EPSY 8225: Operational Measurement:

Test Score Quality Assurance, Standard Setting & Equating

Spring Semester, 2020

Mondays 9:05-11:55 AM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Instructor: Michael C. Rodriguez | Classroom: 119 Folwell Hall |
| Phone: *don’t use…* | Office: 104E Burton Hall |
| Email: mcrdz@umn.edu | Office Hours: Mondays 1:00-3:00  Or by appointment |
| Web: http://www.edmeasurement.net |

**The Course:**

Measurement specialists involved in operational testing programs find a need to understand the principles and practices of test score quality assurance, standard setting, and equating. This course will introduce students to the principles and skills required in operational testing programs, including operational testing in a variety of settings with a focus on achievement tests. Regarding test score quality assurance, students will review industry standards regarding quality control and investigate assurance procedures such as key checks, DIF, detection of cheating, analysis of rater agreement and rater bias, and related activities. Regarding standard setting, students will review existing standard setting methodologies, engage in standard setting exercises, analyze real data from standard setting procedures in state testing programs, and investigate current literature in standard setting practices. Regarding equating, students will gain an understanding of the principles of equating, scaling, and linking, and develop the skills to conduct equating and to interpret results in reasonable ways. Students will engage in equating exercises employing real data from national and international testing programs and investigate current equating literature.

**Course Goals:**

Students will be able to:

* Identify essential elements of test quality control;
* Investigate test score quality through key checks, DIF, cheating detection, and other methods;
* Analyze rater data for rater agreement and/or rater bias, supporting the use of constructed-response items or performance assessments;
* Understand the purposes of standard setting and the context in which it is conducted;
* Distinguish between standard setting methodologies;
* Understand the importance of standard setting to test development;
* Design reasonable and useful standard setting studies;
* Identify appropriate and inappropriate uses and interpretations of standard setting results.
* Understand the purposes of equating, scaling, and linking and the context in which they are conducted;
* Understand the importance of equating to test development and quality control procedures;
* Describe and employ the distinctions among equating properties, equating designs, and equating methods;
* Interpret results from equating analyses;
* Design reasonable and useful equating studies;
* Conduct equating in realistic testing situations.

**Course Schedule, Topics & Readings**

***Test Score Quality Assurance***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1-27 | Introduction to operational testing programs; Review of Testing Standards;  Measurement model inconsistencies | AERA, APA, & NCME (2014);  Brennan (2004); BOTA Documents; Deng Yoo (2009); Reckase (2017) |
| 2-3 | Testing program quality control | Allalouf (2007, 2011, 2017); Frey et al. (2009); NCME (2012) |
| 2-10 | Measurement models, Item review, DIF analyses | Wilson (2008); Yen (1986); Wu (2010);  Dorans (2002); Zumbo (2007) |
| 2-17 | Rater agreement, rater bias; Scorer training and monitoring; Detecting cheating | Everson & Hines (2010); Myford & Wolfe (2009); Wolfe & Gitomer (2001); Impara (2005); Cizek (2001); Olson Fremer (2013); Ferrara (2017) |
| Lit Review Topics | Gabriela: large-scale testing in special populations  Qian: scoring QC in performance ass’ts (edTPA)  Peter: item properties QC in scoring | Diamonique: rater performance (human scoring)  Carlos: mixed-format test specification QC  Mohammed: non-effortful responding |
|  | * **Annotated Bibliography DUE February 24** | |

***Test Score Equating***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2-24 | Introduction and Concepts; Observed score equating, random groups designs | [Kolen & Brennan, Chapter 1-2]  Dorans Moses Eignor (2010)  Newton (2005); Ryan (2011) |
| 3-2 | Nonequivalent groups, linear & equipercentile | [K&B, Chapters 4-5]  Albano (2010);  Livingston (2004) |
| *3-9* | *Spring Break* | |
|  | * **Equating A DUE March 16 (or sooner)** | |
| 3-16 | IRT methods | [K&B, Chapter 6]  Cook Eignor (1991); Kolen Whitney (1982);  Lopez-Cuadrado (2009); Yu Osborn Popp (2005) |
| 3-23 | In-class equating workshop | See *Equating Example Story* link online |
|  | * **Equating B DUE March 30 (or sooner)** | |
| 3-30 | Equating error and practical issues | [K&B, Chapters 7-8]  Fitzpatrick Yen (2001); Sinharay Holland (2007); Tong Kolen (2005); Newton (2005) |

***Standard Setting***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4-6 | Introduction and Concepts | Bejar (2008); Cizek Bunch Koons (2004);  Cizek & Bunch, Chapters 1-3;  Crane Winter (2006); Zieky Perie (2006) |
| 4-13 | Nedelsky []  Ebel []  Angoff []  Direct Consensus Methods [] | C&B, Chapters 4-7 |
| *4-20* | *AERA/NCME* | |
| 4-27 | Contrasting Group, []  Body of Work []  Bookmark Methods [] | C&B, Chapters 8-10;  Huyn (2006); MacCann Stanley (2006) |
| 5-4 | Practice and Quality Control in Standard Setting | C&B, Chapters 13, 15, 16; MCA PLDs  Morgan Michaelides (2005); Perie (2007, 2008)  Reckase (2006); Schultz (2006); Zwick (2001) |
|  | * **Standard Setting Report Critique DUE May 11** | |
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**Evaluation of Student Performance**

Five projects will be required to assess student achievement of the above objectives. These projects include the following:

1. Annotated bibliography of 3 quality assurance articles based on any topic discussed in class in the quality assurance section; APA style reference and one page summary per article.  
   See the 2016 class Bibliography – do not replicate articles summarized there. [15%]
2. Observed score linear and equipercentile equating with CIPE. Describe observed differences in the two forms based on form difficulty and group ability, prior to equating (report univariate summary statistics). Describe the methods of equating and the results of equating in terms of form difficulty and group ability (report synthetic group summary statistics). [25%]
3. IRT equating (software choice, recommending Winsteps). Describe the procedures used and appropriate output, including summary statistics prior to equating and post equating, the anchor-item scatterplot, and decisions about treating missing data. [25%]
4. Presentation of a standard setting method to class, introducing the procedures of the method. The presentation should be approximately 15 minutes with a one-page handout. [10%]
5. A critique of a published standard setting report. The critique should include a table of procedures described in the report and the identification of unique components or missing elements based on those components described by Cizek and Bunch. Also include a summary of the context of the standard setting procedure and a general discussion of the clarity of the report, procedures, and results. No more than 5 pages of double-spaced text. [25%]

**Format for submitting assignments via EMAIL:**

Submit assignments in Word format, in an email message with EPSY8225 in the subject line, using the following document naming system:

Lastname-EPSY8225-assignmentname-yearmonthday.docx

*For example*: **Gabel-EPSY8225-bibliography-20180220.docx**

This indicates: from Gabel, EPSY8225, bibliography, 2018 February 20.

***Note on Grading Policy:***

Evaluation of successful achievement of the course objectives is based on a grading policy that is focused on learning. Projects that require more time are weighted more and each project can be resubmitted for completeness. The focus is on achievement of the learning objectives – each project can be submitted twice for full credit.

***Instruction*:**

Each course meeting will include lecture on key points of the day's topic(s) and a period of class discussion. Many of the sessions will include time to debate issues and challenge assumptions raised by students, the instructor, and the text authors. Several sessions will include small group work (e.g., writing and critiquing test items, evaluating validity arguments). As the instructor, I assume the following responsibilities: to present material in a clear and contextualized format, to provide opportunity for students to pursue additional clarification in and out of class, to develop and employ fair and meaningful assessment activities, to use results of evaluation activities for instructional feedback, and to provide opportunities for recourse if students believe they have been unfairly evaluated.

***Technology*:**

Technology is becoming increasingly important in education and we will pursue learning with the aid of technology in several ways. Students will be allowed to submit assignments electronically. Students are encouraged to investigate measurement-related web sites to support their reading and project work. Additional readings and resources are available at the class website. A class website has been developed that contains class resources, as well as links to additional resources, publicly available software, and some class notes. The TA will support your use of the software and lab exercises during times outside of class.

***Diversity*:**

The College of Education and Human Development is committed to have every course contribute to our understanding of diversity, including but not limited to: age, creed, disability, ethnicity, gender, global perspectives, international background, language background, learning differences, marital status, multicultural perspectives, national origin, public assistance status, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, and veteran status. Each of these characteristics plays a role in educational and psychological measurement. They are factors that contribute to individual differences -- they (may) affect the constructs we set out to measure and the way we interpret and report test results. These issues will be addressed throughout the course and will be used as topics of debate and considerations in cases of responsible test use.

### Late Work and Incompletes

Late work will be accepted, but please notify me so I can keep track of your work – no points will be deducted for late work. It is up to you to stay on track. An incomplete (I) will be assigned only if agreed to prior to the last week of class. If at the end of the semester course work is incomplete and no prior notification has been given, the grade based on points obtained at that time will be awarded. No options will be given to submit incomplete work after grades have been submitted.

**Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences:**

Students will not be penalized for absence during the semester. This is a more flexible policy than that generally given based on University policy. For information on the U’s policy regarding absences, please see: http://policy.umn.edu/education/makeupwork

### Returning Papers, Exams, and Projects

Given the size of the class and the extensiveness of student projects, I will try to return work within one week of the due date. If necessary, you may pick up work prior to the following class period if agreed upon. If, at the end of the semester, you would like to receive remaining work through U.S. mail, submit a self-addressed stamped envelope. Otherwise, you may pick up final projects once grades are submitted in the Psychological Foundations’ office in 250 Education Sciences Building with a student ID. Papers will be available there until February 1. Uncollected papers will be destroyed just prior to fall semester the following year.

**Academic dishonesty**: academic dishonesty in any portion of the academic work for a course shall be grounds for awarding a grade of F or N for the entire course.

**University Grading Policy**

<https://policy.umn.edu/education/gradingtranscripts>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A | 4.000 - Represents achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements |
| B | 3.000 - Represents achievement that is significantly above the level necessary to meet course requirements |
| C | 2.000 - Represents achievement that meets the course requirements in every respect |
| D | 1.000 - Represents achievement that is worthy of credit even though it fails to meet fully the course requirements |
| S | Represents achievement that is satisfactory, which is equivalent to a C- or better. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Letter Grade** | **Percentage** |
| A | 95-100% |
| A- | 90-94.9% |
| B+ | 85-89.9% |
| B | 80-84.9% |
| B- | 75-79.9% |
| C+ | 70-74.9% |
| C | 65-69.9% |
| C- | 60-64.9% |

### How to Access Your Grades

Go to OneStop for Students (<http://onestop.umn.edu/onestop/>), click on Grades & Transcripts; on the right side under Quick Links, click on Grades/Unofficial transcript.

**Workload Expectation** (Policy: [Expected Student Academic Work per Credit](http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/STUDENTWORK.html))

The Senate affirms the standard (first adopted by the University Senate on February 16, 1922, and reaffirmed 1993) that one semester credit is to represent, for the average University of Minnesota undergraduate student, three hours of academic work per week (including lectures, laboratories, recitations, discussion groups, field work, study, and so on), or approximately 45 hours of work over the course of an enrollment period. Expectations of faculty and students will be made clear. It is expected that the academic work required of graduate and professional students will exceed three hours per credit per week or 45 hours per semester.

**Scholastic Dishonesty**

You are expected to do your own academic work and cite sources as necessary. Failing to do so is scholastic dishonesty. Scholastic dishonesty means plagiarizing; cheating on assignments or examinations; engaging in unauthorized collaboration on academic work; taking, acquiring, or using test materials without faculty permission; submitting false or incomplete records of academic achievement; acting alone or in cooperation with another to falsify records or to obtain dishonestly grades, honors, awards, or professional endorsement; altering, forging, or misusing a University academic record; or fabricating or falsifying data, research procedures, or data analysis.

Conduct Code: <http://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/Student_Conduct_Code.pdf>. If it is determined that a student has cheated, he or she may be given an "F" or an "N" for the course, and may face additional sanctions from the University. For additional information, please see: <http://policy.umn.edu/education/instructorresp>.

The Office for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity has compiled a useful list of Frequently Asked Questions pertaining to scholastic dishonesty: <http://www1.umn.edu/oscai/integrity/student/index.html>. If you have additional questions, please clarify with your instructor for the course. Your instructor can respond to your specific questions regarding what would constitute scholastic dishonesty in the context of a particular class-e.g., whether collaboration on assignments is permitted, requirements and methods for citing sources, if electronic aids are permitted or prohibited during an exam.

**University Policies**

See <http://onestop.umn.edu/onestop/faculty/Teaching/Policies.html> for a list of policies related to teaching with links to those policies.

Also see <http://policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/STUDENTRESP.html> for University policies related to Teaching and Learning – Student Responsibilities.

**Student Conduct Code**

The University seeks an environment that promotes academic achievement and integrity, that is protective of free inquiry, and that serves the educational mission of the University. Similarly, the University seeks a community that is free from violence, threats, and intimidation; that is respectful of the rights, opportunities, and welfare of students, faculty, staff, and guests of the University; and that does not threaten the physical or mental health or safety of members of the University community.

As a student at the University you are expected adhere to Board of Regents Policy: Student Conduct Code. To review the Student Conduct Code, please see: http://regents.umn.edu/sites/default/files/policies/Student\_Conduct\_Code.pdf.

Note that the conduct code specifically addresses disruptive classroom conduct, which means "engaging in behavior that substantially or repeatedly interrupts either the instructor's ability to teach or student learning. The classroom extends to any setting where a student is engaged in work toward academic credit or satisfaction of program-based requirements or related activities."

**Use of Personal Electronic Devices in the Classroom**

Using personal electronic devices in the classroom setting can hinder instruction and learning, not only for the student using the device but also for other students in the class. To this end, the University establishes the right of each faculty member to determine if and how personal electronic devices are allowed to be used in the classroom. <http://policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/STUDENTRESP.html>.

**Appropriate Student Use of Class Notes and Course Materials**

Taking notes is a means of recording information but more importantly of personally absorbing and integrating the educational experience. However, broadly disseminating class notes beyond the classroom community or accepting compensation for taking and distributing classroom notes undermines instructor interests in their intellectual work product while not substantially furthering instructor and student interests in effective learning. Such actions violate shared norms and standards of the academic community. <http://policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/STUDENTRESP.html>

**Sexual Harassment**

"Sexual harassment" means unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and/or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature. Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or academic environment in any University activity or program. Such behavior is not acceptable in the University setting. For additional information, please consult Board of Regents Policy: <http://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/SexHarassment.pdf>

**Equity, Diversity, Equal Opportunity, and Affirmative Action**

The University provides equal access to and opportunity in its programs and facilities, without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, gender, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. For more information, please consult Board of Regents Policy: <http://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/Equity_Diversity_EO_AA.pdf>

**Disability Accommodations**

The University of Minnesota is committed to providing equitable access to learning opportunities for all students. The Disability Resource Center is the campus office that collaborates with students who have disabilities to provide and/or arrange reasonable accommodations. If you have, or think you may have, a disability (e.g., mental health, attentional, learning, chronic health, sensory, or physical), please contact Disability Resource Center at 612-626-1333 to arrange a confidential discussion regarding equitable access and reasonable accommodations. If you are registered with Disability Resource Center and have a current letter requesting reasonable accommodations, please contact your instructor as early in the semester as possible to discuss how the accommodations will be applied in the course. <https://diversity.umn.edu/disability/>.

**Mental Health and Stress Management:**

As a student you may experience a range of issues that can cause barriers to learning, such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, alcohol/drug problems, feeling down, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. These mental health concerns or stressful events may lead to diminished academic performance and may reduce your ability to participate in daily activities. University of Minnesota services are available to assist you. You can learn more via the Student Mental Health Website: <http://www.mentalhealth.umn.edu>.

**Academic Freedom and Responsibility:**

Academic freedom is a cornerstone of the University. Within the scope and content of the course as defined by the instructor, it includes the freedom to discuss relevant matters in the classroom and conduct relevant research. Along with this freedom comes responsibility. Students are encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth. Students are free to take reasoned exception to the views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, but they are responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled.\* When conducting research, pertinent institutional approvals must be obtained and the research must be consistent with University policies.

Reports of concerns about academic freedom are taken seriously, and there are individuals and offices available for help. Contact the instructor, the Department Chair, your adviser, the associate dean of the college, or the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs in the Office of the Provost.

|  |
| --- |
| College of Education & Human Development Mission Statement The mission of the University of Minnesota College of Education and Human Development is to contribute to a just and sustainable future through engagement with the local and global communities to enhance human learning and development at all stages of the life span. Department of Educational Psychology Mission Statement Educational psychology involves the study of cognitive, emotional, and social learning processes that underlie education and human development across the lifespan. Research in educational psychology advances scientific knowledge of those processes and their application in diverse educational and community settings. The department provides training in the psychological foundations of education, research methods, and the practice and science of counseling psychology, school psychology, and special education. Faculty and students provide leadership and consultation to the state, the nation, and the international community in each area of educational psychology. The department’s scholarship and teaching enhance professional practice in schools and universities, community mental health agencies, business and industrial organizations, early childhood programs, and government agencies. Quantitative Methods in Education Mission Statement To prepare students to become cutting-edge professionals in educational measurement, evaluation, statistics, and statistics education, through excellence in teaching, research, and service; and through investigating and developing research methodology in education. |

**Six Intellectual Principles of Ph.D./Ed.D./Master’s Research Education**

1. *Scholarly Formation*
2. *Communication*
3. *Leadership and Collaborative Skills*
4. *Global Context*
5. *Professional Responsibility*
6. *Personal and Professional Management Skills*

***The College Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion:***

*We affirm the contributions of all people in our community. Diversity and equity are at the core of our mission in the College of Education and Human Development.*

*We explicitly reject bias, discrimination, and exclusion on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, gender, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.*

*We all are responsible for recognizing, confronting, and addressing bias and discrimination and diligently working for positive change in support of equity and diversity.*
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**NCME Statement on Hate in America**

August 22, 2017

Especially in the early years of the 20th century, testing in the United States was connected with attempts to unfairly and inaccurately characterize the worth of members of particular demographic groups, and to deprive them of access to education, employment, and the right to vote, among other things. That dishonorable history makes it all the more important that the National Council on Measurement in Education make clear its condemnation of hate, discrimination, and bias in our country in whatever forms they may occur. As NCME members, we work hard to help create methods and tools that policy makers, educators, and the public can use to identify how successfully our schools function for all student groups, and to identify and eliminate bias and unfairness in tests and test use. As educators, we deplore statements that endorse or excuse bigotry and reaffirm our commitment to fairness, inclusion, and respect for all.

The NCME Board of Directors

**National Council for Measurement in Education**

100 North 20th Street, Suite 400, Philadelphia, PA 19103

P:(215) 461-6263 / F: (215) 564-2175

E: [ncme@fernley.com](mailto:ncme@fernley.com)

[www.ncme.org](http://www.ncme.org)