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Introduction
This guide is designed to help educators analyze the test results for the Interim Comprehensive Assessment (ICA) and the Interim Assessment Block (IAB) using the Centralized Reporting System.

Section I. Interim Assessments Types
The Oregon Statewide Assessment System (OSAS) offers two types of interim assessments: IABs and ICAs.

What Are the Interim Assessment Blocks?
Interim Assessment Blocks are computer-based assessments teachers can use throughout the school year to focus on sets of concepts in English language arts/literacy and mathematics. Most Interim Assessment Blocks can be administered in a single class period. They provide teachers, parents/guardians, and students with information about what concepts students have already mastered and where they might need additional help. For more information about Interim Assessment Blocks visit the Interim Assessments page of the Oregon Department of Education website.

What Are the Interim Comprehensive Assessments?
Interim Comprehensive Assessments are computer-based assessments teachers can use during the school year that measure the same content and the same standards as the English Language arts/literacy and mathematics summative assessments. There is one Interim Comprehensive Assessment for each grade level in English language arts/literacy and mathematics and each assessment includes a performance task. The Interim Comprehensive Assessments provide information about overall student performance in English and mathematics. For more information, visit the Interim Assessments page of the Oregon Department of Education website.

The lists below provide a summary of the features of each type of assessment.

Common Features Between ICAs and IABs
- Are available in English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics
- Contain high-quality items placed on the same scale as the summative assessments and use the full array of accessibility resources and supports available on the summative assessments
- Are designed for grades 3-8 and high school, but may be administered to students at any grade level
- Use the same item types and formats as the summative assessments
- Include performance tasks
- Are administered online using the same test delivery system as the summative assessments, but are fixed-form tests, not computer-adaptive tests
- May be administered as a standardized or non-standardized assessments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IABs- Interim Assessment Blocks</strong></th>
<th><strong>ICAs- Interim Comprehensive Assessments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on specific topics (e.g., measurement and data, fractions, read informational text).</td>
<td>Measure the same content and the same standards as the summative assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can usually be administered in one class period; include between 4 and 18 items depending on grade and content area.</td>
<td>Take between 3 and 4 hours to administer (like the summative assessments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information about student performance in three categories: above standard, near standard, and below standard.</td>
<td>Provide information about student performance overall and for each claim in ELA and mathematics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a performance task for each content area.</td>
<td>Include a performance task in each content area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May require local hand scoring if the IAB includes constructed-response items or an essay.</td>
<td>Require local hand scoring of some constructed-response items and performance tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be administered to students in a manner consistent with the sequence of the curriculum.</td>
<td>May be used to determine the knowledge and skills of students after a significant period of instruction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II. Measures and Summary Statistics, By Test & Reporting System

The table below lists the student and aggregate level measures that are available to the users in the Centralized Reporting System by assessment type. Please note that some measures that are available for the interim assessments (ICAs) are not applicable to the benchmark (IAB) assessments. For example, the overall scale score and Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) are applicable to the ICAs but not to the IABs. This is because the scale score is calculated across all claim levels which are available only in the interim assessment and not the benchmark assessments, which focus on specific topics. The table below is intended to provide a global view of the measures available across the reporting systems and the ICA and IAB assessments.

The Centralized Reporting system enables the educators to see the actual student responses. This can be helpful to teachers while assessing a student’s performance on writing response items, and also Mathematics and other ELA items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Measure Name</th>
<th>Availability By Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student level</td>
<td>Overall Scale Score</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Error of Measurement (SEM)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement Level</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claim/Block Reporting Categories</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item Level Score</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Item Responses</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claim/Block Performance – Score and SEM (Graphical Representation Only)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Performance Based on Writing Rubric</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate level</td>
<td>Student Count</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Completion Rate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Scale Score</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage Performance Distribution</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Score of Each Item</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Student Responses (Item Level responses)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities Taken</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Blocks Tested</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Blocks Above Standard</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Students Tested at Least One Block</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claim Average Scale Score</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Number of Blocks Students Completed</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Number of Blocks Students Performed Above Standard</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Proficient</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage Distribution of Student Responses (Item-level responses)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reporting Interim and Benchmark Assessments in Centralized Reporting System

This section provides a brief overview of the differences that the user can expect between the ICA and IAB assessments in the Centralized Reporting system. The differences will be analyzed at the group level and individual student level. For more details on how to access each measure, please refer to the Centralized Reporting User Guide.
Differences in Group Level Measures Between ICA and IAB Assessments

Dashboard

The Dashboard displays an aggregate card for each test group. Each aggregation card displays the test group name, a list of grades included, the number of students who took tests in the group, the date of the test last taken, and a performance distribution bar displaying both percentages and student counts. The ELA and Mathematics interim assessments test groups are Interim Assessment Block (IAB) ELA, Interim Assessment Block (IAB) Mathematics, Interim Comprehensive Assessment (ICA) ELA, and Interim Comprehensive Assessment (ICA) Mathematics.

Users can select an aggregate card to display the Performance on Tests report. On the Performance on Tests report, the Average Score is available only for the ICA assessments. Further, under the Performance Distribution column, the ICAs show the percentage distribution across each of the 4 achievement level categories while the IABs show the percentage of students scoring under each of the 3 reporting categories. Please refer to the Glossary section for more details on achievement levels and reporting categories.

Assessment Report: Performance by Roster

In Figure 2, please note that the ICA report by roster shows the Student Count, Test Completion Rate, Average Scale Score and Performance Distribution across the 4 achievement levels, and expandable columns by top 5 best/worst performing items and claim areas. The percentage distribution by achievement level is available for each claim area as well. The IAB report on the other hand, in Figure 3, shows Student Count, Test Completion Rate and Performance Distribution by reporting category, and expandable columns of top 5 best and worst performing items and total items.
Figure 2. Expandable Item Columns: ICA

Figure 3. Expandable Item Columns: IAB

Differences in Student Level Measures Between the ICA and IAB Assessments

Roster Performance on Test

Figures 4 and 5 show what an assessment report looks like for all students within a roster. The ICA report shows the Scale Score and Performance along with the expandable raw score columns by claim area. The IAB report shows the overall performance distribution column along with expandable columns for the raw scores for each item. This is because the IABs do not have separate claim areas and only consist of a small set of items related to a specific concept, which also leads to a much larger error band for the student scale score. For both IAB and ICA tests, educators also have the option to view each student’s actual response on an item by clicking on the raw score for the student.
Figure 4. Student Assessment Report for ICA

Figure 5. Student Assessment Report for IAB
Section III. Analyzing Test Results

General Guidelines for Analyzing Student Test Results

Tests Results are Not Perfect Measures of Student Performance: All tests include measurement error; no test is perfectly reliable. An error band is included with a student’s test score as an indicator of its reliability.

Use the Entire Assessment in Combination with Other Indicators: Students’ performance on the entire IAB is a better indicator of students’ knowledge and skills as compared to looking at performance on individual items, which vary in format, target skill and difficulty level. It is critical to use results from a test in combination with other information about student learning. This can encompass student work on classroom assignments, quizzes, observation, and other forms of evidence.

Validity of Results Depends on Appropriate Interpretation and Use: The interim assessments were designed to be used by educators to evaluate student performance against grade-level standards. When used as designed, results from the interim assessments can provide useful information to help educators improve teaching and learning for their students. However, any inferences made from the test results may not be valid if the test is used for purposes for which it was not designed and validated.

Manner of Administration Informs the Use of Results: Teachers may use the interim assessments in several ways to gain information about what their students know and can do. When combined with other forms of evidence, results from standardized administrations can be reasonably used to gauge student knowledge and growth over time after a period of instruction because those results represent individual student knowledge. Standardized administration of the IABs is much like an end-of-unit test and can be used both as an assessment of learning and an assessment for learning. Non-standardized administration of the interim assessments is done primarily for learning. Results from a non-standardized administration should be used with caution when evaluating an individual student.

  Standardized Administration = Assessment of Learning and Assessment for Learning.
  Non-standardized Administration = Assessment for Learning

Example of Classroom Use of Interim Assessment Results (IAB and ICA)

In this section, we provide an example of how an educator might use the results from an IAB and an ICA to improve teaching and learning in their classroom. Included in this example are screenshots from the Centralized Reporting System that illustrate the different views available to educators to analyze the data and interpret it within their local context. Results will be analyzed at the group level, individual student level, and item level. At each level, highlights of appropriate use and cautions are provided.

**SAMPLE SCENARIO A: IAB**

Ms. Kayla is a fourth-grade teacher who administers the interim ELA grade 4 ELA Read Information Text IAB as one measure of how well her students can read closely and analytically to comprehend a range of increasingly complex informational texts.

**SAMPLE SCENARIO B: ICA**

Ms. Kayla is a fourth-grade teacher who administers the interim grade 3 ELA ICA in the fall to new students who did not take the ELA summative assessment the previous school year. The teacher uses these results, along with grade 4 summative results for the other students, to determine instructional focus in the first few weeks of the school year.
Group-Level Analysis

Group-level results can help educators evaluate the degree to which they may need to adjust their instruction by analyzing areas in which students excel and areas where students need additional support. The definition of a group is locally defined. Some examples are:

- Classroom of students,
- Grade level of students, or
- Students who participate in a special program (e.g., intervention or enrichment) who received similar instruction.

As shown in Figure 6, Ms. Kayla can see the percentage performance distribution for all her classes on the ELA IAB assessments, after selecting the ELA IAB aggregate card on the Dashboard. For ICA tests, she can also view the Average Score for all her students.

**Figure 6. Performance on Test View of IAB Results**

- **In Sample Scenario A, for the IAB:** Ms. Kayla can see from the Performance Distribution section of the first test (Figure 6) that 25% of her students scored within the Above Standard reporting category. The distribution of scores also highlighted that 50% of the students scored within the At/Near Standard reporting category, and 25% scored within the Below Standard category.

  From the Performance on Test page, Ms. Kayla can click on the test to view a group or roster level view of the test performance. She can also access links to instructional resources. Each IAB has an associated Tools for Teachers Connections Playlist.

  **NOTE:** Connections Playlists are time-saving tools that were developed by teachers for teachers. Each playlist provides resources that were selected and organized based on the reporting categories for an IAB.

Ms. Kayla can select the **Get Instructional Resources** button as shown in Figure 7 to access resources for the IABs reporting category. Through these links, Ms. Kayla can find resources to:

- provide students who scored Above Standard with instruction designed to enrich and expand their skills; and
- provide differentiated instruction based on student needs.
In Sample Scenario B, for the ICA: Ms. Kayla clicks on the ELA ICA aggregate card on the Dashboard to display the Performance on Test report. She then selects one ICA assessment to access the Assessment Report for her class. Here Ms. Kayla can see the percentage performance of her class by each claim area. As shown in Figure 8, she can see that in the Listening claim area 100% of the students who took the test scored in the Above Standard level. Similarly, if she were to expand on Reading she would see that 50% scored Above Standard and the remaining 50% scored at the At/Near Standard level. In both Research/Inquiry and Writing claim areas, she may see that only 25% of the students scored in the At/Near Standard level while 75% scored in the Below Standard category. Using this information, along with the results from the summative assessment and other resources, Ms. Kayla can then decide if there is a need for additional support in the Research/Inquiry and Writing claim areas, and if the class may need enrichment activities to expand their existing skills in Listening.

Figure 8. Performance by Roster: ICA

Group Item-Level Analysis

For each item in the IAB and ICA, Ms. Kayla can see the claim, target, item difficulty, and the number of students who received full credit, as well as the number of students who did not receive any credit. This information is
available on the Rubrics and Resources tab under the item-level view. The item-level view can be accessed by clicking on the item number in the expandable tab as shown in Figure 9.¹

For example, as shown in the bottom right corner in Figure 9, item 41 is listed as Difficult. Ms. Kayla sees that none of her students received full credit for Item 41. Continuing in the same row, she can also see that 5 of her students did not receive any points for Item 41. This information indicates a need for additional support.

**Figure 9. Item-Level View of Assessment Results: Group Scores**

---

**Student-Level Analysis**

To inform her teaching to help students comprehend a range of increasingly complex informational texts and provide better instructional support to her students, Ms. Kayla can use individual student performance results by looking at the "Roster Performance on Test" screen (Figure 10). The Performance column is sortable so that Ms. Kayla can easily identify the students who performed within each reporting category for an IAB and each achievement level for an ICA test.

For example, if Ms. Kayla were looking at her class’s IAB results, she can use the test results for students in the Above Standard reporting category, combined with her knowledge of student performance on classroom assignments, homework, and other observations. Ms. Kayla can make inferences about her students’ ability to read and comprehend informational text. She is confident that students who scored in the Above Standard category have mastered the skills and knowledge taught in the classroom and are in no need of additional support on that content.

Because she feels confident in the abilities of her students who scored in the Above Standard category, Ms. Kayla chooses to focus her attention on the students who scored in the Below Standard category, suspecting that there might be a need for additional instruction for that group. Ms. Kayla remembers that the information from the IAB is only one measure and it should always be used in combination with other information about her students. However, the information from the IAB can assist her in adjusting instruction to the specific needs of her students,

---

¹ For more information on how to navigate to the item-level view, please refer to the Centralized Reporting User Guide.
thereby improving teaching and learning in the classroom. For example, Ms. Kayla could use the reporting categories to determine the specific needs of her students and tailor the instruction and processes of collaborative learning groups to meet those needs.

**Figure 10. Student-Level View of Assessment Results – IAB**

Ms. Kayla can follow a very similar process to analyze the student-level results for the ICA assessment by looking at the achievement levels.

As shown in Figure 10, Ms. Kayla can select an individual student from the group list (by selecting the lens box with the student’s name) to examine the student’s performance on items within the IAB. When an individual student is selected, Ms. Kayla can select the option to view the student’s responses and a screen showing each item in the IAB is displayed (see Figure 11).

**Figure 11. Individual Student Item-Level View of IAB Information**

Ms. Kayla selects item number 6 and the following two tabs appear: Item & Score and Rubric & Resources (Figure 12).
By examining student responses in the Item & Score tab for the students in her class, Ms. Kayla can identify common misconceptions or misunderstandings. If several students chose the same incorrect response, for example, Ms. Kayla can isolate areas to revisit with her class.

The Rubric & Resources tab (Figure 13) shows the exemplar (i.e., correct answer), and any other possible correct responses to the item. For multiple-choice questions, the key or correct response is provided.

The Details section in the Rubric & Resources tab describes the claim, assessment target, and topic that the item assesses. This tab also provides the item difficulty.
As shown in Figure 13, Item 3 is aligned to Standard: Describe the relationship between a series of historical events, scientific ideas or concepts, or steps in technical procedures in a text, using language that pertains to time, sequence, and cause/effect, Assessment Target: Analysis within or across texts. This information tells Ms. Kayla what concepts and skills the item assesses.

Ms. Kayla can also see from this tab that Item 3 is classified as Moderate. Ms. Kayla can include item difficulty in her inferences about student performance because item classification provides her with additional context when reviewing test results and considering instructional implications.

Student scores on more difficult items should be treated differently from scores on less difficult items. For example, if half of the students get an item wrong, Ms. Kayla should avoid making generalized inferences about student needs. Instead, Ms. Kayla can account for item difficulty when drawing conclusions from test results to determine what students know and can do. If the item is rated difficult, Ms. Kayla’s conclusions about her students may differ from conclusions based on an item rated as easy. If half of the students answer an easy item incorrectly, she may decide to re-teach the concepts addressed in that item. On the other hand, if half of her students got a difficult item incorrect, she may choose to address that result by encouraging additional practice on this type of item.

**Item-Level Analysis**

For selected response items, Ms. Kayla can analyze whether a large group of students selected a particular incorrect response, which may signal a common misconception about a topic or skill. To do this, Ms. Kayla selects the item number from the ‘Class Performance on Test’ page (Figure 12).

![Figure 14. Select to View Item-level Analysis](image-url)
Ms. Kayla can use the ‘5 Items on which the Students Performed the Worst’ view to see those items on which students had the greatest difficulty and then determine whether there were incorrect answers that many students selected.

The Item-Level Analysis View (Figure 15) displays information for the selected items. Ms. Kayla can see the claim, target, item difficulty, and related standard(s) for each item. In addition, she can see the number of students who earned full credit for each item and the number of students who did not.

**Figure 15. Item-level Analysis View**

Ms. Kayla identifies Item 22 as one on which a majority of her class selected an incorrect answer. To learn more about this item, Ms. Kayla can see the Details section of the Rubric & Resources tab. From the Class Performance on Test page, Ms. Kayla can see which students incorrectly answered item 22. Using these results and using other information she has about her students based on classroom discussion and assignments, she can begin to form hypotheses about why her students may have incorrectly chosen the incorrect response option.
Section IV. Viewing Actual Student Responses

Educators can use the Centralized Reporting System to view individual student responses to find out how well individual students understand the material covered on their completed IAB and ICA assessments. This is achieved in Centralized Reporting by clicking on the student’s score for an individual item, which then opens an Item View window.

Writing Response Items

For writing response items the student-level results are available for teachers to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of student writing (Figure 16, 17) based on student performance on the essay question.

Figure 16. Individual Student Report on the Essay Question-Rubric & Resources

2 For more information on how to navigate to the item-level view, please refer to the Centralized Reporting User Guide.
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This view provides the information found on the Rubric & Resources tab (Figure 16). In addition, as seen in Figure 17, it indicates the points earned by the students, the maximum points the students could achieve and the actual student response. There is a maximum of 4 points for organization/purpose, 4 points for evidence/elaboration, and 2 points maximum for conventions. To compute the total number of points earned, the scores for organization/purpose and evidence/elaboration are averaged and rounded up, and then added to the points earned for conventions. Using this formula, a student can earn a maximum of 6 points.

**This feature to see the actual student response for any item can be especially helpful to educators when analyzing writing response items.**

As she reviews these results, Ms. Kayla keeps in mind all the same caveats about considering student scores in the context of everything else she knows about a student’s performance she factors in the difficulty of the test item and manner of test administration and recognizes that no test or single test question should be used as the sole indicator of student performance. Using all the information she knows about her students, Ms. Kayla can determine whether her class or individual students need additional support related to the writing process. She also can use the rubrics and student test score information to help students and their families understand where a student’s writing skills are on track and where they need further practice.
Non-Writing Response item

There are different types of non-writing response items available, and educators have the option to view the student level responses for each type. Below is an example of what a teacher would see for a multiple-response item. Similar to the writing response item, the teacher can view the Rubric & Resources tab to see the item difficulty, correct responses, and content alignment information (Figure 19). The Item & Score tab shows the actual options the student selected (Figure 18).

Figure 18. Individual Student Report on the Multiple-Response Item: Item & Score

Figure 19. Individual Student Report on the Multiple-Response Item: Rubric & Resources
Section V. Glossary of Terms

**Scaled Score** is the student’s overall numerical score. These scores fall on a continuous scale (from approximately 2000 to 3000) that increases across grade levels. Scaled scores can be used to illustrate students’ current level of achievement and their growth over time. When combined together across a student population, scaled scores can also describe school- and district-level changes in performance, as well as reveal gaps in achievement among different groups of students.

**Achievement Level** is a category of performance based on students’ scaled scores on the ICA and summative assessment. The *four achievement levels* indicate progress toward meeting the expectation of content mastery and college and career readiness: Level 4: Standard Exceeded; Level 3: Standard Met; Level 2: Standard Nearly Met; Level 1: Standard Not Met. The tables below (Figure 20) show the range of scaled scores for each achievement level in the ICA and summative assessments in mathematics and English language arts/Literacy.

**Figure 20. Summative and ICA Scale Score Ranges by Content and Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics:</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;2381</td>
<td>2381–2435</td>
<td>2436–2500</td>
<td>&gt;2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;2411</td>
<td>2411–2484</td>
<td>2485–2548</td>
<td>&gt;2548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;2455</td>
<td>2455–2527</td>
<td>2528–2578</td>
<td>&gt;2578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;2473</td>
<td>2473–2551</td>
<td>2552–2609</td>
<td>&gt;2609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;2484</td>
<td>2484–2566</td>
<td>2567–2634</td>
<td>&gt;2634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;2504</td>
<td>2504–2585</td>
<td>2586–2652</td>
<td>&gt;2652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt;2543</td>
<td>2543–2627</td>
<td>2628–2717</td>
<td>&gt;2717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Language Arts/Literacy</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;2367</td>
<td>2367–2431</td>
<td>2432–2489</td>
<td>&gt;2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;2416</td>
<td>2416–2472</td>
<td>2473–2532</td>
<td>&gt;2532</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;2442</td>
<td>2442–2501</td>
<td>2502–2581</td>
<td>&gt;2581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;2457</td>
<td>2457–2530</td>
<td>2531–2617</td>
<td>&gt;2617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&lt;2479</td>
<td>2479–2551</td>
<td>2552–2648</td>
<td>&gt;2648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;2487</td>
<td>2487–2566</td>
<td>2567–2687</td>
<td>&gt;2687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt;2493</td>
<td>2493–2582</td>
<td>2583–2681</td>
<td>&gt;2681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim Levels/Block Reporting Categories** are as one of three reporting categories: Above Standard, At/Near Standard, or Below Standard. These reporting categories for an IAB are determined using the same calculation used to determine the ICA and summative claim levels. The difference between the proficiency cut score and the claim/block score plus or minus 1.5 times standard error of the claim/block is used to determine the reporting category/claim level.
Claims, Targets, Domain, and Standards are a way of classifying test content.

- **Claim**: The claim is the major topic area. For example, in English language arts, reading is a claim.
- **Target**: Within each claim, there are targets that describe the knowledge and skills that the test measures. Within the Reading claim, for example, one of the targets is concerned with finding the central idea in a text.
- **Standards**: Each target may encompass one or more standards from the Oregon State Standards.
- **Domains**: Domains are large groups of related standards in the Mathematics Oregon State Standards (e.g., Geometry, Statistics and Probability, Ratios and Proportional Relationships).

**Item Difficulty** is assigned to each test item based on the proportion of students in the field-test sample who responded to that item correctly. The students who responded to the item are referred to as the reference population. The reference population determines the difficulty level of a test item. (Note: The reference population for an item consists of all the students who took the test the year the item was field-tested. Depending on when the item was field-tested, the reference population may refer to students who took the spring 2014 field test or a subsequent summative assessment that included embedded field-tested items.)

Test items are classified as easy, moderate, or difficult based on the average proportion of correct responses of the reference population, also referred to as the average proportion-correct score (Table 1). The average proportion-correct score can range from 0.00 (no correct answers meaning the item is difficult) to 1.00 (all correct answers meaning the item is easy).

### Table 1. Item Difficulty Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty Category</th>
<th>Range of Average Proportion Correct (p-value) Score</th>
<th>For items worth more than 1 point, the average proportion correct score is the item’s average score among students in the reference population divided by the maximum possible score on the item. For example, if the average score for a 2-point item is 1, its average proportion correct score is 1 divided by 2, or 0.50. In this example, that test item would be rated as moderate on the item difficulty scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Minimum: 0.67</td>
<td>Maximum: 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Minimum: 0.34</td>
<td>Maximum: 0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Minimum: 0.00</td>
<td>Maximum: 0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Easy items are answered correctly by at least 67% of the students in the reference population.

Moderate items are answered correctly by 34-66% of the reference population.

Difficult items are answered correctly by 33% or less of the reference population.

**Tools for Teachers** is an online collection of instructional and professional learning resources created by educators for educators. All resources are aligned to the Oregon State Standards, assessment targets, and one or more formative assessment attributes. The resources are designed to help educators implement the formative assessment process to improve teaching and learning. The resources can support instruction by:

- providing guidance on differentiated instruction for diverse learners;
Increasing educator’s assessment literacy;
- engaging students in their own learning;
- designing professional development opportunities; and
- providing materials for Professional Learning Communities.

**Writing/Essay Response Items** and the scoring breakdown by dimension and condition code if assigned, are available in Centralized Reporting. Writing prompts are scored on three dimensions: ‘Editing/Conventions’, ‘Evidence/Elaboration’, ‘Statement of Purpose/Focus & Organization’. One of four condition codes can be applied.

- **NOT_ENOUGH_DATA**: Student response is less than minimum number of words configured in the rubric.
- **PROMPT_COPY_MATCH**: Student response is copied from the passage or item prompt (currently flagged when 70% match found, but this is configurable).
- **DUPLICATE_TEXT**: Student response is repeated text copied over and over (currently flagged when 70% match found, but this is configurable).
- **NONSPECIFIC**: Essay scoring engine predicts the assignment of a condition code.

**Standard Error of Measurement (SEM)** is reported along with the scale score. For example, if a student takes the ELA grade 4 ICA and receives a scale score of 2480 with an SEM of +/- 40, this provides the range of scores the student is likely to earn (2440-2520) if that student were to take the test multiple times, or a test of parallel construction and similar difficulty, without receiving further instruction. This range, called an error band, represents one Standard Error of Measurement above and below the student’s scale score.

**Tools for Teachers Connections Playlists** are created by expert educators in collaboration with Smarter Balanced. The Tools for Teachers Connection Playlists link student performance on the IABs to resources in Tools for Teachers. These documents can be easily accessed through the Instructional Resources button in the Centralized Reporting System. Each IAB has an associated Tools for Teachers Connections Playlist. Educators can use these documents to find relevant and useful instructional supports that are aligned to students’ needs.

The Connections Playlists provide just a sample of educator-recommended resources that can supplement curriculum and other classroom activities, such as the example shown in Figure 21. The Connections Playlists are not meant to replace curriculum or define an instructional sequence. Many of the resources can be implemented “as-is,” while others will likely need to be adapted to suit unique classroom and individual student needs. By considering IAB results along with other classroom assessment results and professional judgment, educators can decide how to use Tools for Teachers resources to support their instruction.
To create the Connections Playlists, educators reviewed the items in each IAB, determined the skills and knowledge aligned to each reporting category, and identified corresponding resources in Tools for Teachers.