ithin the Concept.

[7] The alignment criterion for Categorical Concurrence is that at least six Scoring Guide Components measuring content from each Concept are present.

[8] The totals for "Component/Indicator matches" and "Number of non-matching components" do not add to the total number of "Total Components" because some Scoring Guide Components w ere matched multiple Curricular Indicators.

number of Scoring Guide Components that were judged to be aligned in terms of content, by Concept, (4) alignment results based on the four alignment criteria described above, by concept,

(5) overall alignment judgments for the assessment, and (6) additional assessment information. Each of the 21 Scoring Guide Components aligned with at least one Curricular Indicator (many were aligned with more than one). The alignment criteria of Range of Knowledge, Depth of Knowledge, and Categorical Concurrence were met for both Concept 4.2.1 ("Writing Process") and Concept 4.2.2 ("Writing Genres"). The alignment criterion Balance of Representation was not met for either Concept. This finding indicates that unequal emphasis was placed the Curricular Indicators within each concept. None of the Scoring Guide Components were judged to align with Curricular indicators 4.2.1.d or 4.2.2.e.

Grade 8

Table 2 summarizes the alignment results for Grade 8. Like Grade 4, all of the 21 Scoring Guide Components aligned with at least one Curricular Indicator (some were aligned with more than one). The alignment criteria of Range of Knowledge, Depth of Knowledge, and Categorical Concurrence were met for both Concept 8.2.1 and Concept 8.2.2. The alignment criterion Balance of Representation was met for 8.2.1, but not met for 8.2.2. This finding indicates that unequal emphasis was placed the Curricular Indicators within Concept 8.2.2. None of the Scoring Guide Components were judged to align with Curricular indicators 8.2.1.a, 8.2.1.d, or 8.2.2.d.

Table 2. Alignment results: Writing Grade 8

Content Standard/Scoring Guide Component Information							Alignment Measures				
Concept	Curricular Indicator	Cognitive Complexity (CC) of Indicator[1]	Components matching content (by cognitive level)[2]			Total matches for Concept	Percent of matches[3]	Balance of Representation[4]	Range of Knowledge[5]	Depth of Knowledge[6]	Categorical Concurrence[7]
			L	M	H						
8.2.1	a	H	0	0	0	20	0%	Met	Met	Met	Met
	b	H	0	3	**2**		18%				
	c	H	0	3	**8**		39%				
	d	M	0	0	0		0%				
	e	M	0	**1**	**2**		11%				
	f	M	0	**1**	0		4%				
8.2.2	a	H	0	2	**1**	8	11%	Not Met	Met	Met	Met
	b	M	0	**1**	0		4%				
	c	H	0	2	**2**		14%				
	d	H	0	0	0		0%				
	CC Totals		0	13	15	-					

Totals for Assessment		
Total Components	Component/ Indicator matches[8]	Number of non-matching components
21	28	0

[1] L = Low , M = Moderate, H = High. These cognitive levels can be loosely mapped to Bloom's Taxonomy levels as follows: Low = Knowledge, Moderate = Comprehension and Application, High = Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation

[2] Bold numbers represent counts of Scoring Guide Components that are at or above the cognitive complexity of the Curricular Indicator.

[3] The percentage of all Scoring Guide Component/ Curricular Indicator matches. The values may not add to 100% because of rounding.

[4] The alignment criterion for Balance of Representation is that Scoring Guide Components should be distributed among all of the Curricular Indictors within each Concept to at least to some degree. The criteria is said to be met if the Balance Index (Webb

[5] The alignment criterion for Range of Knowledge is that 50% of the Curricular Indictors for a Concept have at least one related Scoring Guide Component.

[6] The alignment criterion for Depth of Knowledge is that at least 50% of theScoring Guide Components corresponding to a Concept be at or above the cognitive complexity of the Curricular Indicator within the Concept.

[7] The alignment criterion for Categorical Concurrence is that at least six Scoring Guide Components measuring content from each Concept are present.

[8] The totals for "Component/Indicator matches" and "Number of non-matching components" do not add to the total number of "Total Components" because some Scoring Guide Components were matched multiple Curricular Indicators.

Grade 11

Table 3 summarizes the alignment results for Grade 11. Again, like the previous grades, all of the 20 Scoring Guide Components aligned with at least one Curricular Indicator (many were aligned with more than one). For Concept 12.2.2, all four alignment criteria were met. For concept 12.2.1, the alignment criteria of Range of Knowledge and Categorical Concurrence were met, but the criteria Balance of Representation and Depth of Knowledge were not met. This finding indicates that unequal emphasis was placed the Curricular Indicators within Concept 12.2.1, and that less than 50% of the Scoring Guide Components corresponding to the

Concept were at or above the cognitive complexity of the Curricular Indicator within the Concept.   None of the Scoring Guide Components were judged to align with Curricular indicators 12.2.1.a, 12.2.1.d, or 12.2.2.d.

Table 3. Alignment results: Writing Grade 11

Content Standard/Scoring Guide Component Information							Alignment Measures				
Concept	Curricular Indicator	Cognitive Complexity (CC) of Indicator[1]	Components matching content (by cognitive level)[2]			Total matches for Concept	Percent of matches[3]	Balance of Representation [4]	Range of Knowledge[5]	Depth of Knowledge[6]	Categorical Concurrence[7]
			L	M	H						
12.2.1	a	M	0	0	0	25	0%	Not Met	Met	Not Met	Met
	b	H	0	5	**7**		35%				
	c	H	0	7	**2**		26%				
	d	H	0	0	0		0%				
	e	M	0	**3**	0		9%				
	f	H	0	1	0		3%				
12.2.2	a	H	0	1	**2**	9	9%	Met	Met	Met	Met
	b	H	0	2	0		6%				
	c	M	0	**2**	**2**		12%				
	d	H	0	0	0		0%				
	CC Totals		0	21	13	-					

Totals for Assessment		
Total Components	Component/ Indicator matches[8]	Number of non-matching components
20	34	0

[1] L = Low, M = Moderate, H = High. These cognitive levels can be loosely mapped to Bloom's Taxonomy levels as follows: Low = Knowledge, Moderate = Comprehension and Application, High = Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation

[2] Bold numbers represent counts of Scoring Guide Components that are at or above the cognitive complexity of the Curricular Indicator.

[3] The percentage of all Scoring Guide Component/ Curricular Indicator matches. The values may not add to 100% because of rounding.

[4] The alignment criterion for Balance of Representation is that Scoring Guide Components should be distributed among all of the Curricular Indictors within each Concept to at least to some degree. The criteria is said to be met if the Balance Index (Webb

[5] The alignment criterion for Range of Knowledge is that 50% of the Curricular Indictors for a Concept have at least one related Scoring Guide Component.

[6] The alignment criterion for Depth of Knowledge is that at least 50% of the Scoring Guide Components corresponding to a Concept be at or above the cognitive complexity of the Curricular Indicator within the Concept.

[7] The alignment criterion for Categorical Concurrence is that at least six Scoring Guide Components measuring content from each Concept are present.

[8] The totals for "Component/Indicator matches" and "Number of non-matching components" do not add to the total number of "Total Components" because some Scoring Guide Components were matched multiple Curricular Indicators.

Scoring Guide Component-level results

Results are the Scoring Guide Component-level are included in Appendix D.

Evaluation

Following the operational ratings, panelists completed an evaluation form that was designed to measure their perceptions of the alignment training and activities. The purpose of the evaluation was to gather information to contribute to the procedural validity evidence for the program, and to provide feedback for facilitators and NDE for future workshops. The results for each section of the evaluation are provided below.

Part 1: Training

There were six questions on the evaluation form that focused on panelists' perceptions of the training aspects of the workshop. Five of these questions were rated on a scale from 1-6 where "1" was Very Unsuccessful and "6" was Very Successful. Intermediate score points were undefined. Panelists were generally positive about the training activities, rating each of the aspects (on average) as a 5.1 or higher. Specifically, ratings on Orientation (5.1), Overview of the Rating Instructions (5.2), Discussion of the Standards (5.4), Practice Rating Activity (5.8), and Overall Training (5.3) suggested that the training was successful.

The final question about the training inquired about the amount of time allocated to training. The scale for this item was 1 – Too little time allocated to training, 2 – Right amount allocated to training, and 3 – Too much time allocated to training. Panelists' average response was 2.1 suggesting that on average, panelists believed the right amount of time was allocated to training. One of the panelists indicated that too much time was allocated to training. None of the panelists indicated that too little time was allocated.

Part 2: Alignment of Scoring Guide Components to Curricular Indicators

In this part of the evaluation, panelists rated their confidence in their cognitive complexity and content ratings of the scoring guide components. Each of these evaluation items was rated on a four-point scale where 1 – Not at all confident, 2 – Not very

confident, 3 – Somewhat confident, and 4 – Confident. Panelists were generally confident in their judgments about the cognitive complexity of the scoring guide components (3.5) and their judgments of the content of the components (3.6). Panelists were also generally confident in their judgments about the cognitive complexity of the curricular indicators (3.6)

The final question in this section asked panelists how they felt about the time allocated to make these judgments. On a four-point scale where 1 – More time needed, 2 – Barely enough time, 3 – Sufficient time, and 4 – More than enough time. Panelists' average rating was 3.3. This rating suggests that most panelists thought that there was sufficient time allocated to make their ratings. There were five panelist who believed there was more than enough time allocated.

Overall evaluation

The final section of the evaluation asked panelists to provide an overall rating of the success and organization of the alignment workshop. Ratings on these two questions were on four-point scales where 1 – Total unsuccessful, 2 – Unsuccessful, 3 – Successful, and 4 – Totally successful. Panelists' average ratings were 3.4 and 3.5 on the success and organization questions, respectively, suggesting the vast majority of the panelists were positive about their experience with the project.

Panelists were also given an opportunity to provide any comments that might be useful in planning future studies. These comments are included as Appendix E.

Conclusions and Discussion of Results

Overall, the alignment results for the SWA are very positive. Nebraska educators judged every Scoring Guide Component to align to at least one Curricular Indicator. This summary indicates that the content coverage of the SWA is appropriate in that it does not

ask students to perform tasks or demonstrate knowledge that is not included in the state standards. The alignment criteria Range of Knowledge and Categorical Concurrence were met for all three assessments indicating that more than 50% of the Curricular Indictors for each Concept had at least one related Scoring Guide Component and there were at least six Scoring Guide Components measuring content from each Concept.

There is room for improvement in terms of the Depth of Knowledge and Balance of Representation alignment criteria: For Grade 11 less than 50% of the Scoring Guide Components corresponding to Concept 12.2.1 were at or above the cognitive complexity of the Curricular Indicator within the Concept. For all grades there was at least one Concept where the SWA content was not well-balanced across Curricular Indicators. Finally, there were Curricular Indicators that were not addressed by any of the Scoring Guide Components in each of the three grades. We would be glad to discuss with NDE steps it could take to balance the assessment better across the Curricular Indicators.

This study has an important limitation that should be noted. As stated earlier, every Scoring Guide Component was judged to align to at least one Curricular Indicator. This statement means that each content/skill measured by each Scoring Guide Component fell under the "umbrella" of at least one Curricular Indicator, that is, evaluated content or skills that were appropriate based on the standards. It does not mean, however, that the Scoring Guide Component measured the entire breadth of the Curricular Indicator. For example, Curricular Indicator 8.2.2.a asks that the student "Write in a variety of genres, considering purpose and audience." A single writing sample based on a descriptive prompt (like the SWA) may fit under this standard in that it requires the student to write in a specific genre, but it clearly does not cover all aspects of the Curricular Indicator (i.e., write in a variety of genres).

This project employed a novel method for evaluating content alignment for an assessment that consists of a single writing prompt. Beyond a simple matching of items to standards, the Scoring Guide Components were evaluated for Balance of Representation, Range of Knowledge, Depth of Knowledge, and Categorical Concurrence. This information will be useful for NDE in evaluating the usefulness and appropriateness of SWA as a tool for measuring student achievement on the state's revised Language Arts – Writing standards.

References

Frisbie, D. A. (2003). Checking the alignment of an assessment tool and a set of content standards. Iowa Technical Adequacy Project (ITAP). Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa.

Webb, N. L. (1997). Criteria for alignment of expectations and assessments in mathematics and mathematics education (NISE Research Monograph No. 6). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, National Institute for Mathematics Education.

Webb, N. L. (2002). *Alignment study in language arts, mathematics, mathematics, and social studies of state standards and assessments for four states.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Appendix A: Detailed Panelist Information

Grade level	Highest degree	Received	Additional Credits	Certification(s)	Current position	Years in Education	Grades taught	Specialties	Awards
4	Ed Specialist	2002	54	Elementary Ed., ELL, Physical Education, Health	Director of Education	22	K-8	Curriculum, assessment, administration	
4	BS (MA in May '09)	2006	30	Elementary Education	4th grade teacher	3	4		
4	2 Masters	1998; 2004		Elementary Ed. (K-6), Early Childhood, K-6 administration	Elementary Curriculum Consultant K-6	16	Pre-K, 1, 3, 4-6 facilitator		
4	Masters	2005	3	Elementary (K-8)	4th grade teacher	6	4	Mathematics	
4	MA	2001	9	K-12 SPED, K-6 Elementary Ed.	K-5 SPED	11	K-5		
8	MA	1982	36	English/Gifted	SWA - Retired English Teacher	34	9-12	AP	Kiewit Teaching; Phi Delta Kappa Feature Teacher
8	MS	1978	30	Social Studies & English (7-12)	Writing Coordinator K-12/Westside Schools	38	7-12		Ike Friedman Outstanding Educator (1999?); Schrayer Teacher of Year Award (2002?); Kelly Endowed Chair (2000?); Joseph Whitehead Educator of Distinction Award
8	MS	1996	36	English (7-12) & minor in Psychology	7-12 Coordinator for English & 8th grade class teacher	15	8		
8	MA	2007	12	English 7-12, ESL K-12	MS ESL Teacher	8	6-8, adult, college	ESL	
8	BA	1992	Several	Language Arts, Secondary Ed.	8th grade Language Arts	13	8-12	Speech & Drama	
8	MA	1993		Secondary English	7/8 English Teacher Leader	22	7,9		
11	MS	1990	18	Language Arts, Rhetoric, Technical Communication	Writing Graduation Demonstration Exam Coordinator	23	7-12	Composition	
11	MA	2001		English Language Arts, Gifted Ed., Curr. & Inst.	Assessment Services Coordinator ESU#3	25	K-Post Secondary	Curr. & Assess.	
11	MA	2006		English & German	English 10th Grade	12	8, 10, 12	District Writing Assessment Coordinator	
11	MA	1996	36	Secondary English, 7-12 Principal	Staff Development Director	30	7-12	Curriculum & Instruction	
11	MS	2005		Language Arts	10-12 English	19	9-12		Millard Employee of the Month (2005)
11	Masters	2008		English-Educational Administration	Teacher-English 9th-12th	4	9-12		Wells Fargo Teacher of the Year Nominee (2007, 2008)

Appendix B: Scoring Guide Components

NEBRASKA DEPT OF EDUCATION SCORING GUIDE FOR NARRATIVE WRITING				
Component	1 1+	2- 2 2+	3- 3 3+	4- 4
IDEAS/CONTENT — *1.* Understanding of Story	• Creates no understanding of the events of the story	• Creates a limited understanding of the events of the story	• Creates a general understanding of the events of the story	• Creates a clear understanding of the events of the story
2. Focused on Prompt	• Severe digressions from the prompt	• Some digressions from the prompt	• Is generally focused on the prompt	• Is well-focused on prompt throughout
3. Supporting Details	• Lacks supporting details	• Contains limited, unrelated details	• Contains adequate, relevant details	• Contains numerous, relevant details
4. Logical Storyline	• Storyline is repetitious, disconnected, or seemingly random	• Storyline is occasionally vague	• Storyline is generally logical and easy to follow	• Storyline is distinctive and easy to follow
ORGANIZATION — *5. Structural Development*	• Structural development does not include a beginning, middle, and end	• Structural development of a beginning, middle, and end is incomplete	• Structural development includes a functional beginning, middle, and end	• Structural development includes an effective beginning, middle, and end
6. Appropriate Sequencing	• Sequencing is random	• Sequencing is somewhat logical	• Sequencing is functional and logical	• Sequencing is thoughtful, logical and effective
7. Controlled Pacing	• Pacing is awkward	• Pacing is sometimes inconsistent	• Pacing is generally controlled	• Pacing is well-controlled
8. Effective Transitions	• Transitions are missing; connections are unclear	• Transitions are predictable, repetitious or weak	• Transitions are generally effective	• Transitions clearly show how ideas connect
VOICE — *9. Conveys Sense of Person*	• Conveys no sense of the person behind the words	• Conveys a limited sense of the person behind the words	• Conveys a general sense of the person behind the words	• Conveys a strong sense of the person behind the words
10. Appropriate Tone	• Tone is not appropriate for the purpose and audience	• Tone is sometimes not appropriate for purpose and audience	• Tone is generally appropriate for purpose and audience	• Tone is well-suited to the purpose and audience
11. Expressive Voice	• Is lifeless and/or mechanical	• Is occasionally expressive	• Is generally individualistic or expressive	• Is individualistic, expressive, and engaging throughout

SCORING GUIDE FOR NARRATIVE WRITING, cont'd

	Component	1 1+	2- 2 2+	3- 3 3+	4- 4
WORD CHOICE	*12. Specific Language*	• Language is neither specific nor precise	• Language is occasionally specific and precise	• Language is usually specific and precise	• Language is specific and precise throughout
	13. Appropriate Language	• Contains numerous misused or overused words and phrases	• Language is occasionally forced or contrived for the purpose and audience	• Language is generally appropriate for the purpose and audience	• Language is natural and appropriate for the purpose and audience
	14. Avoids Jargon	• Uses clichés and jargon rather than original language	• Some overuse of clichés and jargon	• Generally avoids clichés and jargon	• Avoids clichés and jargon
	15. Vivid Language		• Few vivid words and phrases	• Generally uses vivid words and phrases	• Effectively uses vivid words and phrases
SENTENCE FLUENCY	*16. Sentence Variety*	• Sentences almost never vary in length or structure	• Sentences occasionally vary in length or structure	• Sentences generally vary in length and structure	• Sentences vary in length and structure throughout
	17. Natural Phrasing	• Choppy, incomplete, rambling, or awkward phrasing throughout	• Phrasing occasionally sounds unnatural	• Phrasing generally sounds natural and conveys meaning	• Phrasing consistently sounds natural and conveys meaning
	18. Fragment Use	• Fragments or run-ons distract the reader	• Fragments, if present, sometimes confuse the reader	• Fragments, if present, may add style	• Fragments, if present, add style
	19. Natural Dialogue	• Dialogue, if present, is used inappropriately or sounds unnatural	• Dialogue, if present, occasionally sounds unnatural	• Dialogue, if present, generally sounds natural	• Dialogue, if present, sounds natural
CONVENTIONS	*20. Paragraph Use*	• Paragraphing is missing	• Paragraphing, if attempted, is irregular	• Attempts at paragraphing are generally successful	• Paragraphing is sound
	21. Grammar and Spelling	• Errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling throughout distract the reader	• Errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling may distract the reader	• A few errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling—especially with more sophisticated words and concepts—do not distract the reader	• Grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are generally correct; conventions—especially grammar and spelling—may be manipulated for stylistic effect

NEBRASKA DEPT OF EDUCATION SCORING GUIDE FOR DESCRIPTIVE WRITING

	Component	1 1+	2- 2 2+	3- 3 3+	4- 4
IDEAS/ CONTENT	*1. Creates Picture*	• Creates no picture of what is being described	• Creates a limited picture of what is being described	• Creates a general picture of what is being described	• Creates a clear picture of what is being described
	2. Focused on Prompt	• Severe digressions from the prompt	• Some digressions from the prompt	• Is generally focused on the prompt	• Is well-focused on prompt
	3. Supporting Details	• Lacks supporting details	• Contains some supporting, relevant details	• Contains adequate, supporting, relevant details	• Contains numerous, supporting, relevant details
	4. Acceptable Description	• Description is missing	• Description is limited	• Description is acceptable	• Description is distinctive
ORGANIZATION	*5. Structural Development*	• Structural development does not include an introduction, body, and conclusion	• Structural development of an introduction, body, and conclusion is incomplete	• Structural development includes a functional introduction, body, and conclusion	• Structural development includes an effective introduction, body, and conclusion
	6. Appropriate Sequencing	• Sequencing is random	• Sequencing is somewhat logical	• Sequencing is functional and logical	• Sequencing is thoughtful, logical and effective
	7. Controlled Pacing	• Pacing is awkward	• Pacing is sometimes inconsistent	• Pacing is generally controlled	• Pacing is well-controlled
	8. Effective Transitions	• Transitions are missing; connections are unclear	• Transitions may be repetitious, predictable or weak	• Transitions are generally effective	• Transitions clearly show how ideas connect
VOICE	*9. Conveys Sense of Person*	• Conveys no sense of the person behind the words	• Conveys a limited sense of the person behind the words	• Conveys a general sense of the person behind the words	• Conveys a strong sense of the person behind the words
	10. Appropriate Tone	• Tone is not appropriate for purpose and audience	• Tone is sometimes not appropriate for purpose and audience	• Tone is generally appropriate for purpose and audience	• Tone is well-suited to the purpose and audience
	11. Expressive Voice	• Is lifeless and/or mechanical	• Is occasionally expressive	• Is generally individualistic or expressive	• Is individualistic, expressive, and engaging throughout

SCORING GUIDE FOR DESCRIPTIVE WRITING, cont'd

	Component	1 1+	2- 2 2+	3- 3 3+	4- 4
WORD CHOICE	*12. Specific Language*	• Language is neither specific nor precise	• Language is occasionally specific and precise	• Language is usually specific and precise	• Language is consistently specific and precise throughout
	13. Appropriate Language	• Contains numerous misused or repetitious words and phrases	• Language is occasionally forced or contrived	• Language is generally appropriate for the purpose and audience	• Language is natural and appropriate for the purpose and audience
	14. Avoids Jargon	• Overuse of clichés and jargon	• Some overuse of clichés and jargon	• Generally avoids clichés and jargon	• Avoids clichés and jargon
	15. Vivid Language	• Lacks vivid words or phrases	• A few vivid words and phrases	• Some vivid words and phrases	• Effectively uses vivid words and phrases
SENTENCE FLUENCY	*16. Sentence Variety*	• Sentences almost never vary in length or structure	• Sentences occasionally vary in length or structure	• Sentences generally vary in length and structure	• Sentences vary in length and structure throughout
	17. Natural Phrasing	• Phrasing is choppy, incomplete, rambling, or awkward	• Phrasing occasionally sounds unnatural	• Phrasing generally sounds natural and conveys meaning	• Phrasing consistently sounds natural and conveys meaning
	18. Fragment Use	• Fragments or run-ons confuse the reader	• Fragments, if present, may confuse the reader	• Fragments, if present, may add style	• Fragments, if present, add style
	19. Natural Dialogue	• Dialogue, if present, is used inappropriately or sounds unnatural	• Dialogue, if present, occasionally sounds unnatural	• Dialogue, if present, generally sounds natural	• Dialogue, if present, sounds natural
CONVENTIONS	*20. Paragraph Use*	• Paragraphing is missing	• Paragraphing, if attempted, is irregular	• Attempts at paragraphing are generally successful	• Paragraphing is sound
	21. Grammar and Spelling	• Errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling throughout distract the reader	• Errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling may distract the reader	• A few errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling—especially with more sophisticated words and concepts—do not distract the reader	• Grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are mostly correct; conventions—especially grammar and spelling—may be manipulated for stylistic effect

NEBRASKA DEPT OF EDUCATION SCORING GUIDE FOR PERSUASIVE WRITING

	Component	1 1+	2- 2 2+	3- 3 3+	4- 4
IDEAS/ CONTENT	1. Creates Understanding	• Creates no understanding of the writer's opinion/position	• Creates a limited understanding of the writer's opinion/position	• Creates a general understanding of the writer's opinion/position	• Creates a clear understanding of the writer's opinion/position
	2. Focused on Prompt	• Severe digressions from the prompt	• Some digressions from the prompt	• Is generally focused on the prompt	• Is well-focused on prompt
	3. Supporting Examples	• Lacks supporting examples, reasons	• Contains limited supporting examples, reasons	• Contains adequate relevant supporting examples, reasons	• Contains numerous, relevant supporting examples, reasons
	4. Logical Argument	• Contains no persuasive arguments	• Arguments may not be logical	• Arguments are acceptable	• Contains arguments that are distinctive and convincing
ORGANIZATION	5. Structural Development	• Structural development does not include an introduction, body, and conclusion	• Structural development of an introduction, body, and conclusion is incomplete	• Structural development includes a functional introduction, body, and conclusion	• Structural development includes an effective introduction, body, and conclusion
	6. Appropriate Sequencing	• Sequencing is random	• Sequencing is somewhat logical	• Sequencing is functional and logical	• Sequencing is thoughtful, logical and effective
	7. Controlled Pacing	• Pacing is awkward	• Pacing is sometimes inconsistent	• Pacing is generally controlled	• Pacing is well-controlled
	8. Effective Transitions	• Transitions are missing	• Transitions may be repetitious, predictable or weak	• Transitions are generally effective	• Transitions clearly show how ideas connect
VOICE/TONE	9. Commitment to Topic	• Shows no commitment to the topic	• Shows limited commitment to the topic	• Shows a general commitment to the topic	• Shows a strong commitment to the topic
	10. Engaging	• Is not engaging	• Is occasionally engaging	• Is generally engaging	• Is engaging throughout
	11. Appropriate Tone	• Tone is not appropriate for purpose and audience	• Tone is sometimes not appropriate for purpose and audience	• Tone is appropriate for purpose and audience	• Tone is appropriate and effective for the purpose and audience
	12. Reader's Questions	• Fails to anticipate the reader's questions	• Anticipates a few of the reader's questions	• Generally anticipates the reader's questions	• Consistently anticipates reader's questions

		SCORING GUIDE FOR PERSUASIVE WRITING, cont'd			
	Component	**1 1+**	**2- 2 2+**	**3- 3 3+**	**4- 4**
WORD CHOICE	*13. Specific Language*	• Language is neither specific nor precise	• Language is occasionally specific and precise	• Language is usually specific and precise	• Language is specific and precise throughout
	14. Appropriate Language	• Contains numerous misused or overused words and phrases	• Language is occasionally forced or contrived for the purpose and audience	• Language is generally appropriate for the purpose and audience	• Language is natural and appropriate for the purpose and audience
	15. Avoids Jargon	• Overuse of clichés and jargon distract the reader	• Some clichés and jargon may distract the reader	• Generally avoids clichés and jargon	• Consistently avoids clichés and jargon
SENTENCE FLUENCY	*16. Sentence Variety*	• Sentences almost never vary in length or structure	• Sentences occasionally vary in length or structure	• Sentences generally vary in length and structure	• Sentences vary in length and structure throughout
	17. Natural Phrasing	• Choppy, incomplete, rambling, or awkward phrases throughout	• Phrasing occasionally sounds unnatural	• Phrasing generally sounds natural and conveys meaning	• Phrasing consistently sounds natural and conveys meaning
	18. Fragment Use	• Fragments or run-ons distract the reader	• Fragments or run-ons, if present, may distract the reader	• Fragments, if present, may add style	• Fragments, if present, add style
CONVENTIONS	*19. Paragraph Use*	• Paragraphing is missing	• Paragraphing may be irregular	• Paragraphing is generally successful	• Paragraphing is sound
	20. Grammar and Spelling	• Errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling throughout distract the reader	• Errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling may distract the reader	• A few errors in grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling—especially with more sophisticated words and concepts—do not distract the reader	• Grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are mostly correct; conventions—especially grammar and spelling—may be manipulated for stylistic effect

Appendix C: Example Rating Form

Nebraska Statewide Writing Alignment - Grade 11
Individual Rating Form

Name:

Key
Cognitive Complexity: L = Low, M = Moderate, H = High
Level of Match: S = Slight, P = Partial, C = Complete

Scoring Guide Component	Cognitive Complexity	NO MATCH	Primary Match		Secondary Match (if applicable)	
			Curricular Indicator	Level of Match	Curricular Indicator	Level of Match
1. Creates Understanding	L M H		LA 12.2.____	S P C	LA 12.2.____	S P C
2. Focused on Prompt	L M H		LA 12.2.____	S P C	LA 12.2.____	S P C
3. Supporting Examples	L M H		LA 12.2.____	S P C	LA 12.2.____	S P C
4. Logical Argument	L M H		LA 12.2.____	S P C	LA 12.2.____	S P C
5. Structural Development	L M H		LA 12.2.____	S P C	LA 12.2.____	S P C
6. Appropriate Sequencing	L M H		LA 12.2.____	S P C	LA 12.2.____	S P C
7. Controlled Pacing	L M H		LA 12.2.____	S P C	LA 12.2.____	S P C
8. Effective Transitions	L M H		LA 12.2.____	S P C	LA 12.2.____	S P C
9. Commitment to Topic	L M H		LA 12.2.	S P C	LA 12.2.	S P C

Appendix D: Scoring Guide Component-level Results

Nebraska Statewide Writing Alignment - Grade 4
Group Consensus Form

Key
Cognitive Complexity: L = Low, M = Moderate, H = High
Level of Match: S = Slight, P = Partial, C = Complete

Scoring Guide Component	Cognitive Complexity	Primary Match		Secondary Match (if applicable)		Tertiary Match (if applicable)	
		Curricular Indicator	Level of Match	Curricular Indicator	Level of Match	Curricular Indicator	Level of Match
1. Understanding of Story	M	LA 4.2.1.b	C	LA 4.2.1.a	C	LA 4.2.1.c	C
2. Focused on Prompt	M	LA 4.2.1.b	C	LA 4.2.2.a	C		
3. Supporting Details	M	LA 4.2.1.b	C	LA 4.2.1.c	C		
4. Logical Storyline	M	LA 4.2.1.b	C	LA 4.2.2.d	C		
5. Structural Development	M	LA 4.2.2.d	C	LA 4.2.1.b	C		
6. Appropriate Sequencing	M	LA 4.2.2.d	C	LA 4.2.1.b	c		
7. Controlled Pacing	M	LA 4.2.1.b	C				
8. Effective Transitions	M	LA 4.2.1.b	C	LA 4.2.1.c	C		
9. Conveys Sense of Person	H	LA 4.2.1.b	C	LA 4.2.2.b	C		
10. Appropriate Tone	H	LA 4.2.2.b	C	LA 4.2.2.c	C		
11. Expressive Voice	H	LA 4.2.2.c	C	LA 4.2.1.b	C		
12. Specific Language	H	LA 4.2.1.c	C	LA 4.2.2.b	C		
13. Appropriate Language	H	LA 4.2.2.b	C	LA 4.2.1.c	C		
14. Avoids Jargon	M	LA 4.2.1.b	C	LA 4.2.2.b	C		
15. Vivid Language	H	LA 4.2.1.c	C				
16. Sentence Variety	M	LA 4.2.1.b	C	LA 4.2.1.c	C		
17. Natural Phrasing	M	LA 4.2.1.b	C	LA 4.2.1.c	C	LA 4.2.2.b	C
18. Fragment Use	H	LA 4.2.2.b	C	LA 4.2.1.c	C		
19. Natural Dialogue	H	LA 4.2.1.c	C	LA 4.2.1.b	C		
20. Paragraph Use	H	LA 4.2.1.e	C	LA 4.2.1.f	C	LA 4.2.1.b	C
21. Grammar and Spelling	M	LA 4.2.1.e	C	LA 4.2.1.b	C		

Nebraska Statewide Writing Alignment - Grade 8
Group Consensus Form
Key
Cognitive Complexity: L = Low, M = Moderate, H = High
Level of Match: S = Slight, P = Partial, C = Complete

Scoring Guide Component	Cognitive Complexity	Primary Match		Secondary Match (if applicable)		Tertiary Match (if applicable)	
		Curricular Indicator	Level of Match	Curricular Indicator	Level of Match	Curricular Indicator	Level of Match
1. Creates Picture	H	LA 8.2.1.c	S	LA 8.2.2.b	S		
2. Focused on Prompt	M	LA 8.2.1.b	P	LA 8.2.2.a	P	LA 8.2.2.b	P
3. Supporting Details	H	LA 8.2.1.b	P	LA 8.2.1.c	P		
4. Acceptable Description	H	LA 8.2.1.c	S	LA 8.2.2.b	S		
5. Structural Development	H	LA 8.2.1.b	C	LA 8.2.2.c	C		
6. Appropriate Sequencing	M	LA 8.2.1.b	P	LA 8.2.1.c	P	LA 8.2.2.c	P
7. Controlled Pacing	H	LA 8.2.1.b	S	LA 8.2.1.c	S		
8. Effective Transitions	H	LA 8.2.1.c	P	LA 8.2.2.c	P		
9. Conveys Sense of Person	H	LA 8.2.1.c	S				
10. Appropriate Tone	M	LA 8.2.1.b	P	LA 8.2.2.a	P		
11. Expressive Voice	H	LA 8.2.1.c	P	LA 8.2.2.a	P		
12. Specific Language	H	LA 8.2.1.c	P	LA 8.2.2.a	S	LA 8.2.2.b	S
13. Appropriate Language	M	LA 8.2.1.c	P	LA 8.2.2.a	S	LA 8.2.2.b	S
14. Avoids Jargon	M	LA 8.2.1.c	P	LA 8.2.2.a	S	LA 8.2.2.b	S
15. Vivid Language	H	LA 8.2.1.c	P	LA 8.2.2.a	S	LA 8.2.2.b	S
16. Sentence Variety	H	LA 8.2.1.c	P	LA 8.2.2.b	S		
17. Natural Phrasing	H	LA 8.2.1.c	P				
18. Fragment Use	H	LA 8.2.1.c	P	LA 8.2.1.e	P		
19. Natural Dialogue	H	LA 8.2.1.c	S	LA 8.2.2.b	S		
20. Paragraph Use	M	LA 8.2.1.e	P	LA 8.2.1.f	P	LA 8.2.2.c	P
21. Grammar and Spelling	H	LA 8.2.1.e	C				

Nebraska Statewide Writing Alignment - Grade 11
Group Consensus Form

Key
Cognitive Complexity: L = Low, M = Moderate, H = High
Level of Match: S = Slight, P = Partial, C = Complete

Scoring Guide Component	Cognitive Complexity	Primary Match		Secondary Match (if applicable)		Tertiary Match (if applicable)	
		Curricular Indicator	Level of Match	Curricular Indicator	Level of Match	Curricular Indicator	Level of Match
1. Creates Understanding	H	LA 12.2.1.b	C				
2. Focused on Prompt	M	LA 12.2.1.b	C	LA 12.2.2.a	C		
3. Supporting Examples	H	LA 12.2.1.b	C				
4. Logical Argument	H	LA 12.2.1.b	C				
5. Structural Development	M	LA 12.2.1.b	C	LA 12.2.2.c	C		
6. Appropriate Sequencing	H	LA 12.2.1.b	C	LA 12.2.2.c	C		
7. Controlled Pacing	H	LA 12.2.1.b	C	LA 12.2.2.c	P		
8. Effective Transitions	M	LA 12.2.1.b	C	LA 12.2.2.c	C		
9. Commitment to Topic	M	LA 12.2.1.c	C	LA 12.2.1.b	C		
10. Engaging	H	LA 12.2.1.b	C	LA 12.2.1.c	C		
11. Appropriate Tone	H	LA 12.2.2.a	C	LA 12.2.1.c	C		
12. Reader's Questions	H	LA 12.2.2.a	C	LA 12.2.1.b	C		
13. Specific Language	M	LA 12.2.1.c	C	LA 12.2.2.b	C		
14. Appropriate Language	M	LA 12.2.1.c	C	LA 12.2.2.b	C		
15. Avoids Jargon	M	LA 12.2.1.c	C				
16. Sentence Variety	M	LA 12.2.1.c	C	LA 12.2.1.b	C		
17. Natural Phrasing	M	LA 12.2.1.c	C				
18. Fragment Use	M	LA 12.2.1.c	C	LA 12.2.1.e	C		
19. Paragraph Use	M	LA 12.2.1.e	C	LA 12.2.1.f	P		
20. Grammar and Spelling	M	LA 12.2.1.e	C				

Appendix E: Panelist Comments

- It would be beneficial to have someone to answer questions in regards to writing standards and outcomes

- Different drink choices, maybe tea?

- Great chance for discussion - discussion time very helpful for understanding

- Thought-provoking day!

- Good group to work with =)

- Good conversation!

- Thank you!!

- It might have been helpful to highlight words and phrases on the lavender sheet so we were consistent. Also, the confusion about thinking in terms of the test experience or only the written response should occur before the activity so that all three grades approached it in the same way.

- The process became more workable as the day progressed. The Buros personnel were very pleasant and helpful. You made an abstract concept/process come alive!