

## Participation & Supported Independence

### SECTION 5 — MI-ACCESS P/SI: SCORING

During the assessment, each student taking a Participation or Supported Independence assessment is observed by two people: a Primary Assessment Administrator (PAA) and a Shadow Assessment Administrator (SAA). The two assessment administrators simultaneously and independently score the student using a standardized scoring rubric that (1) is based on the student responding correctly, and (2) takes into consideration the amount of assistance needed to engage the student in the item. The P/SI scoring rubrics are shown in Table 3 (below).

<b>TABLE 3 MI-Access Participation and Supported Independence Scoring Rubrics</b>		
<b>Participation Score Point/ Condition Code</b>	<b>Supported Independence Score Point/ Condition Code</b>	<b>Term</b>
3	2	Responds correctly with no assessment administrator assistance
2	1	Responds correctly after assessment administrator provides verbal/ physical cues
1	Not allowed in SI	Responds correctly after assessment administrator provides modeling, short of hand-over-hand assistance
A	A	Incorrect response
B	B	Resists/Refuses
C	C	Assessment administrator provides hand-over-hand assistance and/or step-by-step directions

The PAA and SAA scores are added together to calculate a score for each item. Then, all of the item scores are added together to determine the student's total earned points for the assessment. (It should be noted that condition codes—As, Bs, and Cs—count as zero points.) In addition to earned points, students are assigned a performance level, which adds meaning to the point value.

## — Participation & Supported Independence

### Performance Levels and Earned Points

There are three performance levels a student can achieve on the P/SI assessments: (1) Surpassed the Performance Standard, (2) Attained the Performance Standard, or (3) Emerging Toward the Performance Standard. The charts in Appendices A and B explain, in detail, what students need to do to achieve each of the three levels for ELA and mathematics. The Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs) for science were under development when the handbook was published and, therefore, will be posted on the MI-Access Web page ([www.mi.gov/mi-access](http://www.mi.gov/mi-access)) and at the MI-Access Information Center ([www.mi-access.info](http://www.mi-access.info)).

The number of earned points needed to achieve a particular performance level varies by type of assessment (Participation or Supported Independence), by content area (ELA, mathematics, or science), and by grade. Tables 4-7 show the number of points needed by performance level for ELA and mathematics. Similar numbers for science were not available when the handbook was published and, therefore, will be posted on the MI-Access Web page ([www.mi.gov/mi-access](http://www.mi.gov/mi-access)) and at the MI-Access Information Center ([www.mi-access.info](http://www.mi-access.info)).

TABLE 4	<b>MI-Access Participation English Language Arts Performance Levels and Earned Points</b>							
	<b>Grade</b>							
	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	
Surpassed the Performance Standard	46-60	46-60	47-60	43-60	44-60	46-60	44-60	
Attained the Performance Standard	19-45	20-45	21-46	19-42	19-43	23-45	19-43	
Emerging Toward the Performance Standard	0-18	0-19	0-20	0-18	0-18	0-22	0-18	

TABLE 5	<b>MI-Access Participation Mathematics Performance Levels and Earned Points</b>							
	<b>Grade</b>							
	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	
Surpassed the Performance Standard	38-60	41-60	45-60	44-60	45-60	49-60	49-60	
Attained the Performance Standard	17-37	20-40	24-44	23-43	25-44	28-48	28-48	
Emerging Toward the Performance Standard	0-16	0-19	0-23	0-22	0-24	0-27	0-27	

## Participation & Supported Independence

TABLE 6	<b>MI-Access Supported Independence English Language Arts Performance Levels and Earned Points</b>						
	<b>Grade</b>						
	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>
Surpassed the Performance Standard	43-60	47-60	49-60	41-60	45-60	47-60	47-60
Attained the Performance Standard	24-42	30-46	33-48	23-40	27-44	29-46	29-46
Emerging Toward the Performance Standard	0-23	0-29	0-32	0-22	0-26	0-28	0-28

TABLE 7	<b>MI-Access Supported Independence Mathematics Performance Levels and Earned Points</b>						
	<b>Grade</b>						
	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>
Surpassed the Performance Standard	41-60	44-60	48-60	37-60	42-60	41-60	46-60
Attained the Performance Standard	19-40	23-43	25-47	16-36	19-41	19-40	21-45
Emerging Toward the Performance Standard	0-18	0-22	0-24	0-15	0-18	0-18	0-20

### Performance Standard Setting

To determine the total number of earned points needed to Surpass, Attain, or Emerge Toward the Performance Standard, the OEAA involved stakeholders—such as general and special education classroom teachers, administrators, parents, special education directors, school psychologists, and related services providers—in an intensive standard-setting process. The process was conducted by Questar—the MI-Access contractor—and involved Michigan stakeholders who were nominated by their school districts and selected by the OEAA to participate. The participants were divided into panels by content area and grade spans and met over the course of two days. The standard-setting process worked as follows.

## — Participation & Supported Independence

- The full group heard a presentation on the components of the P/SI assessments.
- The group also discussed (1) how the score points from the MI-Access assessments would translate into score reports, (2) the terminology that was selected to describe the three levels of student performance, and (3) how the standard-setting process would work.
- The full group was then divided into panels, each of which was asked to add more concrete meaning to the performance levels by reviewing and finalizing detailed PLDs. Panel members were also asked to make an initial, independent judgment about cut scores (or, in other words, where the lines should be drawn between the minimum number of points needed to Surpass or Attain the Performance Standard).
- During the second day, panelists discussed their initial judgments with their peers, internalized the feedback, and were informed about the difficulty of each assessment item. Panelists were then able to use that information, if desired, in making a second round of judgments.
- After the second round, the panelists discussed their judgments again. They also reviewed per-

formance data to see roughly how many students would fall into each performance category if their second-round judgments were adopted.

- Once the data were presented and discussed, the panelists made a final round of judgments to (1) increase the reliability of their judgments, (2) increase their confidence in their determinations, and (3) encourage a convergence of ideas. The judgments made during the final round were considered to be the panelists' recommendations to the OEAA.

At the end of the standard-setting session, Questar took the judgments of each panelist and calculated descriptive statistics—such as the mean, the median, and standard errors—for the cut scores recommended for each grade and content-area assessment.

After the statistics were calculated, the TAC reviewed the standard-setting process to ensure that the proper procedures were followed; the OEAA reviewed and synthesized the data; cut score recommendations were made to the state Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education (SBE); and the cut scores were approved by the SBE.