

REPORT

Alignment Analysis of Reading Standards and Assessments

Illinois

Grades 3-8

Norman L. Webb

October 31, 2006

REPORT

Alignment Analysis of Reading Standards and Assessments

**Illinois
Grades 3-8**

Norman L. Webb

October 31, 2006

Acknowledgements

Reviewers

John Fortier	(Group Leader), Assistant Superintendent, WI DPI, Language Arts Teacher, Retired	WI
Cynthia Jacobson	Reading Teacher, Reading Consultant, Retired	WI
Ellen Last English	Language Arts State Consultant, WI DPI, Retired	WI
Gail Bohnenstiehl	Program Coordinator and ELA Teacher	Crete, IL
Anne Krosnjar	Curriculum Coordinator and ELA Teacher	Highland Park, IL

The State of Illinois and the Illinois State Board of Education funded this analysis. Rebecca McCabe, Division Administrator, and Judith Steinhauser, Principal Consultant for Reading of the Student Assessment Division were the main contact people for the Illinois State Board of Education and oversaw the coordination of the study.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Introduction.....	1
Alignment Criteria Used for This Analysis	2
Categorical Concurrence.....	3
Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency.....	3
Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence	5
Balance of Representation	6
Source of Challenge.....	6
Findings.....	6
Standards.....	6
Alignment of Curriculum Standards and Assessments.....	8
Reviewers' Comments	12
Reliability Among Reviewers.....	12
Summary	13
References.....	13
Appendix A	
Illinois Grades 3-8 Reading Standards and Group Consensus DOK Value	
Appendix B	
Data Analysis Tables Illinois Grades 3-8 Reading	
Appendix C	
Reviewers' Notes and Source of Challenge Comments Illinois Grades 3-8 Reading	
Appendix D	
Debrief Summary Notes Illinois Grades 3-8 Reading	

Executive Summary

This is a report of the results of a three-day Alignment Analysis Institute conducted September 27-29, 2006 in Springfield, Illinois. Five people, including language arts content experts, district language arts supervisors, and language arts teachers, met to analyze the agreement between the state's reading standards and assessments for grades 3-8.

This analysis indicates that the alignment needs some improvement except for grade 8. The alignment at grade 8 was considered reasonable. The Balance criterion was not satisfied for Goal 1 across all the grades, primarily due to the over-abundance of assessment items asking for simple inferences about a passage's meaning. For Grades 3-6 the Range of Knowledge Correspondence criterion was also not satisfied, meaning that too high of a proportion of benchmarks were not addressed by assessment items. The depth-of-knowledge levels were low compared to the complexity of the benchmarks for Goal 2 at Grade 4 and Grade 7. These alignment findings were supported and detailed by reviewer debriefing comments. These alignment weaknesses could be addressed by replacing from 3-8 items at each grade level. It is the conclusion of this analysis that the alignment between the Illinois reading standards and assessments needs some improvement.

Alignment Analysis of Reading Standards and Assessments

Illinois Grades 3-8

Norman L. Webb

Introduction

The alignment of expectations for student learning with assessments for measuring students' attainment of these expectations is an essential attribute for an effective standards-based education system. Alignment is defined as the degree to which expectations and assessments are in agreement and serve in conjunction with one another to guide an education system toward students learning what they are expected to know and do. As such, alignment is a quality of the relationship between expectations and assessments and not an attribute of any one of these two system components. Alignment describes the match between expectations and assessment that can be legitimately improved by changing either student expectations or the assessments. As a relationship between two or more system components, alignment is determined by using the multiple criteria described in detail in a National Institute of Science Education (NISE) research monograph, *Criteria for Alignment of Expectations and Assessments in Mathematics and Science Education* (Webb, 1997).

A three-day Alignment Analysis Institute was conducted September 27-29, 2006 in Springfield, Illinois. Five people, including language arts content experts, district language arts supervisors, and language arts teachers, met to analyze the agreement between the state's reading goals and assessments for Grades 3-8.

The State of Illinois uses the terminology of *state goals, learning standards, and benchmarks* for the mathematics content expectations. The state had two reading state goals (Reading and Literature). The reading state goal had three learning standards—vocabulary development, reading strategies, and reading comprehension. The literature state goal had two learning standards—literary elements and techniques and variety of literary works. Each learning goal had from 1 to 13 benchmarks (or sometimes referred to as objectives). For this analysis, data were coded using the benchmarks (objectives) and reported by the two state goals. The state goals, learning standards, and benchmarks are reproduced in Appendix A.

Reviewers were trained to identify the depth-of-knowledge of the benchmarks and assessment items. This training included reviewing the definitions of the four depth-of-knowledge (DOK) levels and then reviewing examples of each. Then for each grade, the reviewers participated in 1) a consensus process to determine the depth-of-knowledge levels of the benchmarks and 2) individual analyses of the assessment items.

To derive the results from the analysis, the reviewers' responses are averaged. Any variance among reviewers is considered legitimate, with the true depth-of-knowledge level for the item falling somewhere in between the two or more assigned values. Such variation could signify a lack of clarity in how the benchmarks were written, the robustness of an item that can legitimately correspond to more than one benchmark, and/or a depth of knowledge that falls in between two of the four defined levels. Reviewers were allowed to identify one assessment item as corresponding to up to three benchmarks—one primary hit (benchmark) and up to two secondary hits. However, reviewers could only code one depth-of-knowledge level to each assessment item even if the item corresponded to more than one benchmark. Finally, in addition to learning the process, reviewers were asked to provide suggestions for improving the process.

Reviewers were instructed to focus primarily on the alignment between the state standards and assessments. However, they were encouraged to offer their opinion on the quality of the state goals and standards, or of the assessment activities/items, by writing a note about the item. Reviewers could also indicate whether there was a source-of-challenge issue with the item—i.e., a problem with the item that might cause the student who knows the material to give a wrong answer, or enable someone who does not have the knowledge being tested to answer the item correctly.

The results produced from the institute pertain only to the issue of agreement between the Illinois state goals and the state assessment instruments. Note that this alignment analysis does not serve as external verification of the general quality of the state's goals and standards or assessments. Rather, only the degree of alignment is discussed in these results. For these results, the averages of the reviewers' coding were used to determine whether the alignment criteria were met.

This report describes the results of an alignment study of standards and grade-level operational tests in reading for grades 3-8 in Illinois. The study addressed specific criteria related to the content agreement between the state goals and grade-level assessments. Four criteria received major attention: categorical concurrence, depth-of-knowledge consistency, range-of-knowledge correspondence, and balance of representation.

Alignment Criteria Used for This Analysis

This analysis judged the alignment between the standards and the assessments on the basis of four criteria. Information is also reported on the quality of items by identifying items with Sources-of-Challenge and other issues. For each alignment criterion, an acceptable level was defined by what would be required to assure that a student had met the standards.

Categorical Concurrence

An important aspect of alignment between standards and assessments is whether both address the same content categories. The categorical-concurrence criterion provides a very general indication of alignment if both documents incorporate the same content. *The criterion of categorical concurrence between standards and assessment is met if the same or consistent categories of content appear in both documents.* This criterion was judged by determining whether the assessment included items measuring content from each standard. The analysis assumed that the assessment had to have at least six items for measuring content from a standard in order for an acceptable level of categorical concurrence to exist between the standard and the assessment. The number of items, six, is based on estimating the number of items that could produce a reasonably reliable subscale for estimating students' mastery of content on that subscale. Of course, many factors have to be considered in determining what a reasonable number is, including the reliability of the subscale, the mean score, and cutoff score for determining mastery. Using a procedure developed by Subkoviak (1988) and assuming that the cutoff score is the mean and that the reliability of one item is .1, it was estimated that six items would produce an agreement coefficient of at least .63. This indicates that about 63% of the group would be consistently classified as masters or nonmasters if two equivalent test administrations were employed. The agreement coefficient would increase if the cutoff score is increased to one standard deviation from the mean to .77 and, with a cutoff score of 1.5 standard deviations from the mean, to .88. Usually states do not report student results by standards or require students to achieve a specified cutoff score on subscales related to a standard. If a state did do this, then the state would seek a higher agreement coefficient than .63. Six items were assumed as a minimum for an assessment measuring content knowledge related to a standard, and as a basis for making some decisions about students' knowledge of that standard. If the mean for six items is 3 and one standard deviation is one item, then a cutoff score set at 4 would produce an agreement coefficient of .77. Any fewer items with a mean of one-half of the items would require a cutoff that would only allow a student to miss one item. This would be a very stringent requirement, considering a reasonable standard error of measurement on the subscale.

Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency

Standards and assessments can be aligned not only on the category of content covered by each, but also on the basis of the complexity of knowledge required by each. *Depth-of-knowledge consistency between standards and assessment indicates alignment 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.* For consistency to exist between the assessment and the standard, as judged in this analysis, at least 50% of the items corresponding to a standard had to be at or above the level of knowledge of the standard: 50%, a conservative cutoff point, is based on the assumption that a minimal passing score for any one standard of 50% or higher would require the student to successfully answer at least some items at or above the depth-of-knowledge level of the corresponding standard. For example, assume an assessment included six items related to one standard and students were required to answer correctly four of those items to be

judged proficient—i.e., 67% of the items. If three, 50%, of the six items were at or above the depth-of-knowledge level of the corresponding standards, then for a student to achieve a proficient score would require the student to answer correctly at least one item at or above the depth-of-knowledge level of one standard. Some leeway was used in this analysis on this criterion. If a standard had between 40% and 50% of items at or above the depth-of-knowledge levels of the standards, then it was reported that the criterion was “weakly” met.

Interpreting and assigning depth-of-knowledge levels to both objectives within standards and assessment items is an essential requirement of alignment analysis. These descriptions help to clarify what the different levels represent in reading

Reading Level 1. Level 1 requires students to receive or recite facts or to use simple skills or abilities. Oral reading that does not include analysis of the text, as well as basic comprehension of a text, is included. Items require only a shallow understanding of the text presented and often consist of verbatim recall from text, slight paraphrasing of specific details from the text, or simple understanding of a single word or phrase. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 1 performance are:

- Support ideas by reference to verbatim, or only slightly paraphrased, details from the text.
- Use a dictionary to find the meanings of words.
- Recognize figurative language in a reading passage.

Reading Level 2. Level 2 includes the engagement of some mental processing beyond recalling or reproducing a response; it requires both comprehension and subsequent processing of text or portions of text. Inter-sentence analysis of inference is required. Some important concepts are covered, but not in a complex way. Standards and items at this level may include words such as summarize, interpret, infer, classify, organize, collect, display, compare, and determine whether fact or opinion. Literal main ideas are stressed. A Level 2 assessment item may require students to apply skills and concepts that are covered in Level 1. However, items require closer understanding of text, possibly through the item’s paraphrasing of both the question and the answer. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 2 performance are:

- Use context cues to identify the meaning of unfamiliar words, phrases, and expressions that could otherwise have multiple meanings.
- Predict a logical outcome based on information in a reading selection.
- Identify and summarize the major events in a narrative.

Reading Level 3. Deep knowledge becomes a greater focus at Level 3. Students are encouraged to go beyond the text; however, they are still required to show understanding of the ideas in the text. Students may be encouraged to explain, generalize, or connect ideas. Standards and items at Level 3 involve reasoning and planning. Students must be able to support their thinking. Items may involve abstract theme identification, inference across an entire passage, or application of prior knowledge.

Items may also involve more superficial connections between texts. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 3 performance are:

- Explain or recognize how author's purpose affects the interpretation of a reading selection.
- Summarize information from multiple sources to address a specific topic.
- Analyze and describe the characteristics of various types of literature.

Reading Level 4. Higher-order thinking is central and knowledge is deep at Level 4. The standard or assessment item at this level will probably be an extended activity, with extended time provided for completing it. The extended time period is not a distinguishing factor if the required work is only repetitive and does not require the application of significant conceptual understanding and higher-order thinking. Students take information from at least one passage of a text and are asked to apply this information to a new task. They may also be asked to develop hypotheses and perform complex analyses of the connections among texts. Some examples that represent, but do not constitute all of, Level 4 performance are:

- Analyze and synthesize information from multiple sources.
- Examine and explain alternative perspectives across a variety of sources.
- Describe and illustrate how common themes are found across texts from different cultures.

Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence

For standards and assessments to be aligned, the breadth of knowledge required on both should be comparable. *The range-of-knowledge criterion is used to judge whether a comparable span of knowledge expected of students by a standard is the same as, or corresponds to, the span of knowledge that students need in order to correctly answer the assessment items/activities.* The criterion for correspondence between span of knowledge for a standard and an assessment considers the number of objectives within the standard with one related assessment item/activity. Fifty percent of the objectives for a standard had to have at least one related assessment item in order for the alignment on this criterion to be judged acceptable. This level is based on the assumption that students' knowledge should be tested on content from over half of the domain of knowledge for a standard. This assumes that each benchmark for a standard should be given equal weight. Depending on the balance in the distribution of items and the need to have a low number of items related to any one objective, the requirement that assessment items need to be related to more than 50% of the objectives for an standard increases the likelihood that students will have to demonstrate knowledge on more than one objective per standard to achieve a minimal passing score. As with the other criteria, a state may choose to make the acceptable level on this criterion more rigorous by requiring an assessment to include items related to a greater number of the objectives. However, any restriction on the number of items included on the test will place an upper limit on the number of objectives that can be assessed. Range-of-knowledge correspondence is more difficult to attain if the content expectations are partitioned among a greater number of standards and

a large number of objectives. If 50% or more of the objectives for a standard had a corresponding assessment item, then the Range-of-knowledge correspondence criterion was met. If between 40% and 50% of the objectives for a standard had a corresponding assessment item, the criterion was “weakly” met.

Balance of Representation

In addition to comparable depth and breadth of knowledge, aligned standards and assessments require that knowledge be distributed equally in both. The range-of-knowledge criterion only considers the number of objectives within a standard hit (an standard with a corresponding item); it does not take into consideration how the hits (or assessment items/activities) are distributed among these objectives. *The balance-of-representation criterion is used to indicate the degree to which one objective is given more emphasis on the assessment than another.* An index is used to judge the distribution of assessment items. This index only considers the objectives for a standard that have at least one hit—i.e., one related assessment item per objective. The index is computed by considering the difference in the proportion of objectives and the proportion of hits assigned to the objective. An index value of 1 signifies perfect balance and is obtained if the hits (corresponding items) related to a standard are equally distributed among the objectives for the given standard. Index values that approach 0 signify that a large proportion of the hits are on only one or two of all of the objectives hit. Depending on the number of objectives and the number of hits, a unimodal distribution (most items related to one objective and only one item related to each of the remaining objectives) has an index value of less than .5. A bimodal distribution has an index value of around .55 or .6. Index values of .7 or higher indicate that items/activities are distributed among all of the objectives at least to some degree (e.g., every objective has at least two items) and is used as the acceptable level on this criterion. Index values between .6 and .7 indicate the balance-of-representation criterion has only been “weakly” met.

Source-of-Challenge Criterion

The Source-of-Challenge criterion is only used to identify items on which the major cognitive demand is inadvertently placed and is other than the targeted reading objective, concept, or application. Cultural bias or specialized knowledge could be reasons for an item to have a Source-of-Challenge problem. Such item characteristics may result in some students not answering an assessment item, or answering an assessment item incorrectly, or at a lower level, even though they possess the understanding and skills being assessed.

Findings

State Goals

The consensus DOK value for each reading benchmark can be found in Appendix A. Table 1 shows the percentages of benchmarks at each DOK level. Around 10% of all the benchmarks were found to be at a Level 3, and there were no benchmarks at Level 4.

A very slight progression can be observed as the DOK values for the benchmarks increase across the grades.

Table 1

Percent of Benchmarks by Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Levels for Grades 3-8 Illinois Alignment Analysis for Reading

Grade	Total number of benchmarks	DOK Level	# of benchmarks by Level	% within std by Level
3	38	1	6	15
		2	26	68
		3	6	15
4	40	1	4	10
		2	28	70
		3	8	20
5	42	1	3	7
		2	30	71
		3	9	21
6	39	1	3	7
		2	24	61
		3	12	30
7	39	1	1	2
		2	23	60
		3	14	36
8	38	1	1	2
		2	23	60
		3	14	36

Table 2

Items Coded to Generic Benchmarks by More Than One Reviewer, Illinois Alignment Analysis for Reading, Grades 3-8

Grade	Assessment Item	Generic Benchmark (Number of Reviewers)
3	22	2A (4)
4	12	1B,1C (5)
5	24	1A (5)
5	25	1B,1C (5)
5	16	1C (5)
5	14	2A (4)
6	4	1B,1C (5)
6	16	1B,1C (3)
6	19	1B,1C (5)
7	3	1B,1C (5)
8	1	1B,1C (4)
8	15	1B,1C (3)

If no particular benchmark is targeted by a given assessment item, reviewers are instructed to code the item at the level of a standard or a goal. This coding to a generic benchmark sometimes indicates that the item is inappropriate for the grade level. However, if the item is grade-appropriate, then this situation may instead indicate that there is a piece of content not expressly or precisely described in the benchmarks. These items may highlight areas in the benchmarks that should be changed or made more precise. Table 2 displays the assessment items coded to generic benchmarks by more than one reviewer. Four or five of the reviewers assigned the greatest number of items, four items, to generic benchmarks at grade 5. These items should be reviewed to determine if there is some omission in the benchmarks. The reviewers' comments indicate that the item is not explicitly addressed in any of the benchmarks.

Reviewer debriefing comments also highlight some ambiguities in the benchmarks. These comments can be found in Appendix D.

Alignment of Curriculum Standards and Assessments

The results of the analysis for each of the four alignment criteria are summarized in Tables 4.1-4.6. More detailed data on each of the criteria are given in Appendix B in the first three tables. With each table is a description of the satisfaction of the alignment criteria for the given grade. The reviewer debriefing comments provide more detail about the individual reviewers' impressions of the alignment.

Table 3 displays the number of items and points for each assessment form. In the analysis that follows, multiple-point items are weighted extra for alignment purposes. For example, a 4-point item is counted towards the alignment as 4 identically coded 1-point items.

Table 3

Number of items and point value by grade for Illinois Assessments, Grades 3-8

Grade Level	Number of Items	Number of Four Point Items	Total Point Value
3	51	1	54
4	51	1	54
5	51	1	54
6	51	1	54
7	51	1	54
8	51	1	54

In Table 4, "YES" indicates that an acceptable level was attained between the assessment and the standard on the criterion. "WEAK" indicates that the criterion was nearly met, within a margin that could simply be due to error in the system. "NO" indicates that the criterion was not met by a noticeable margin—10% over an acceptable level for Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency, 10% over an acceptable level for Range-of-

Knowledge Correspondence, and .1 under an index value of .7 for Balance of Representation.

Grade 3

The alignment criteria for Grade 3 Goal 2 (Literature) are fully satisfied (Table 4.1). However, Goal 1 has alignment weaknesses with respect to Range and Balance. The Balance weakness is caused by too many items targeting benchmark 1.3.20, and the Range weakness is caused by very few items addressing the benchmarks within the Vocabulary and Reading Strategies standards. These alignment findings are supported by the reviewers' debriefing comments (Appendix D). The alignment issues could be addressed by changing at least 3 of the items currently targeting benchmark 1.3.20 to target any of the untargeted benchmarks within Goal 1 (see Appendix B, Table 3.10).

Table 4.1

Summary of Acceptable Levels on Alignment Criteria for Reading Grade 3 Standards and Assessments for Illinois Alignment Analysis

<i>Grade 3</i>	<i>Alignment Criteria</i>			
<i>Standards</i>	<i>Categorical Concurrence</i>	<i>Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency</i>	<i>Range of Knowledge</i>	<i>Balance of Representation</i>
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	WEAK	WEAK
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	YES	YES	YES

Grade 4

Many of the alignment criteria for Grade 4 are not satisfied (Table 4.2). The Range is not met for either goal, the DOK Consistency is weak for Goal 2, and the Balance criterion is not met for Goal 1. The Balance weakness is caused by too many items targeting benchmark 1.4.17. The Range weakness is caused by essentially no items addressing benchmarks 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, and 24 within Goal 1, and benchmarks 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 14 within Goal 2. Most of the targeted benchmarks within Goal 2 have DOK Level 3, while most of the items are at a DOK of 2. These alignment findings are supported by the reviewers' debriefing comments (Appendix D). The issues could be addressed by changing at least 8 of the items currently targeting benchmark 1.4.17 so that the new items target five of the untargeted benchmarks within Goal 1 and three of the untargeted benchmarks within Goal 2. Doing this will also likely solve the DOK issue for Goal 2, especially if the items target the benchmarks that reviewers assigned a DOK Level 2 (benchmarks 1, 2, 4, 12, 14).

Table 4.2

Summary of Acceptable Levels on Alignment Criteria for Reading Grade 4 Standards and Assessments for Illinois Alignment Analysis

Grade 4	Alignment Criteria			
Standards	<i>Categorical Concurrence</i>	<i>Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency</i>	<i>Range of Knowledge</i>	<i>Balance of Representation</i>
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	NO	NO
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	WEAK	NO	YES

Grade 5

Several of the alignment criteria for Grade 5 are not satisfied (Table 4.3). The Range is weak for both goals and the Balance criterion is not met for Goal 1. The Balance weakness is caused by too many items targeting benchmark 1.5.16. The Range weakness is caused by essentially no items addressing benchmarks 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, and 28 within Goal 1, and benchmarks 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 13 within Goal 2. These alignment findings are supported by the reviewers' debriefing comments (Appendix D). The alignment issues could be addressed by changing at least 6 of the items currently targeting benchmark 1.5.16 so that they target four of the untargeted benchmarks within Goal 1 and two of the untargeted benchmarks within Goal 2.

Table 4.3

Summary of Acceptable Levels on Alignment Criteria for Reading Grade 5 Standards and Assessments for Illinois Alignment Analysis

Grade 5	Alignment Criteria			
Standards	<i>Categorical Concurrence</i>	<i>Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency</i>	<i>Range of Knowledge</i>	<i>Balance of Representation</i>
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	WEAK	NO
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	YES	WEAK	YES

Grade 6

Several of the alignment criteria for Grade 6 are not satisfied (Table 4.4). The Range is weak for both goals and the Balance criterion is not met for Goal 1. The Balance weakness is caused by too many items targeting benchmark 1.6.14. The Range weakness is caused by essentially no items addressing benchmarks 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, and 24 within Goal 1, and benchmarks 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 11, 12, and 13 within Goal 2. These alignment findings, supported by the reviewers' debriefing comments (Appendix D), could be addressed by changing 4 of the items currently targeting benchmark 1.6.14. The new items should target two of benchmarks without any items within each of the two goals.

Table 4.4

Summary of Acceptable Levels on Alignment Criteria for Reading Grade 6 Standards and Assessments for Illinois Alignment Analysis

Grade 6	Alignment Criteria			
Standards	<i>Categorical Concurrence</i>	<i>Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency</i>	<i>Range of Knowledge</i>	<i>Balance of Representation</i>
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	WEAK	NO
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	YES	WEAK	YES

Grade 7

Two of the alignment criteria for Grade 7 are not satisfied (Table 4.5). The Balance criterion is weak for Goal 1 and the DOK values are low for Goal 2. The Balance weakness is caused by too many items targeting benchmark 1.7.15 and 1.7.20. Part of the issue with 1.7.20 is that item 47 is worth multiple points. However, several items targeting 1.7.15 should be changed; preferably to target some of the untargeted benchmarks in Goal 1 (see Appendix B Table 7.10). These alignment findings are supported by the reviewers' debriefing comments (Appendix D). The DOK weakness for Goal 2 is caused by too many items at a Level 2 addressing benchmarks predominately at a Level 3. At least two items should be changed to include more inference and analysis.

Table 4.5

Summary of Acceptable Levels on Alignment Criteria for Reading Grade 7 Standards and Assessments for Illinois Alignment Analysis

Grade 7	Alignment Criteria			
Standards	<i>Categorical Concurrence</i>	<i>Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency</i>	<i>Range of Knowledge</i>	<i>Balance of Representation</i>
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	YES	WEAK
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	WEAK	YES	YES

Grade 8

The alignment at grade 8 is considered reasonable. All of the alignment criteria for Grade 8 are satisfied except a minor Balance weakness for Goal 1 (Table 4.6). When all of the other alignment criteria have acceptable levels, the balance is not as critical and more of an option for the state. The balance issue could be corrected by changing a couple of the items targeting benchmark 1.8.14 so that they instead address untargeted benchmarks within the goal (see Appendix B Table 8.10).

Table 4.6

Summary of Acceptable Levels on Alignment Criteria for Reading Grade 8 Standards and Assessments for Illinois Alignment Analysis

Grade 8	Alignment Criteria			
Standards	<i>Categorical Concurrence</i>	<i>Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency</i>	<i>Range of Knowledge</i>	<i>Balance of Representation</i>
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	YES	WEAK
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	YES	YES	YES

Reviewers' Comments

Reviewers were instructed to document any Source-of-Challenge issue and to provide any other comments they may have. These comments can be found in Tables (grade).5 and (grade).7 in Appendix C. No items were mentioned for Source-of-Challenge issues by more than one reviewer. After coding each grade-level assessment, reviewers also were asked to respond to five debriefing questions. All of the comments made by the reviewers are given in Appendix D. The notes in general offer an opinion on the item or give an explanation of the reviewers' coding.

Reliability Among Reviewers

The overall intraclass correlation among the Reading reviewers' assignment of DOK levels to items was high (Table 5). An intraclass correlation value greater than 0.8 generally indicates a high level of agreement among the reviewers. A pairwise comparison is used to determine the degree of reliability of reviewer coding at the benchmark level and at the standard level. The standard pairwise comparison values are high, while the benchmark values are moderate and comparable to those for most of the alignment studies.

Table 5

Intraclass and Pairwise Comparisons, Illinois Alignment Analysis for Reading Grades 3–8 Assessments

Grade	Intraclass Correlation	Pairwise Comparison:	Pairwise: Benchmark	Pairwise: Standard
3	.88	.70	.66	.89
4	.81	.70	.62	.88
5	.88	.75	.67	.91
6	.84	.72	.67	.89
7	.88	.74	.64	.84
8	.84	.65	.60	.88

Summary

This is a report of the results of a three-day Alignment Analysis Institute conducted September 27-29, 2006 in Springfield, Illinois. Five people, including language arts content experts, district language arts supervisors, and language arts teachers, met to analyze the agreement between the state's reading standards and assessments for grades 3-8.

This analysis indicates that the alignment needs some improvement except for grade 8 where the alignment was judged to be reasonable. The Balance criterion is not satisfied for Goal 1 across all the grades, primarily due to the over-abundance of assessment items asking for simple inferences about a passage's meaning. For Grades 3-6 the Range of Representation criterion is also not satisfied, meaning that many benchmarks are not addressed by assessment items. The DOK Levels are low for Goal 2 at Grade 4 and Grade 7. These alignment findings are supported and detailed by reviewer debriefing comments. These alignment weaknesses could be addressed by replacing from 3-8 items at each grade level. It is the conclusion of this analysis that the alignment between the Illinois reading standards and assessments needs some improvement.

References

- Subkoviak, M. J. (1988). A practitioner's guide to computation and interpretation of reliability indices for mastery tests. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 25(1), 47-55.
- Webb, N. L. (1997). *Criteria for alignment of expectations and assessments in mathematics and science education*. Council of Chief State School Officers and National Institute for Science Education Research Monograph No. 6. Madison: University of Illinois, Illinois Center for Education Research.

Appendix A

Illinois Grades 3-8 Reading Standards and Group Consensus DOK Values

Table 3.14
Group Consensus
IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 3, Language Arts, Grade 3

Level	Description	DOK
Goal 1	Reading	2
1A	Vocabulary Development	1
1.3.01	Determine the meaning of an unknown word using knowledge of common prefixes, suffixes, and word roots (see Roots and Affixes List) (e.g., use knowledge of the prefix dis- to determine the meaning of disrespect).	2
1.3.02	Identify the word base of familiar words with affixes from Roots and Affixes list (e.g., misspelled, unfinished).	1
1.3.03	Identify words that begin with the same sound (including consonant digraphs, different letters having the same sound, and silent letters-e.g., knight and new).	1
1.3.04	Identify words having the same vowel sound (e.g., date and slave).	1
1.3.05	Identify rhyming words with different spelling patterns (e.g., feet and neat, light and kite).	1
1.3.06	Determine the meaning of unknown compound words by applying knowledge of individual known words (e.g., baseball).	2
1.3.07	Determine the meaning of unknown words using within-sentence clues.	2
1.3.08	Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.	2
1.3.09	Use synonyms to define words.	1
1.3.10	Use antonyms to define words.	1
1.3.11	Determine the word that best fits a given context.	2
1B, 1C	READING STRATEGIES	2
1.3.12	Activate prior knowledge to establish purpose for reading a given passage.	2
1.3.13	Identify probable outcomes or actions.	2
1.3.14	Use information in illustrations to help understand a reading passage.	2
1.3.15	Determine which illustrations support the meaning of a passage.	2
1.3.16	Determine which charts and graphs support the meaning of a passage.	2
1.3.17	Identify explicit and implicit main ideas.	2
1.3.18	Locate information using simple graphic organizers such as Venn diagrams.	2
1.3.19	Make comparisons across reading passages (e.g., topics, story elements).	3
1C	READING COMPREHENSION	2
1.3.20	Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage.	2
1.3.21	Distinguish the main ideas and supporting details in informational text.	2
1.3.22	Identify the main idea of a selection when it is not explicitly stated (e.g., by choosing the best alternative title from among several suggested for a given passage).	2
1.3.23	Identify or summarize the order of events in a story.	2
1.3.24	Draw inferences, conclusions, or generalizations about text, and support them with textual evidence and prior knowledge.	3
1.3.25	Differentiate between fact and opinion.	2
1.3.26	Draw conclusions from information in maps, charts, and graphs.	2
1.3.27	Determine whether a set of simple instructions or procedures is complete and, therefore, clear (e.g., if incomplete, identify what is missing)	2
1.3.28	Identify the author's purpose for writing a fiction or nonfiction text, (e.g., to entertain or	2

Table 3.14

*Group Consensus**IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 3, Language Arts, Grade 3*

Level	Description	DOK
	to inform).	
Goal 2	Literature	2
2A	LITERARY ELEMENTS AND TECHNIQUES	2
2.3.01	Differentiate among the literary elements of plot, character, and setting.	2
2.3.02	Identify main and supporting characters.	2
2.3.03	Identify events important to the development of the plot.	2
2.3.04	Identify setting (i.e., place and time period).	2
2.3.05	Identify author's message.	3
2.3.06	Explain outcomes using the following literary elements: problem/conflict, resolution.	3
2.3.07	Determine what characters are like by what they say or do by how the author or illustrator portrays them.	3
2.3.08	Determine character motivation.	3
2.3.09	Identify and compare characters' attributes in a story.	2
2B	Variety of Literary Works	2
2.3.10	Identify the following forms and genres: story, poem, fairy tale, tall tale, fable, nonfiction, and essay	2

Table 4.14

*Group Consensus**IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 4, Language Arts, Grade 4*

Level	Description	DOK
Goal 1	Reading	2
1A	Vocabulary Development	2
1.4.01	Determine the meaning of an unknown word using knowledge of common prefixes, suffixes, and word roots (see Roots and Affixes list) (e.g., using knowledge of the suffix -ish to determine the meaning of foolish).	2
1.4.02	Identify the word base of familiar words with affixes from Roots and Affixes list (e.g., precooked, realistic).	1
1.4.03	Determine the meaning of unknown compound words by applying knowledge of known individual words (e.g., watchman).	2
1.4.04	Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.	2
1.4.05	Use synonyms to define words	1
1.4.06	Use antonyms to define words.	1
1.4.07	Determine the word that best fits a given context.	2
1.4.08	Determine the correct use of homonyms using context clues.	2
1B, 1C	READING STRATEGIES	2
1.4.09	Activate prior knowledge to establish purpose for reading a given passage.	2
1.4.10	Identify probable outcomes or actions.	2
1.4.11	Use information in charts, graphs, and diagrams to help understand a reading passage.	2
1.4.12	Determine the purpose of features of informational text (e.g., bold print, key words, graphics).	2
1.4.13	Distinguish between minor and significant details in a passage.	2
1.4.14	Identify explicit and implicit main ideas.	2
1.4.15	Demonstrate understanding by using graphic organizers (e.g., Venn Diagrams and semantic webs) to represent passage content.	2
1.4.16	Make comparisons across reading passages (e.g., topics, story elements).	3
1C	READING COMPREHENSION	2
1.4.17	Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage.	2
1.4.18	Distinguish the main ideas and supporting details in informational text.	2
1.4.19	Identify the main idea of a selection when it is not explicitly stated (e.g., by choosing the best alternative title from among several suggested for a given passage).	2
1.4.20	Summarize a story passage or text, or identify the best summary.	2
1.4.21	Identify or summarize the order of events in a story.	2
1.4.22	Draw inferences, conclusions, or generalizations about text, and support them with textual evidence and prior knowledge.	3
1.4.23	Differentiate between fact and opinion.	2
1.4.24	Draw conclusions from information in maps, charts, graphs, and diagrams.	2
1.4.25	Determine whether a set of complex instructions or procedures is complete and, therefore, clear (e.g., if incomplete, identify what is missing).	2
1.4.26	Identify the author's purpose for writing a fiction or nonfiction text (e.g., to entertain, to inform, to persuade).	2
Goal 2	Literature	2

Table 4.14

*Group Consensus**IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 4, Language Arts, Grade 4*

Level	Description	DOK
2A	LITERARY ELEMENTS AND TECHNIQUES	3
2.4.01	Differentiate among the literary elements of plot, character, setting, and theme.	2
2.4.02	Distinguish between main and supporting characters.	2
2.4.03	Identify events important to the development of the plot and subplot.	2
2.4.04	Identify setting, including how setting affects the plot.	2
2.4.05	Identify author's message.	3
2.4.06	Compare stories to personal experience, prior knowledge, or other stories.	3
2.4.07	Explain outcomes using the following literary elements: rising action, climax.	3
2.4.08	Determine what characters are like by what they say or do by how the author or illustrator portrays them.	3
2.4.09	Determine character motivation.	3
2.4.10	Determine the causes of characters' actions (other than motivation).	3
2.4.11	Identify and interpret figurative language (e.g., metaphor, simile, idiom).	2
2.4.12	Identify examples of poetic devices using sound, (e.g., alliteration, onomatopoeia, rhyme scheme, consonance)	1
2B	Variety of Literary Works	2
2.4.13	Identify the following forms and genres: myth or legend, story, folk tale, nonfiction, poem.	2
2.4.14	Identify whether a given nonfiction passage is narrative, persuasive, or expository.	2

Table 5.14
Group Consensus
IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 5, Language Arts, Grade 5

Level	Description	DOK
Goal 1	Reading	2
1A	Vocabulary Development	2
1.5.01	Determine the meaning of an unknown word using knowledge of prefixes, suffixes, and word roots (see Roots and Affixes list) (e.g., using knowledge of the suffix -ian to determine the meaning of guardian).	2
1.5.02	Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.	2
1.5.03	Use synonyms to define words.	1
1.5.04	Use antonyms to define words.	1
1.5.05	Determine the meaning of a word in context when the word has multiple meanings.	2
1.5.06	Determine the correct use of homonyms, idioms, and analogies using context clues.	2
IB, IC	Reading Strategies	2
1.5.07	Establish and adjust purposes for reading.	2
1.5.08	Identify probable outcomes or actions.	2
1.5.09	Use information in tables, maps, and charts to help understand a reading passage.	2
1.5.10	Determine the purpose of features of informational text (e.g., bold print, organization of content, key words, graphics).	2
1.5.11	Distinguish between minor and significant details in a passage.	2
1.5.12	Identify explicit and implicit main ideas.	2
1.5.13	Demonstrate understanding by using sophisticated graphic organizers (e.g., cause-effect organizers, semantic webs) to represent passage content.	3
1.5.14	Make comparisons across reading passages (e.g., topics, story elements, themes).	3
1.5.15	Identify cause and effect organizational patterns in fiction.	2
1C	READING COMPREHENSION	2
1.5.16	Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage.	2
1.5.17	Distinguish the main ideas and supporting details in any text.	2
1.5.18	Identify the main idea of a selection when it is not explicitly stated (e.g., by choosing the best alternative title from among several suggested for a given passage).	2
1.5.19	Summarize a story or nonfiction passage, or identify the best summary.	2
1.5.20	Identify or summarize the order of events in a story or nonfiction account.	2
1.5.21	Identify the causes of events in a story or nonfiction account.	2
1.5.22	Draw inferences, conclusions, or generalizations about text and support them with textual evidence and prior knowledge.	3
1.5.23	Differentiate between fact and opinion.	2
1.5.24	Draw conclusions from information in maps, charts, graphs, and diagrams.	2
1.5.25	Interpret an image based on information provided in a passage.	2
1.5.26	Determine whether a set of complex instructions or procedures is complete and, therefore, clear (e.g., if incomplete, identify what is missing).	2
1.5.27	Determine the author's purpose for writing a fiction or nonfiction text (e.g., to entertain, to inform, to persuade).	2
1.5.28	Determine how authors and illustrators express their ideas.	3
Goal 2	Literature	2

Table 5.14

*Group Consensus**IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 5, Language Arts, Grade 5*

Level	Description	DOK
2A	LITERARY ELEMENTS AND TECHNIQUES	2
2.5.01	Differentiate among the literary elements of plot, character, setting, and theme.	2
2.5.02	Identify events important to the development of the plot and subplot.	2
2.5.03	Identify setting, including how setting affects the plot.	2
2.5.04	Identify the author's message or theme.	3
2.5.05	Compare stories to personal experience, prior knowledge, or other stories.	3
2.5.06	Interpret literary passages using the following elements of literary structure: rising action, and falling action/resolution.	3
2.5.07	Recognize points of view in narratives (e.g., first person).	2
2.5.08	Determine what characters are like by what they say or do by how the author or illustrator portrays them.	3
2.5.09	Determine character motivation.	3
2.5.10	Determine the causes of characters' actions (other than motivation).	3
2.5.11	Explain the relationship between main and supporting characters.	2
2.5.12	Identify and interpret figurative language (e.g., metaphor, alliteration, personification).	2
2.5.13	Identify examples of poetic devices using sound, such as alliteration, onomatopoeia, rhyme scheme, unrhymed verse.	1
2B	Variety of Literary works	2
2.5.14	Identify the following subcategories of genres: science fiction, historical fiction, myth or legend, drama, biography/autobiography, story, poem, fairy tale, folktale, fable, nonfiction, and essay.	2
2.5.15	Identify whether a given passage is narrative, persuasive, or expository.	2

Table 6.14
Group Consensus
IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 6, Language Arts, Grade 6

Level	Description	DOK
Goal 1	Reading	2
1A	Vocabulary Development	2
1.6.01	Determine the meaning of an unknown word or content-area vocabulary using knowledge of prefixes, suffixes, and word roots (see Roots and Affixes list).	2
1.6.02	Given words that are spelled alike, identify them as homonyms.	1
1.6.03	Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.	2
1.6.04	Determine the connotation of a word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.	2
1.6.05	Use synonyms and antonyms to define words.	1
1.6.06	Determine the meaning of a word in context when the word has multiple meanings.	2
IB, IC	Reading Strategies	2
1.6.07	Make and verify predictions based on prior knowledge and text.	2
1.6.08	Identify probable outcomes or actions.	2
1.6.09	Identify the structure and format of text, including graphics and headers (e.g., persuasive, informational).	1
1.6.10	Use information in charts, graphs, diagrams, maps, and tables to help understand a reading passage.	2
1.6.11	Locate and interpret information found in headings, graphs, and charts.	2
1.6.12	Identify explicit and implicit main ideas.	2
1.6.13	Identify cause and effect organizational patterns in fiction and nonfiction.	2
1C	READING COMPREHENSION	2
1.6.14	Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage.	2
1.6.15	Distinguish the main ideas and supporting details in any text.	2
1.6.16	Summarize a story or nonfiction passage, or identify the best summary.	2
1.6.17	Identify or summarize the order of events in a story or nonfiction account.	2
1.6.18	Identify the causes of events in a story or nonfiction account.	2
1.6.19	Draw inferences, conclusions, or generalizations about text and support them with textual evidence and prior knowledge.	3
1.6.20	Distinguish between fact and opinion.	2
1.6.21	Interpret an image based on information provided in a passage.	2
1.6.22	Determine whether a set of complex, multiple-step instructions or procedures are clear (e.g., if not clear, edit to clarify).	2
1.6.23	Explain how the author's choice of words appeals to the senses, creates imagery, suggests mood, and sets tone.	3
1.6.24	Determine how illustrators use art to express their ideas.	3
Goal 2	Literature	3
2A	LITERARY ELEMENTS AND TECHNIQUES	3
2.6.01	Identify elements of fiction: plot, character, setting, theme, character foils.	2
2.6.02	Explain how plot, setting, character, and theme contribute to the meaning of a literary selection.	3
2.6.03	Interpret literary passages using the following element of literary structure: exposition.	3
2.6.04	Identify the author's message or theme.	3

Table 6.14

*Group Consensus**IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 6, Language Arts, Grade 6*

Level	Description	DOK
2.6.05	Compare stories to personal experience, prior knowledge, or other stories.	3
2.6.06	Recognize points of view in narratives (e.g., first person).	2
2.6.07	Determine what characters are like by what they say or do by how the author or illustrator portrays them.	3
2.6.08	Determine character motivation.	3
2.6.09	Compare or contrast the behavior of two characters.	3
2.6.10	Explain the relationship between main and supporting characters.	2
2.6.11	Identify and interpret figurative language or literary devices: (e.g., sensory detail, simile, rhyme, repetition, metaphors, alliteration, personification).	2
2.6.12	Explain how the literary devices (e.g., sensory detail, simile, rhyme, repetition, onomatopoeia, personification) contribute to the meaning of a literary selection.	3
2.6.13	Identify verbal irony.	3
2B	Variety of Literary Works	2
2.6.14	Identify the following subcategories of genres: science fiction, historical fiction, myth or legend, drama, biography/autobiography, story, poem, fairy tale, folktale, fable, nonfiction, and essay.	2
2.6.15	Identify whether a given passage is narrative, persuasive, or expository.	2

Table 7.14
Group Consensus
IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 7, Language Arts, Grade 7

Level	Description	DOK
Goal 1	Reading	2
1A	Vocabulary Development	2
1.7.01	Determine the meaning of an unknown word or content-area vocabulary using knowledge of prefixes, suffixes, and word roots (see Roots and Affixes list).	2
1.7.02	Use etymologies to determine the meanings of words.	2
1.7.03	Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.	2
1.7.04	Determine the connotation of a word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.	2
1.7.05	Use synonyms and antonyms to determine the implied meanings of words.	2
1.7.06	Determine the meaning of a word in context when the word has multiple meanings.	2
IB, IC	Reading Strategies	2
1.7.07	Make and verify predictions based on prior knowledge and text.	2
1.7.08	Identify the structure and format of text, including graphics and headers (e.g., persuasive, informational, narrative).	1
1.7.09	Use information in charts, graphs, diagrams, maps, and tables to help understand a reading passage.	2
1.7.10	Locate and interpret information found in headings, graphs, and charts.	2
1.7.11	Compare the content and organization (e.g., themes, topics, text structure, story elements) of various selections.	3
1.7.12	Relate information in the passage to other readings on the same topic.	3
1.7.13	Identify cause and effect organizational patterns in fiction and nonfiction.	2
1.7.14	Identify compare and contrast organizational patterns in fiction and nonfiction.	2
1C	READING COMPREHENSION	2
1.7.15	Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage.	3
1.7.16	Distinguish the main ideas and supporting details in any text.	2
1.7.17	Summarize a story or nonfiction passage, or identify the best summary.	2
1.7.18	Identify or summarize the order of events in a story or nonfiction account.	2
1.7.19	Identify the causes of events in a story or nonfiction account.	2
1.7.20	Draw inferences, conclusions, or generalizations about text, and support them with textual evidence and prior knowledge.	3
1.7.21	Differentiate between fact and opinion in a persuasive essay or excerpt.	2
1.7.22	Determine whether a set of technical, multiple-step instructions or procedures are clear (e.g., if not clear, edit to clarify).	2
1.7.23	Explain how the author's choice of words appeals to the senses, creates imagery, suggests mood, and sets tone.	3
1.7.24	Determine how illustrators use art to express their ideas.	3
Goal 2	Literature	3
2A	LITERARY ELEMENTS AND TECHNIQUES	3
2.7.01	Identify elements of fiction: character, theme, conflict, point of view, plot, setting, and flashback.	2
2.7.02	Explain how character, theme, conflict, and point of view contribute to the meaning of a literary selection.	3

Table 7.14

*Group Consensus**IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 7, Language Arts, Grade 7*

Level	Description	DOK
2.7.03	Identify the author's message or theme.	3
2.7.04	Compare stories to personal experience, prior knowledge, or other stories.	3
2.7.05	Recognize points of view in narratives (e.g., first person).	2
2.7.06	Determine what characters are like by what they say or do or by how the author or illustrator portrays them.	3
2.7.07	Determine character motivation.	3
2.7.08	Compare or contrast the behavior of two characters.	3
2.7.09	Explain the relationship between main and supporting characters.	2
2.7.10	Identify literary devices: (e.g., alliteration, imagery, sensory detail, simile, rhyme, repetition, subtle metaphors, alliteration, personification).	2
2.7.11	Explain how the literary devices (e.g., alliteration, imagery, metaphor) contribute to the meaning of a literary selection.	3
2.7.12	Identify varieties of irony, including situational irony.	3
2B	Variety of Literary Works	2
2.7.13	Identify various subcategories of genres: science fiction, historical fiction, myth or legend, drama, biography/autobiography, story, poem, fairy tale, folktale, fable, nonfiction, and essay.	2
2.7.14	Identify whether a given passage is narrative, persuasive, or expository.	2

Table 8.14
Group Consensus
IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 8, Language Arts, Grade 8

Level	Description	DOK
Goal 1	Reading	2
1A	Vocabulary Development	2
1.8.01	Determine the meaning of an unknown word or content-area vocabulary using knowledge of prefixes, suffixes, and word roots (see Roots and Affixes list).	2
1.8.02	Use etymologies to determine the meanings of words.	2
1.8.03	Determine the meaning of an unknown word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.	2
1.8.04	Determine the connotation of a word using word, sentence, and cross-sentence clues.	2
1.8.05	Determine the meaning of a word in context when the word has multiple meanings.	2
IB, IC	Reading Strategies	2
1.8.06	Make and verify predictions based on prior knowledge and understanding of genres.	2
1.8.07	Clarify an understanding of text by creating outlines, notes, or other visual representations.	2
1.8.08	Use information in charts, graphs, diagrams, maps, and tables to help understand a reading passage.	2
1.8.09	Compare the content and organization (e.g., themes, topics, text structure, story elements) of various selections.	3
1.8.10	Relate information in the passage to other readings.	3
1.8.11	Identify cause and effect organizational patterns in fiction and nonfiction.	2
1.8.12	Identify compare and contrast organizational patterns in fiction and nonfiction.	2
1.8.13	Identify proposition and support organizational patterns in fiction and nonfiction.	2
1C	READING COMPREHENSION	2
1.8.14	Determine the answer to a literal or simple inference question regarding the meaning of a passage.	2
1.8.15	Compare an original text to a summary to determine whether the summary accurately captures the key ideas.	2
1.8.16	Summarize a story or nonfiction passage, or identify the best summary.	2
1.8.17	Identify the outcome or conclusion of a story or nonfiction account, based on previous occurrences or events.	2
1.8.18	Identify the causes of events in a story or nonfiction account.	2
1.8.19	Draw inferences, conclusions, or generalizations about text and support them with textual evidence and prior knowledge.	3
1.8.20	Differentiate between conclusions that are based on fact and those that are based on opinion.	2
1.8.21	Explain information presented in a nonfiction passage using evidence from the passage.	3
1.8.22	Use information from a variety of sources to explain a situation or decision or to solve a problem.	3
1.8.23	Determine whether a set of technical, multiple-step instructions or procedures are clear (e.g., if not clear, edit to clarify).	2
1.8.24	Determine the author's purpose as represented by the choice of genre, and literary devices employed.	3
1.8.25	Determine why some points are illustrated.	2
Goal 2	Literature	3

Table 8.14

*Group Consensus**IL Reading Assmt Framework Grade 8, Language Arts, Grade 8*

Level	Description	DOK
2A	LITERARY ELEMENTS AND TECHNIQUES	3
2.8.01	Identify elements of fiction: theme, rising action, falling action, conflict, point of view, resolution, and flashback.	2
2.8.02	Explain how theme, rising action, falling action, conflict, point of view, and resolution contribute to the meaning and a reader's interpretation of a literary selection.	3
2.8.03	Identify the author's message or theme.	3
2.8.04	Compare stories to personal experience, prior knowledge, or other stories	3
2.8.05	Recognize points of view in narratives. (e.g., first person).	2
2.8.06	Determine what characters are like by their words, thoughts, and actions, as well as how other characters react to them.	3
2.8.07	Determine character motivation.	3
2.8.08	Identify conflict or contradiction within a character or a character's behavior.	3
2.8.09	Explain the relationship between main and supporting characters.	2
2.8.10	Identify literary devices: (e.g., figurative language, hyperbole, understatement, symbols, dialogue).	1
2.8.11	Explain how the literary devices (e.g., imagery, metaphor, figurative language dialogue) contribute to the meaning of a literary selection.	3
2.8.12	Identify varieties of irony, including dramatic irony.	3
2B	Variety of Literary Works	2
2.8.13	Identify various subcategories of genres: poetry, drama (comedy and tragedy), science fiction, historical fiction, myth or legend, drama, biography/autobiography, story, poem, fairy tale, folktale, fable, nonfiction, and essay	2

Appendix B

Data Analysis Tables

Illinois Grades 3-8 Reading

Brief Explanation of Data in the Alignment Tables by Column

Tables *grade.1*

Standards #	Number of standards plus one for a generic standard for each standard.
Standards #	Average number of standards for reviewers. If the number is greater than the actual number in the standard, then at least one reviewer coded an item for the standard/standard but did not find any standard in the standard that corresponded to the item.
Level	The Depth-of-Knowledge level coded by the reviewers for the standards for each standard.
# of standards by Level	The number of standards coded at each level
% w/in std by Level	The percent of standards coded at each level
Hits	
Mean & SD	Mean and standard deviation number of items reviewers coded as corresponding to standard. The total is the total number of coded hits.
Cat. Conc. Accept.	“Yes” indicates that the standard met the acceptable level for criterion. “Yes” if mean is six or more. “Weak” if mean is five to six. “No” if mean is less than five.

Tables *grade.2*

	First five columns repeat columns from Table 1.
Level of Item w.r.t. Stand	Mean percent and standard deviation of items coded as “under” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding standard, as “at” (the same) the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding standard, and as “above” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding standard.
Depth-of-Know. Consistency	
Accept.	<p>“Yes” indicates that 50% or more of the items were rated as “at” or “above” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding standards.</p> <p>“Weak” indicates that 40% to 50% of the items were rated as “at” or “above” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding standards.</p> <p>“No” indicates that less than 40% items were rated as “at” or “above” the Depth-of-Knowledge level of the corresponding standards.</p>

Tables *grade.3*

First five columns repeat columns from Table 1 and 2.

Range of

Standards

Standards Hit

Average number and standard deviation of the standards hit coded by reviewers.

% of Total

Average percent and standard deviation of the total standards that had at least one item coded.

Range of

Know.

Accept.

“Yes” indicates that 50% or more of the standards had at least one coded standard.

“Weak” indicates that 40% to 50% of the standards had at least one coded standard.

“No” indicates that 40% or less of the standards had at least one coded standard.

Balance

Index

% Hits in

Std/Ttl Hits

Average and standard deviation of the percent of the items hit for a standard of total number of hits (see total under the Hits column).

Index

Average and standard deviation of the Balance Index.

$$\text{Note: BALANCE INDEX} = 1 - \left(\sum_{k=1} \left| 1/(O) - I_{(k)} / (H) \right| \right) / 2$$

Where O = Total number of standards hit for the standard

I_(k) = Number of items hit corresponding to standard (k)

H = Total number of items hit for the standard

Bal. of Rep

Accept.

“Yes” indicates that the Balance Index was .7 or above (items evenly distributed among standards).

“Weak” indicates that the Balance Index was .6 to .7 (a high percentage of items coded as corresponding to two or three standards).

“No” indicates that the Balance Index was .6 or less (a high percentage of items coded as corresponding to one standard.)

Tables *grade.4*

Summary if standard met the acceptable level for the four criteria by each standard.

Tables *grade.6*

The DOK value for each assessment item given by each reviewer. The intraclass correlation for the group of reviewers is given on the last row.

Tables *grade.8*

The DOK level and standard code assigned by each reviewer for each item.

Tables *grade.9*

This list for each item all of the standards coded by the group of reviewers as corresponding to the item. Repeat of a standard indicates the number of reviewers who coded that standard as corresponding to the item.

Tables *grade.10*

This lists for each standard all of the items coded by the group of reviewers as corresponding to the standard. Repeat of an item indicates the number of reviewers who coded the item as corresponding to the standard.

Tables *grade.12*

This table summarizes the number of reviewers who coded an item as corresponding to a standard. It contains the same information as in Table 10.

Tables *grade.13*

This table can be used to compare the DOK level of a standard to the average DOK level of the items reviewers assigned to the standard. This table is helpful to identify items with a lower DOK level that should be replaced by an item with a higher DOK level to improve the Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency.

Table 3.1
Categorical Concurrence Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Level by Objective			Hits		Cat. Concurr.
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Level	# of objs by Level	% w/in std by Level	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	28	1	6	21	42.2	2.56	YES
			2	20	71			
			3	2	7			
Goal 2 - Literature	2	10.8	2	6	60	12.6	1.74	YES
			3	4	40			
Total	5	38.8	1	6	15	54.8	1.6	
			2	26	68			
			3	6	15			

Table 3.2

Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers

IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Level of Item w.r.t. Standard						DOK Consistency
					% Under		% At		% Above		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	28	42.2	2.56	18	33	77	36	4	19	YES
Goal 2 - Literature	2	10.8	12.6	1.74	44	46	56	46	0	0	YES
Total	5	38.8	54.8	1.6	26	39	71	40	3	16	

Table 3.3

Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence and Balance of Representation Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Range of Objectives				Rng. of Know.	Balance Index				Bal. of Represent.
					# Objs Hit		% of Total			% Hits in Std/Ttl Hits		Index		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	28	42.2	2.56	13.6	0.8	49	3	WEAK	77	3	0.60	0.04	WEAK
Goal 2 - Literature	2	10.8	12.6	1.74	6	0.63	56	6	YES	23	3	0.70	0.03	YES
Total	5	38.8	54.8	1.6	9.8	3.87	52	6		50	27	0.65	0.06	

Table 3.4

*Summary of Attainment of Acceptable Alignment Level on Four Content Focus Criteria
as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51*

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	WEAK	WEAK
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	YES	YES	YES

Table 3.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	1	2	1	1	1
3	2	2	1	2	2
4	2	2	1	2	2
5	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	1
7	2	1	2	2	1
8	2	2	2	2	2
9	2	2	2	2	2
10	2	2	3	3	2
11	1	2	1	1	1
12	2	2	2	2	2
13	2	1	2	2	2
14	2	3	3	3	2
15	2	2	3	3	2
16	2	1	2	1	1
17	2	2	2	1	1
18	2	2	2	2	2
19	1	2	2	1	1
20	2	2	2	2	2
21	2	2	2	2	1
22	1	1	2	2	1
23	2	2	2	2	2
24	2	2	2	2	2
25	2	2	2	2	2
26	2	2	2	2	1
27	2	2	2	3	2
28	1	1	2	1	1
29	1	1	2	1	1
30	2	2	2	2	3
31	2	1	3	2	2
32	2	2	2	2	1
33	1	1	2	2	1
34	2	1	2	2	1
35	1	1	1	1	1
36	2	2	2	2	2
37	3	2	3	2	3
38	2	2	2	2	2
39	1	1	2	1	1
40	2	2	3	2	2

Table 3.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
41	2	2	2	2	2
42	2	2	2	2	2
43	1	1	2	2	1
44	1	1	1	1	1
45	2	2	2	2	3
46	2	2	2	2	2
47	3	3	3	3	3
48	1	1	2	1	1
49	2	2	2	3	2
50	2	1	2	1	2
51	1	1	1	1	1

Intraclass Correlation: 0.8796

Pairwise Comparison: 0.7

Table 3.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
1	1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.13		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
2	1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.18	
3	2	1.3.28		2	1.3.28		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.28		2	1.3.20	
4	2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.17	
5	1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.21		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
6	1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
7	2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
8	2	1.3.25		2	1.3.25		2	1.3.25		2	1.3.25		2	1.3.25	
9	2	2.3.05		2	1.3.28		2	1.3.28		2	1.3.28		2	1.3.28	
10	2	1.3.12		2	1.3.13		3	1.3.24		3	1.3.24		2	1.3.24	
11	1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	2.3.08	
12	2	1.3.13		2	1.3.13		2	1.3.17		2	1.3.13		2	2.3.07	
13	2	1.3.23		1	1.3.23		2	1.3.23		2	1.3.23		2	1.3.23	
14	2	2.3.05		3	2.3.05		3	1.3.24		3	2.3.05		2	2.3.05	
15	2	1.3.24		2	1.3.24		3	1.3.24		3	1.3.24		2	2.3.03	
16	2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
17	2	1.3.12		2	2.3.04		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
18	2	1.3.17		2	1.3.17		2	1.3.17		2	1.3.17		2	1.3.17	
19	1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.21		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
20	2	1.3.13		2	1.3.13		2	1.3.13		2	1.3.13		2	1.3.13	
21	2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
22	1	2A		1	2.3.10		2	2A		2	2A		1	2A	
23	2	1.3.08		2	1.3.07		2	1.3.08		2	1.3.08		2	1.3.08	
24	2	1.3.20		2	1.3.13		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20	
25	2	1.3.24		2	1.3.28		2	1.3.22		2	1.3.22		2	1.3.22	
26	2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
27	2	1.3.22		2	1.3.22		2	1.3.22		3	1.3.22		2	1.3.22	
28	1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.23		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
29	1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
30	2	1.3.12		2	1.3.12		2	1.3.12		2	1.3.12		3	1.3.12	
31	2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		3	2.3.07		2	2.3.07		2	2.3.07	
32	2	1.3.07		2	1.3.07		2	1.3.07		2	2.3.03		1	1.3.07	
33	1	1.3.23		1	1.3.23		2	1.3.23		2	1.3.23		1	1.3.23	
34	2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	2.3.07	
35	1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	2.3.07		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
36	2	1.3.08		2	1.3.08		2	1.3.09		2	1.3.08		2	1.3.08	
37	3	2.3.08		2	2.3.08		3	2.3.08		2	2.3.08		3	2.3.08	
38	2	1.3.07		2	1.3.07		2	1.3.08		2	1.3.07		2	1.3.07	

Table 3.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
39	1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
40	2	2.3.07		2	2.3.07		3	2.3.08		2	2.3.08		2	2.3.07	
41	2	1.3.08		2	1.3.08		2	1.3.07		2	1.3.08		2	1.3.08	
42	2	2.3.06		2	1.3.20		2	2.3.06		2	2.3.06		2	2.3.08	
43	1	1.3.03		1	1.3.01		2	1.3.01		2	1.3.01		1	1.3.01	
44	1	2.3.06		1	2.3.06		1	2.3.06		1	2.3.07		1	2.3.08	
45	2	1.3.28		2	1.3.28		2	1.3.28		2	1.3.28		3	1.3.28	
46	2	2.3.10		2	2.3.10		2	2.3.10		2	1.3.27		2	2.3.10	
47	3	2.3.07	1.3.24	3	2.3.07		3	2.3.07		3	2.3.07		3	2.3.06	
48	1	1.3.20		1	1.3.27		2	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	
49	2	1.3.27		2	1.3.27		2	1.3.27		3	1.3.24		2	1.3.27	
50	2	1.3.27		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.27		1	1.3.20		2	1.3.20	
51	1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20		1	1.3.20	

Objective Pairwise Comparison: 0.6583

Standard Pairwise Comparison: 0.8949

Table 3.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Low		Medium		High
5		5.372549		24

1	1.3.13	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
2	1.3.18	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
3	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.28	1.3.28	1.3.28
4	1.3.17	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
5	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.21
6	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
7	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
8	1.3.25	1.3.25	1.3.25	1.3.25	1.3.25
9	1.3.28	1.3.28	1.3.28	1.3.28	2.3.05
10	1.3.12	1.3.13	1.3.24	1.3.24	1.3.24
11	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	2.3.08
12	1.3.13	1.3.13	1.3.13	1.3.17	2.3.07
13	1.3.23	1.3.23	1.3.23	1.3.23	1.3.23
14	1.3.24	2.3.05	2.3.05	2.3.05	2.3.05
15	1.3.24	1.3.24	1.3.24	1.3.24	2.3.03
16	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
17	1.3.12	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	2.3.04
18	1.3.17	1.3.17	1.3.17	1.3.17	1.3.17
19	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.21
20	1.3.13	1.3.13	1.3.13	1.3.13	1.3.13
21	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
22	2A	2A	2A	2A	2.3.10
23	1.3.07	1.3.08	1.3.08	1.3.08	1.3.08
24	1.3.13	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
25	1.3.22	1.3.22	1.3.22	1.3.24	1.3.28
26	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
27	1.3.22	1.3.22	1.3.22	1.3.22	1.3.22
28	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.23
29	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20
30	1.3.12	1.3.12	1.3.12	1.3.12	1.3.12
31	1.3.20	1.3.20	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07
32	1.3.07	1.3.07	1.3.07	1.3.07	2.3.03
33	1.3.23	1.3.23	1.3.23	1.3.23	1.3.23
34	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	2.3.07
35	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	2.3.07
36	1.3.08	1.3.08	1.3.08	1.3.08	1.3.09
37	2.3.08	2.3.08	2.3.08	2.3.08	2.3.08
38	1.3.07	1.3.07	1.3.07	1.3.07	1.3.08

Table 3.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

39	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20					
40	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.08	2.3.08					
41	1.3.07	1.3.08	1.3.08	1.3.08	1.3.08					
42	1.3.20	2.3.06	2.3.06	2.3.06	2.3.08					
43	1.3.01	1.3.01	1.3.01	1.3.01	1.3.03					
44	2.3.06	2.3.06	2.3.06	2.3.07	2.3.08					
45	1.3.28	1.3.28	1.3.28	1.3.28	1.3.28					
46	1.3.27	2.3.10	2.3.10	2.3.10	2.3.10					
47	1.3.24	1.3.24	1.3.24	1.3.24	2.3.06	2.3.06	2.3.06	2.3.06	2.3.07	2.3.07
	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	
	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07	2.3.07					
48	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.27					
49	1.3.24	1.3.27	1.3.27	1.3.27	1.3.27					
50	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.27	1.3.27					
51	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20	1.3.20					

Table 3.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Low		Medium		High
0		5.956522		95

Goal 1																				
1A																				
1.3.01	43	43	43	43																
1.3.02																				
1.3.03	43																			
1.3.04																				
1.3.05																				
1.3.06																				
1.3.07	23	32	32	32	32	38	38	38	38	41										
1.3.08	23	23	23	23	36	36	36	36	38	41	41	41	41							
1.3.09	36																			
1.3.10																				
1.3.11																				
1B, 1C																				
1.3.12	10	17	30	30	30	30	30													
1.3.13	1	10	12	12	12	20	20	20	20	20	24									
1.3.14																				
1.3.15																				
1.3.16																				
1.3.17	4	12	18	18	18	18	18													
1.3.18	2																			
1.3.19																				
1C																				
1.3.20	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	6	6
	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	11	11	11	11	16	16	16	16	16	17	17	
	17	19	19	19	19	21	21	21	21	21	24	24	24	24	26	26	26	26	26	
	28	28	28	28	29	29	29	29	29	31	31	34	34	34	34	35	35	35	35	
	39	39	39	39	39	42	48	48	48	48	50	50	50	51	51	51	51	51		
1.3.21	5	19																		
1.3.22	25	25	25	27	27	27	27	27												
1.3.23	13	13	13	13	13	28	33	33	33	33	33									
1.3.24	10	10	10	14	15	15	15	15	25	47	47	47	47	49						
1.3.25	8	8	8	8	8															
1.3.26																				
1.3.27	46	48	49	49	49	49	50	50												
1.3.28	3	3	3	9	9	9	9	25	45	45	45	45	45							
Goal 2																				
2A	22	22	22	22																

Table 3.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

2.3.01																				
2.3.02																				
2.3.03	15	32																		
2.3.04	17																			
2.3.05	9	14	14	14	14															
2.3.06	42	42	42	44	44	44	47	47	47	47										
2.3.07	12	31	31	31	34	35	40	40	40	44	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47
	47	47	47	47	47	47														
2.3.08	11	37	37	37	37	37	40	40	42	44										
2.3.09																				
2B																				
2.3.10	22	46	46	46	46															

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Goal 1														
1A														
1.3.01	43:4													
1.3.02														
1.3.03	43:1													
1.3.04														
1.3.05														
1.3.06														
1.3.07	23:1	32:4	38:4	41:1										
1.3.08	23:4	36:4	38:1	41:4										
1.3.09	36:1													
1.3.10														
1.3.11														
1B, 1C														
1.3.12	10:1	17:1	30:5											
1.3.13	1:1	10:1	12:3	20:5	24:1									
1.3.14														
1.3.15														
1.3.16														
1.3.17	4:1	12:1	18:5											
1.3.18	2:1													
1.3.19														
1C														
1.3.20	1:4	2:4	3:2	4:4	5:4	6:5	7:5	11:4	16:5	17:3	19:4	21:5	24:4	
	26:5	28:4	29:5	31:2	34:4	35:4	39:5	42:1	48:4	50:3	51:5			
1.3.21	5:1	19:1												
1.3.22	25:3	27:5												
1.3.23	13:5	28:1	33:5											
1.3.24	10:3	14:1	15:4	25:1	47:1	49:1								
1.3.25	8:5													
1.3.26														
1.3.27	46:1	48:1	49:4	50:2										
1.3.28	3:3	9:4	25:1	45:5										
Goal 2														
2A	22:4													
2.3.01														
2.3.02														
2.3.03	15:1	32:1												

Table 3.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

2.3.04	17:1							
2.3.05	9:1	14:4						
2.3.06	42:3	44:3	47:1					
2.3.07	12:1	31:3	34:1	35:1	40:3	44:1	47:4	
2.3.08	11:1	37:5	40:2	42:1	44:1			
2.3.09								
2B								
2.3.10	22:1	46:4						

Table 3.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Low		Medium		High
1		2		5

1	1.3.13:1	1.3.20:4	
2	1.3.18:1	1.3.20:4	
3	1.3.20:2	1.3.28:3	
4	1.3.17:1	1.3.20:4	
5	1.3.20:4	1.3.21:1	
6	1.3.20:5		
7	1.3.20:5		
8	1.3.25:5		
9	1.3.28:4	2.3.05:1	
10	1.3.12:1	1.3.13:1	1.3.24:3
11	1.3.20:4	2.3.08:1	
12	1.3.13:3	1.3.17:1	2.3.07:1
13	1.3.23:5		
14	1.3.24:1	2.3.05:4	
15	1.3.24:4	2.3.03:1	
16	1.3.20:5		
17	1.3.12:1	1.3.20:3	2.3.04:1
18	1.3.17:5		
19	1.3.20:4	1.3.21:1	
20	1.3.13:5		
21	1.3.20:5		
22	2A:4	2.3.10:1	
23	1.3.07:1	1.3.08:4	
24	1.3.13:1	1.3.20:4	
25	1.3.22:3	1.3.24:1	1.3.28:1
26	1.3.20:5		
27	1.3.22:5		
28	1.3.20:4	1.3.23:1	
29	1.3.20:5		
30	1.3.12:5		
31	1.3.20:2	2.3.07:3	
32	1.3.07:4	2.3.03:1	
33	1.3.23:5		
34	1.3.20:4	2.3.07:1	
35	1.3.20:4	2.3.07:1	
36	1.3.08:4	1.3.09:1	
37	2.3.08:5		
38	1.3.07:4	1.3.08:1	

Table 3.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

39	1.3.20:5		
40	2.3.07:3	2.3.08:2	
41	1.3.07:1	1.3.08:4	
42	1.3.20:1	2.3.06:3	2.3.08:1
43	1.3.01:4	1.3.03:1	
44	2.3.06:3	2.3.07:1	2.3.08:1
45	1.3.28:5		
46	1.3.27:1	2.3.10:4	
47	1.3.24:1	2.3.06:1	2.3.07:4
48	1.3.20:4	1.3.27:1	
49	1.3.24:1	1.3.27:4	
50	1.3.20:3	1.3.27:2	
51	1.3.20:5		

Table 3.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)

IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Low DOK		Matched DOK		High DOK
1		2		5

Goal 1 [2]:						
1A [1]:						
1.3.01 [2]:	43:4 [1.5]					
1.3.02 [1]:						
1.3.03 [1]:	43:1 [1]					
1.3.04 [1]:						
1.3.05 [1]:						
1.3.06 [2]:						
1.3.07 [2]:	23:1 [2]	32:4 [1.75]	38:4 [2]	41:1 [2]		
1.3.08 [2]:	23:4 [2]	36:4 [2]	38:1 [2]	41:4 [2]		
1.3.09 [1]:	36:1 [2]					
1.3.10 [1]:						
1.3.11 [2]:						
1B, 1C [2]:						
1.3.12 [2]:	10:1 [2]	17:1 [2]	30:5 [2.2]			
1.3.13 [2]:	1:1 [1]	10:1 [2]	12:3 [2]	20:5 [2]	24:1 [2]	
1.3.14 [2]:						
1.3.15 [2]:						
1.3.16						

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

[2]:												
1.3.17 [2]:	4:1 [2]	12:1 [2]	18:5 [2]									
1.3.18 [2]:	2:1 [1]											
1.3.19 [3]:												
1C [2]:												
1.3.20 [2]:	1:4 [1]	2:4 [1.25]	3:2 [1.5]	4:4 [1.75]	5:4 [1]	6:5 [1]	7:5 [1.6]	11:4 [1.25]	16:5 [1.4]	17:3 [1.33]	19:4 [1.25]	
	26:5 [1.8]	28:4 [1]	29:5 [1.2]	31:2 [1.5]	34:4 [1.75]	35:4 [1]	39:5 [1.2]	42:1 [2]	48:4 [1.25]	50:3 [1.33]	51:5 [1]	
1.3.21 [2]:	5:1 [1]	19:1 [2]										
1.3.22 [2]:	25:3 [2]	27:5 [2.2]										
1.3.23 [2]:	13:5 [1.8]	28:1 [2]	33:5 [1.4]									
1.3.24 [3]:	10:3 [2.67]	14:1 [3]	15:4 [2.5]	25:1 [2]	47:1 [3]	49:1 [3]						
1.3.25 [2]:	8:5 [2]											
1.3.26 [2]:												
1.3.27 [2]:	46:1 [2]	48:1 [1]	49:4 [2]	50:2 [2]								
1.3.28 [2]:	3:3 [2]	9:4 [2]	25:1 [2]	45:5 [2.2]								
Goal 2 [2]:												
2A [2]:	22:4 [1.5]											
2.3.01 [2]:												
2.3.02 [2]:												
2.3.03 [2]:	15:1 [2]	32:1 [2]										
2.3.04 [2]:	17:1 [2]											
2.3.05 [3]:	9:1 [2]	14:4 [2.5]										

Table 3.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)

IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

2.3.06 [3]:	42:3 [2]	44:3 [1]	47:1 [3]				
2.3.07 [3]:	12:1 [2]	31:3 [2.33]	34:1 [1]	35:1 [1]	40:3 [2]	44:1 [1]	47:4 [3]
2.3.08 [3]:	11:1 [1]	37:5 [2.6]	40:2 [2.5]	42:1 [2]	44:1 [1]		
2.3.09 [2]:							
2B [2]:							
2.3.10 [2]:	22:1 [1]	46:4 [2]					

Table 4.1

Categorical Concurrence Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers

IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Level by Objective			Hits		Cat. Concurr.
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Level	# of objs by Level	% w/in std by Level	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 – Reading	3	27	1	3	11	42	2.68	YES
			2	21	80			
			3	2	7			
Goal 2 - Literature	2	14	1	1	7	13.6	2.8	YES
			2	7	50			
			3	6	42			
Total	5	41	1	4	10	55.6	1.96	
			2	28	70			
			3	8	20			

Table 4.2

Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers

IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Level of Item w.r.t. Standard						DOK Consistency
					% Under		% At		% Above		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	27	42	2.68	15	27	82	30	4	17	YES
Goal 2 - Literature	2	14	13.6	2.8	55	46	31	42	15	34	WEAK
Total	5	41	55.6	1.96	28	39	65	42	7	24	

Table 4.3

Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence and Balance of Representation Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Range of Objectives				Rng. of Know.	Balance Index				Bal. of Represent.
					# Objs Hit		% of Total			% Hits in Std/Ttl Hits		Index		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	27	42	2.68	10.4	0.49	39	2	NO	76	5	0.57	0.03	NO
Goal 2 - Literature	2	14	13.6	2.8	5	0.63	36	5	NO	24	5	0.82	0.07	YES
Total	5	41	55.6	1.96	7.7	2.76	37	4		50	26	0.69	0.14	

Table 4.4

*Summary of Attainment of Acceptable Alignment Level on Four Content Focus Criteria
as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51*

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	NO	NO
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	WEAK	NO	YES

Table 4.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
1	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	2	2	2	2	2
4	2	2	2	2	2
5	2	2	2	2	2
6	2	2	2	2	1
7	2	2	2	2	2
8	2	2	2	2	2
9	2	2	2	2	2
10	1	1	2	2	1
11	2	2	2	3	2
12	2	2	2	3	2
13	1	2	2	1	1
14	1	1	2	1	1
15	1	1	2	2	1
16	1	2	2	2	1
17	2	2	2	1	2
18	2	2	2	2	2
19	2	2	2	2	2
20	2	2	2	2	2
21	2	2	2	3	2
22	1	1	2	1	1
23	2	2	2	2	2
24	1	1	2	1	1
25	3	2	2	3	2
26	2	2	2	3	2
27	2	2	2	3	2
28	2	2	2	3	2
29	2	2	2	3	2
30	2	2	2	3	2
31	2	2	2	1	1
32	2	2	2	2	2
33	1	1	2	1	1
34	1	2	2	1	1
35	1	2	2	2	1
36	2	2	2	2	2
37	2	1	2	1	2
38	2	1	2	1	1
39	2	2	2	2	2
40	1	2	3	2	1

Table 4.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
41	2	2	2	2	1
42	2	2	2	2	2
43	2	2	2	2	1
44	2	2	2	2	2
45	2	2	2	2	3
46	3	3	2	3	3
47	3	3	3	3	3
48	2	2	2	2	2
49	2	2	2	3	2
50	1	1	2	1	1
51	2	2	2	1	2

Intraclass Correlation: 0.8111

Pairwise Comparison: 0.702

Table 4.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
1	2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17	
2	2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04	
3	2	1.4.10		2	1.4.10		2	1.4.10		2	1.4.10		2	1.4.17	
4	2	1.4.21		2	1.4.21		2	1.4.21		2	1.4.21		2	1.4.21	
5	2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17	
6	2	2.4.11		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	2.4.11		1	1.4.17	
7	2	2.4.11		2	2.4.11		2	1.4.17		2	2.4.11		2	2.4.11	
8	2	1.4.22		2	1.4.22		2	1.4.22		2	1.4.22		2	1.4.22	
9	2	2.4.11		2	2.4.11		2	1.4.22		2	2.4.11		2	2.4.11	
10	1	1.4.04		1	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.04		1	1.4.17	
11	2	2.4.05		2	2.4.05		2	2.4.05		3	2.4.05		2	2.4.05	
12	2	1B, 1C		2	1B, 1C		2	1B, 1C		3	1B, 1C		2	1B, 1C	
13	1	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17	
14	1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		2	1.4.18		1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17	
15	1	1.4.22		1	1.4.17		2	1.4.18		2	1.4.17		1	1.4.17	
16	1	1.4.14		2	1.4.14		2	1.4.14		2	1.4.14		1	1.4.17	
17	2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		2	1.4.17	
18	2	1.4.12		2	1.4.25		2	1.4.21		2	1.4.25		2	1.4.21	
19	2	2.4.13		2	1.4.19		2	1.4.22		2	1.4.19		2	1.4.19	
20	2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04		2	1.4.26		2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04	
21	2	1.4.22		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.26		3	1.4.22		2	1.4.17	
22	1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17	
23	2	1.4.09		2	1.4.09		2	1.4.26		2	1.4.22		2	1.4.09	
24	1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17	
25	3	1.4.22		2	1.4.26		2	1.4.26		3	1.4.22		2	1.4.26	
26	2	1.4.10		2	1.4.10		2	1.4.17		3	1.4.22		2	1.4.17	
27	2	1.4.22		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.22		3	1.4.22		2	1.4.17	
28	2	1.4.10		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		3	1.4.22		2	1.4.17	
29	2	1.4.25		2	1.4.09		2	1.4.09		3	1.4.22		2	1.4.09	
30	2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.26		3	1.4.26		2	1.4.17	
31	2	1.4.21		2	1.4.21		2	1.4.21		1	1.4.21		1	1.4.21	
32	2	2.4.09		2	2.4.09		2	2.4.09		2	2.4.09		2	2.4.09	
33	1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		2	2.4.09		1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17	
34	1	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17	
35	1	1.4.21		2	1.4.21		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		1	2.4.03	
36	2	2.4.09		2	2.4.09		2	2.4.08		2	1.4.17		2	2.4.09	
37	2	2.4.09		1	2.4.09		2	2.4.09		1	2.4.09		2	2.4.09	
38	2	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		2	2.4.03		1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17	

Table 4.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
39	2	1.4.10		2	1.4.10		2	2.4.10		2	1.4.10		2	1.4.10	
40	1	1.4.17		2	1.4.22		3	2.4.03		2	1.4.17		1	2.4.08	
41	2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04		1	1.4.04	
42	2	2.4.09		2	1.4.22		2	2.4.09		2	2.4.08		2	2.4.08	
43	2	1.4.04		2	1.4.04		2	2.4.05		2	1.4.04		1	1.4.05	
44	2	2.4.08		2	2.4.08		2	2.4.09		2	2.4.08		2	2.4.08	
45	2	1.4.26		2	1.4.26		2	2.4.05		2	1.4.26		3	1.4.26	
46	3	2.4.05		3	2.4.05		2	2.4.05		3	2.4.05		3	2.4.05	
47	3	1.4.22	2.4.03	3	2.4.03		3	2.4.03		3	1.4.22		3	1.4.22	2.4.03
48	2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17	
49	2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		3	1.4.22		2	1.4.17	
50	1	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		1	1.4.17		1	1.4.21	
51	2	1.4.17		2	1.4.17		2	1.4.22		1	1.4.17		2	1.4.17	

Objective Pairwise Comparison: 0.6197

Standard Pairwise Comparison: 0.8762

Table 4.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Low		Medium		High
5		5.45098		28

1	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17
2	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.04
3	1.4.10	1.4.10	1.4.10	1.4.10	1.4.17
4	1.4.21	1.4.21	1.4.21	1.4.21	1.4.21
5	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17
6	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	2.4.11	2.4.11
7	1.4.17	2.4.11	2.4.11	2.4.11	2.4.11
8	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22
9	1.4.22	2.4.11	2.4.11	2.4.11	2.4.11
10	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17
11	2.4.05	2.4.05	2.4.05	2.4.05	2.4.05
12	1B, 1C	1B, 1C	1B, 1C	1B, 1C	1B, 1C
13	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17
14	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.18
15	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.18	1.4.22
16	1.4.14	1.4.14	1.4.14	1.4.14	1.4.17
17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17
18	1.4.12	1.4.21	1.4.21	1.4.25	1.4.25
19	1.4.19	1.4.19	1.4.19	1.4.22	2.4.13
20	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.26
21	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.26
22	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17
23	1.4.09	1.4.09	1.4.09	1.4.22	1.4.26
24	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17
25	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.26	1.4.26	1.4.26
26	1.4.10	1.4.10	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.22
27	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22
28	1.4.10	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.22
29	1.4.09	1.4.09	1.4.09	1.4.22	1.4.25
30	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.26	1.4.26
31	1.4.21	1.4.21	1.4.21	1.4.21	1.4.21
32	2.4.09	2.4.09	2.4.09	2.4.09	2.4.09
33	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	2.4.09
34	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17
35	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.21	1.4.21	2.4.03
36	1.4.17	2.4.08	2.4.09	2.4.09	2.4.09
37	2.4.09	2.4.09	2.4.09	2.4.09	2.4.09

Table 4.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

38	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	2.4.03					
39	1.4.10	1.4.10	1.4.10	1.4.10	2.4.10					
40	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.22	2.4.03	2.4.08					
41	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.04					
42	1.4.22	2.4.08	2.4.08	2.4.09	2.4.09					
43	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.04	1.4.05	2.4.05					
44	2.4.08	2.4.08	2.4.08	2.4.08	2.4.09					
45	1.4.26	1.4.26	1.4.26	1.4.26	2.4.05					
46	2.4.05	2.4.05	2.4.05	2.4.05	2.4.05					
47	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22	1.4.22
	1.4.22	1.4.22	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	
	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	2.4.03	
48	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17					
49	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.22					
50	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.21					
51	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.17	1.4.22					

Table 4.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Low		Medium		High
0		5.791667		93

Goal 1																				
1A																				
1.4.01																				
1.4.02																				
1.4.03																				
1.4.04	2	2	2	2	2	10	10	20	20	20	20	41	41	41	41	41	43	43	43	
1.4.05	43																			
1.4.06																				
1.4.07																				
1.4.08																				
1B, 1C	12	12	12	12	12															
1.4.09	23	23	23	29	29	29														
1.4.10	3	3	3	3	26	26	28	39	39	39	39									
1.4.11																				
1.4.12	18																			
1.4.13																				
1.4.14	16	16	16	16																
1.4.15																				
1.4.16																				
1C																				
1.4.17	1	1	1	1	1	3	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	7	10	10	10	13	13
	13	13	13	14	14	14	14	15	15	15	16	17	17	17	17	17	21	21	22	
	22	22	22	22	24	24	24	24	24	26	26	27	27	28	28	28	30	30	30	
	33	33	33	33	34	34	34	34	34	35	35	36	38	38	38	38	40	40	48	
	48	48	48	48	49	49	49	49	50	50	50	50	51	51	51	51				
1.4.18	14	15																		
1.4.19	19	19	19																	
1.4.20																				
1.4.21	4	4	4	4	4	18	18	31	31	31	31	31	35	35	50					
1.4.22	8	8	8	8	8	9	15	19	21	21	23	25	25	26	27	27	27	28	29	40
	42	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	49	51				
1.4.23																				
1.4.24																				
1.4.25	18	18	29																	
1.4.26	20	21	23	25	25	25	30	30	45	45	45	45								
Goal 2																				
2A																				
2.4.01																				

Table 4.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

2.4.02																				
2.4.03	35	38	40	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47
2.4.04																				
2.4.05	11	11	11	11	11	43	45	46	46	46	46	46								
2.4.06																				
2.4.07																				
2.4.08	36	40	42	42	44	44	44	44												
2.4.09	32	32	32	32	32	33	36	36	36	37	37	37	37	37	42	42	44			
2.4.10	39																			
2.4.11	6	6	7	7	7	7	9	9	9	9										
2.4.12																				
2B																				
2.4.13	19																			
2.4.14																				

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Low		Medium		High
1		2		5

Goal 1														
1A														
1.4.01														
1.4.02														
1.4.03														
1.4.04	2:5	10:2	20:4	41:5	43:3									
1.4.05	43:1													
1.4.06														
1.4.07														
1.4.08														
1B, 1C	12:5													
1.4.09	23:3	29:3												
1.4.10	3:4	26:2	28:1	39:4										
1.4.11														
1.4.12	18:1													
1.4.13														
1.4.14	16:4													
1.4.15														
1.4.16														
1C														
1.4.17	1:5	3:1	5:5	6:3	7:1	10:3	13:5	14:4	15:3	16:1	17:5	21:2	22:5	
	24:5	26:2	27:2	28:3	30:3	33:4	34:5	35:2	36:1	38:4	40:2	48:5	49:4	
	50:4	51:4												
1.4.18	14:1	15:1												
1.4.19	19:3													
1.4.20														
1.4.21	4:5	18:2	31:5	35:2	50:1									
1.4.22	8:5	9:1	15:1	19:1	21:2	23:1	25:2	26:1	27:3	28:1	29:1	40:1	42:1	
	47:3	49:1	51:1											
1.4.23														
1.4.24														
1.4.25	18:2	29:1												
1.4.26	20:1	21:1	23:1	25:3	30:2	45:4								
Goal 2														
2A														
2.4.01														
2.4.02														
2.4.03	35:1	38:1	40:1	47:4										

Table 4.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

2.4.04						
2.4.05	11:5	43:1	45:1	46:5		
2.4.06						
2.4.07						
2.4.08	36:1	40:1	42:2	44:4		
2.4.09	32:5	33:1	36:3	37:5	42:2	44:1
2.4.10	39:1					
2.4.11	6:2	7:4	9:4			
2.4.12						
2B						
2.4.13	19:1					
2.4.14						

Table 4.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Low		Medium		High
1		2		5

1	1.4.17:5		
2	1.4.04:5		
3	1.4.10:4	1.4.17:1	
4	1.4.21:5		
5	1.4.17:5		
6	1.4.17:3	2.4.11:2	
7	1.4.17:1	2.4.11:4	
8	1.4.22:5		
9	1.4.22:1	2.4.11:4	
10	1.4.04:2	1.4.17:3	
11	2.4.05:5		
12	1B, 1C:5		
13	1.4.17:5		
14	1.4.17:4	1.4.18:1	
15	1.4.17:3	1.4.18:1	1.4.22:1
16	1.4.14:4	1.4.17:1	
17	1.4.17:5		
18	1.4.12:1	1.4.21:2	1.4.25:2
19	1.4.19:3	1.4.22:1	2.4.13:1
20	1.4.04:4	1.4.26:1	
21	1.4.17:2	1.4.22:2	1.4.26:1
22	1.4.17:5		
23	1.4.09:3	1.4.22:1	1.4.26:1
24	1.4.17:5		
25	1.4.22:2	1.4.26:3	
26	1.4.10:2	1.4.17:2	1.4.22:1
27	1.4.17:2	1.4.22:3	
28	1.4.10:1	1.4.17:3	1.4.22:1
29	1.4.09:3	1.4.22:1	1.4.25:1
30	1.4.17:3	1.4.26:2	
31	1.4.21:5		
32	2.4.09:5		
33	1.4.17:4	2.4.09:1	
34	1.4.17:5		
35	1.4.17:2	1.4.21:2	2.4.03:1
36	1.4.17:1	2.4.08:1	2.4.09:3
37	2.4.09:5		
38	1.4.17:4	2.4.03:1	

Table 4.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

39	1.4.10:4	2.4.10:1		
40	1.4.17:2	1.4.22:1	2.4.03:1	2.4.08:1
41	1.4.04:5			
42	1.4.22:1	2.4.08:2	2.4.09:2	
43	1.4.04:3	1.4.05:1	2.4.05:1	
44	2.4.08:4	2.4.09:1		
45	1.4.26:4	2.4.05:1		
46	2.4.05:5			
47	1.4.22:3	2.4.03:4		
48	1.4.17:5			
49	1.4.17:4	1.4.22:1		
50	1.4.17:4	1.4.21:1		
51	1.4.17:4	1.4.22:1		

Table 4.13

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Low DOK		Matched DOK		High DOK
1		2		5

Goal 1 [2]:					
1A [2]:					
1.4.01 [2]:					
1.4.02 [1]:					
1.4.03 [2]:					
1.4.04 [2]:	2:5 [2]	10:2 [1.5]	20:4 [2]	41:5 [1.8]	43:3 [2]
1.4.05 [1]:	43:1 [1]				
1.4.06 [1]:					
1.4.07 [2]:					
1.4.08 [2]:					
1B, 1C [2]:	12:5 [2.2]				
1.4.09 [2]:	23:3 [2]	29:3 [2]			
1.4.10 [2]:	3:4 [2]	26:2 [2]	28:1 [2]	39:4 [2]	
1.4.11 [2]:					
1.4.12 [2]:	18:1 [2]				
1.4.13 [2]:					
1.4.14 [2]:	16:4 [1.75]				
1.4.15 [2]:					
1.4.16 [3]:					
1C [2]:					

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

1.4.17 [2]:	1:5 [2]	3:1 [2]	5:5 [2]	6:3 [1.67]	7:1 [2]	10:3 [1.33]	13:5 [1.4]	14:4 [1]	15:3 [1.33]	16:1 [1]	17:5 [1.8]	21:2 [2]	22:5 [1.2]
	24:5 [1.2]	26:2 [2]	27:2 [2]	28:3 [2]	30:3 [2]	33:4 [1]	34:5 [1.4]	35:2 [2]	36:1 [2]	38:4 [1.25]	40:2 [1.5]	48:5 [2]	49:4 [2]
	50:4 [1.25]	51:4 [1.75]											
1.4.18 [2]:	14:1 [2]	15:1 [2]											
1.4.19 [2]:	19:3 [2]												
1.4.20 [2]:													
1.4.21 [2]:	4:5 [2]	18:2 [2]	31:5 [1.6]	35:2 [1.5]	50:1 [1]								
1.4.22 [3]:	8:5 [2]	9:1 [2]	15:1 [1]	19:1 [2]	21:2 [2.5]	23:1 [2]	25:2 [3]	26:1 [3]	27:3 [2.33]	28:1 [3]	29:1 [3]	40:1 [2]	42:1 [2]
	47:3 [3]	49:1 [3]	51:1 [2]										
1.4.23 [2]:													
1.4.24 [2]:													
1.4.25 [2]:	18:2 [2]	29:1 [2]											
1.4.26 [2]:	20:1 [2]	21:1 [2]	23:1 [2]	25:3 [2]	30:2 [2.5]	45:4 [2.25]							
Goal 2 [2]:													
2A [3]:													
2.4.01 [2]:													
2.4.02 [2]:													
2.4.03 [2]:	35:1 [1]	38:1 [2]	40:1 [3]	47:4 [3]									
2.4.04 [2]:													
2.4.05 [3]:	11:5 [2.2]	43:1 [2]	45:1 [2]	46:5 [2.8]									
2.4.06 [3]:													
2.4.07 [3]:													
2.4.08 [3]:	36:1 [2]	40:1 [1]	42:2 [2]	44:4 [2]									

Table 4.13

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

2.4.09 [3]:	32:5 [2]	33:1 [2]	36:3 [2]	37:5 [1.6]	42:2 [2]	44:1 [2]
2.4.10 [3]:	39:1 [2]					
2.4.11 [2]:	6:2 [2]	7:4 [2]	9:4 [2]			
2.4.12 [1]:						
2B [2]:						
2.4.13 [2]:	19:1 [2]					
2.4.14 [2]:						

Table 5.1
Categorical Concurrence Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Level by Objective			Hits		Cat. Concurr.
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Level	# of objs by Level	% w/in std by Level	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	4	30.2	1	2	7	41.8	1.17	YES
			2	22	81			
			3	3	11			
Goal 2 - Literature	2	15.8	1	1	6	15.2	2.14	YES
			2	8	53			
			3	6	40			
Total	6	46	1	3	7	57	1.79	
			2	30	71			
			3	9	21			

Table 5.2
Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Level of Item w.r.t. Standard						DOK Consistency
					% Under		% At		% Above		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	4	30.2	41.8	1.17	22	37	75	38	2	14	YES
Goal 2 - Literature	2	15.8	15.2	2.14	39	44	61	44	0	0	YES
Total	6	46	57	1.79	28	41	70	41	1	11	

Table 5.3

Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence and Balance of Representation Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Range of Objectives				Rng. of Know.	Balance Index				Bal. of Represent.
					# Objs Hit		% of Total			% Hits in Std/Ttl Hits		Index		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	4	30.2	41.8	1.17	12.8	1.47	42	5	WEAK	73	3	0.53	0.05	NO
Goal 2 - Literature	2	15.8	15.2	2.14	7.6	1.2	48	7	WEAK	27	3	0.71	0.03	YES
Total	6	46	57	1.79	10.2	2.93	45	7		50	24	0.62	0.10	

Table 5.4

*Summary of Attainment of Acceptable Alignment Level on Four Content Focus Criteria
as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51*

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	WEAK	NO
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	YES	WEAK	YES

Table 5.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
1	1	2	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	2	2	2	2	2
4	2	2	2	2	2
5	2	2	2	3	3
6	1	2	1	1	1
7	2	2	2	2	2
8	1	1	1	1	1
9	2	2	2	2	1
10	2	2	2	2	2
11	1	1	1	2	1
12	2	2	2	2	2
13	2	1	2	2	2
14	2	2	1	2	2
15	2	2	2	2	3
16	2	2	2	2	2
17	1	1	1	1	1
18	2	2	2	3	2
19	2	2	1	1	2
20	1	1	1	2	1
21	2	2	2	2	2
22	1	2	1	1	1
23	2	2	2	3	2
24	2	2	2	2	1
25	2	2	2	2	2
26	1	1	1	1	1
27	2	2	2	2	1
28	3	2	2	2	2
29	1	2	2	1	1
30	1	1	1	1	1
31	1	1	1	1	1
32	2	2	2	2	2
33	2	2	2	2	2
34	2	2	2	2	1
35	2	2	2	2	1
36	1	3	3	2	2
37	1	1	1	1	1
38	2	2	2	1	1
39	1	1	1	2	1
40	2	2	2	2	2

Table 5.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
41	2	2	2	2	1
42	2	2	2	2	1
43	2	2	2	2	2
44	1	2	2	2	1
45	2	2	2	2	2
46	2	2	2	2	2
47	3	3	3	3	3
48	1	1	1	1	1
49	1	1	2	1	1
50	2	2	1	2	1
51	1	1	2	1	1

Intraclass Correlation: 0.8807

Pairwise Comparison: 0.749

Table 5.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
1	1	1.5.16		2	1.5.17		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
2	2	2.5.09		2	2.5.09		2	2.5.09		2	2.5.09		2	2.5.09	
3	2	2.5.08		2	2.5.08		2	2.5.08		2	2.5.08		2	2.5.08	
4	2	1.5.28		2	1.5.27		2	1.5.27		2	1.5.27		2	1.5.28	
5	2	1.5.22		2	1.5.16		2	1.5.22		3	1.5.22		3	1.5.22	
6	1	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
7	2	1.5.07		2	1.5.07		2	1.5.07		2	1.5.07		2	1.5.07	
8	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
9	2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		2	1.5.18		2	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
10	2	1.5.08		2	1.5.07		2	1.5.22		2	1.5.08		2	1.5.08	
11	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
12	2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16	
13	2	2.5.14		1	2.5.14		2	2.5.14		2	1.5.13		2	2.5.14	
14	2	2A		2	2.5.03		1	2A		2	2A		2	2A	
15	2	IB, IC		2	1.5.07		2	1.5.27		2	1.5.22		3	1.5.22	
16	2	1C		2	1C		2	1C		2	1C		2	1C	
17	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
18	2	1.5.27		2	1.5.18		2	1.5.27		3	1.5.27		2	1.5.07	
19	2	1.5.16		2	1.5.22	1.5.08	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		2	1.5.16	
20	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.12		2	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
21	2	2.5.12		2	1.5.12		2	1.5.22		2	1.5.12		2	1.5.12	
22	1	1.5.16		2	1.5.21		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.20		1	1.5.21	
23	2	2.5.04		2	1.5.27		2	1.5.27		3	1.5.27		2	1.5.17	
24	2	1A		2	1A		2	1A		2	1A		1	1A	
25	2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC	
26	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
27	2	1.5.12		2	1.5.12		2	1.5.12		2	1.5.12		1	1.5.12	
28	3	1.5.22		2	1.5.27		2	1.5.27		2	1.5.27		2	1.5.27	
29	1	1.5.16		2	1.5.26		2	1.5.26		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
30	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
31	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
32	2	2.5.03		2	2.5.08		2	2.5.08		2	2.5.08		2	2.5.08	
33	2	2.5.12		2	2.5.12		2	2.5.08		2	2.5.12		2	2.5.12	
34	2	2.5.09		2	1.5.21	2.5.09	2	2.5.09		2	2.5.09		1	2.5.09	
35	2	1.5.02		2	1.5.02		2	1.5.02		2	1.5.03		1	1.5.03	
36	1	1.5.16	2.5.09	3	2.5.08		3	2.5.09		2	2.5.09		2	2.5.09	
37	1	1.5.16		1	2.5.12		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	
38	2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		2	2.5.11		1	1.5.16		1	2.5.10	

Table 5.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
39	1	2.5.03		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		1	2.5.03	
40	2	2.5.12		2	1.5.06		2	2.5.12		2	2.5.12		2	2.5.12	
41	2	1.5.02		2	1.5.02		2	1.5.02		2	1.5.03		1	1.5.03	
42	2	1.5.22		2	1.5.22		2	1.5.22		2	1.5.22		1	1.5.22	
43	2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16	
44	1	2.5.11		2	2.5.11		2	2.5.11		2	2.5.11		1	2.5.11	
45	2	1.5.22		2	1.5.22		2	1.5.22		2	1.5.22		2	1.5.22	
46	2	2.5.15		2	2.5.15		2	2.5.15		2	2.5.14		2	2.5.15	
47	3	1.5.22	2.5.08	3	2.5.08		3	1.5.22		3	1.5.22	2.5.08	3	1.5.22	2.5.08
48	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.21	
49	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		2	1.5.20		1	1.5.20		1	1.5.20	
50	2	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		2	1.5.16		1	1.5.21	
51	1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16		2	1.5.26		1	1.5.16		1	1.5.16	

Objective Pairwise Comparison: 0.6667

Standard Pairwise Comparison: 0.9108

Table 5.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Low		Medium		High
5		5.588235		32

1	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.17	
2	2.5.09	2.5.09	2.5.09	2.5.09	2.5.09	
3	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	
4	1.5.27	1.5.27	1.5.27	1.5.28	1.5.28	
5	1.5.16	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	
6	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	
7	1.5.07	1.5.07	1.5.07	1.5.07	1.5.07	
8	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	
9	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.18	
10	1.5.07	1.5.08	1.5.08	1.5.08	1.5.22	
11	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	
12	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	
13	1.5.13	2.5.14	2.5.14	2.5.14	2.5.14	
14	2A	2A	2A	2A	2.5.03	
15	IB, IC	1.5.07	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.27	
16	1C	1C	1C	1C	1C	
17	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	
18	1.5.07	1.5.18	1.5.27	1.5.27	1.5.27	
19	1.5.08	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.22
20	1.5.12	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	
21	1.5.12	1.5.12	1.5.12	1.5.22	2.5.12	
22	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.20	1.5.21	1.5.21	
23	1.5.17	1.5.27	1.5.27	1.5.27	2.5.04	
24	1A	1A	1A	1A	1A	
25	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	
26	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	
27	1.5.12	1.5.12	1.5.12	1.5.12	1.5.12	
28	1.5.22	1.5.27	1.5.27	1.5.27	1.5.27	
29	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.26	1.5.26	
30	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	
31	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	
32	2.5.03	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	
33	2.5.08	2.5.12	2.5.12	2.5.12	2.5.12	
34	1.5.21	2.5.09	2.5.09	2.5.09	2.5.09	2.5.09
35	1.5.02	1.5.02	1.5.02	1.5.03	1.5.03	
36	1.5.16	2.5.08	2.5.09	2.5.09	2.5.09	2.5.09
37	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	2.5.12	
38	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	2.5.10	2.5.11	

Table 5.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

39	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	2.5.03	2.5.03					
40	1.5.06	2.5.12	2.5.12	2.5.12	2.5.12					
41	1.5.02	1.5.02	1.5.02	1.5.03	1.5.03					
42	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22					
43	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16					
44	2.5.11	2.5.11	2.5.11	2.5.11	2.5.11					
45	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22					
46	2.5.14	2.5.15	2.5.15	2.5.15	2.5.15					
47	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22
	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	1.5.22	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	
	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	
	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08	2.5.08						
48	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.21					
49	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.20	1.5.20	1.5.20					
50	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.21					
51	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.16	1.5.26					

Table 5.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Low		Medium		High
0		5.588235		92

Goal 1																				
1A	24	24	24	24	24															
1.5.01																				
1.5.02	35	35	35	41	41	41														
1.5.03	35	35	41	41																
1.5.04																				
1.5.05																				
1.5.06	40																			
IB, IC	15	25	25	25	25	25														
1.5.07	7	7	7	7	7	10	15	18												
1.5.08	10	10	10	19																
1.5.09																				
1.5.10																				
1.5.11																				
1.5.12	20	21	21	21	27	27	27	27	27											
1.5.13	13																			
1.5.14																				
1.5.15																				
1C	16	16	16	16	16															
1.5.16	1	1	1	1	5	6	6	6	6	6	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	11
	11	11	11	11	12	12	12	12	12	17	17	17	17	17	19	19	19	19	20	
	20	20	20	22	22	26	26	26	26	26	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	31	
	31	31	31	31	36	37	37	37	37	38	38	38	39	39	39	43	43	43	43	
	43	48	48	48	48	49	49	50	50	50	50	51	51	51	51					
1.5.17	1	23																		
1.5.18	9	18																		
1.5.19																				
1.5.20	22	49	49	49																
1.5.21	22	22	34	48	50															
1.5.22	5	5	5	5	10	15	15	19	21	28	42	42	42	42	42	45	45	45	45	45
	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47				
1.5.23																				
1.5.24																				
1.5.25																				
1.5.26	29	29	51																	
1.5.27	4	4	4	15	18	18	18	23	23	23	28	28	28	28						
1.5.28	4	4																		
Goal 2																				

Table 5.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

2A	14	14	14	14																	
2.5.01																					
2.5.02																					
2.5.03	14	32	39	39																	
2.5.04	23																				
2.5.05																					
2.5.06																					
2.5.07																					
2.5.08	3	3	3	3	3	32	32	32	32	33	36	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47
	47	47	47	47	47	47	47														
2.5.09	2	2	2	2	2	34	34	34	34	34	36	36	36	36							
2.5.10	38																				
2.5.11	38	44	44	44	44	44															
2.5.12	21	33	33	33	33	37	40	40	40	40											
2.5.13																					
2B																					
2.5.14	13	13	13	13	46																
2.5.15	46	46	46	46																	

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Low		Medium		High
1		2		5

Goal 1														
1A	24:5													
1.5.01														
1.5.02	35:3	41:3												
1.5.03	35:2	41:2												
1.5.04														
1.5.05														
1.5.06	40:1													
IB, IC	15:1	25:5												
1.5.07	7:5	10:1	15:1	18:1										
1.5.08	10:3	19:1												
1.5.09														
1.5.10														
1.5.11														
1.5.12	20:1	21:3	27:5											
1.5.13	13:1													
1.5.14														
1.5.15														
1C	16:5													
1.5.16	1:4	5:1	6:5	8:5	9:4	11:5	12:5	17:5	19:4	20:4	22:2	26:5	29:3	
	30:5	31:5	36:1	37:4	38:3	39:3	43:5	48:4	49:2	50:4	51:4			
1.5.17	1:1	23:1												
1.5.18	9:1	18:1												
1.5.19														
1.5.20	22:1	49:3												
1.5.21	22:2	34:1	48:1	50:1										
1.5.22	5:4	10:1	15:2	19:1	21:1	28:1	42:5	45:5	47:4					
1.5.23														
1.5.24														
1.5.25														
1.5.26	29:2	51:1												
1.5.27	4:3	15:1	18:3	23:3	28:4									
1.5.28	4:2													
Goal 2														
2A	14:4													
2.5.01														
2.5.02														
2.5.03	14:1	32:1	39:2											

Table 5.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

2.5.04	23:1				
2.5.05					
2.5.06					
2.5.07					
2.5.08	3:5	32:4	33:1	36:1	47:4
2.5.09	2:5	34:5	36:4		
2.5.10	38:1				
2.5.11	38:1	44:5			
2.5.12	21:1	33:4	37:1	40:4	
2.5.13					
2B					
2.5.14	13:4	46:1			
2.5.15	46:4				

Table 5.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Low		Medium		High
1		2		5

1	1.5.16:4	1.5.17:1		
2	2.5.09:5			
3	2.5.08:5			
4	1.5.27:3	1.5.28:2		
5	1.5.16:1	1.5.22:4		
6	1.5.16:5			
7	1.5.07:5			
8	1.5.16:5			
9	1.5.16:4	1.5.18:1		
10	1.5.07:1	1.5.08:3	1.5.22:1	
11	1.5.16:5			
12	1.5.16:5			
13	1.5.13:1	2.5.14:4		
14	2A:4	2.5.03:1		
15	IB, IC:1	1.5.07:1	1.5.22:2	1.5.27:1
16	1C:5			
17	1.5.16:5			
18	1.5.07:1	1.5.18:1	1.5.27:3	
19	1.5.08:1	1.5.16:4	1.5.22:1	
20	1.5.12:1	1.5.16:4		
21	1.5.12:3	1.5.22:1	2.5.12:1	
22	1.5.16:2	1.5.20:1	1.5.21:2	
23	1.5.17:1	1.5.27:3	2.5.04:1	
24	1A:5			
25	IB, IC:5			
26	1.5.16:5			
27	1.5.12:5			
28	1.5.22:1	1.5.27:4		
29	1.5.16:3	1.5.26:2		
30	1.5.16:5			
31	1.5.16:5			
32	2.5.03:1	2.5.08:4		
33	2.5.08:1	2.5.12:4		
34	1.5.21:1	2.5.09:5		
35	1.5.02:3	1.5.03:2		
36	1.5.16:1	2.5.08:1	2.5.09:4	
37	1.5.16:4	2.5.12:1		
38	1.5.16:3	2.5.10:1	2.5.11:1	

Table 5.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

39	1.5.16:3	2.5.03:2
40	1.5.06:1	2.5.12:4
41	1.5.02:3	1.5.03:2
42	1.5.22:5	
43	1.5.16:5	
44	2.5.11:5	
45	1.5.22:5	
46	2.5.14:1	2.5.15:4
47	1.5.22:4	2.5.08:4
48	1.5.16:4	1.5.21:1
49	1.5.16:2	1.5.20:3
50	1.5.16:4	1.5.21:1
51	1.5.16:4	1.5.26:1

IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Goal 1 [2]:													
1A [2]:	24:5 [1.8]												
1.5.01 [2]:													
1.5.02 [2]:	35:3 [2]	41:3 [2]											
1.5.03 [1]:	35:2 [1.5]	41:2 [1.5]											
1.5.04 [1]:													
1.5.05 [2]:													
1.5.06 [2]:	40:1 [2]												
IB, IC [2]:	15:1 [2]	25:5 [2]											
1.5.07 [2]:	7:5 [2]	10:1 [2]	15:1 [2]	18:1 [2]									
1.5.08 [2]:	10:3 [2]	19:1 [2]											
1.5.09 [2]:													
1.5.10 [2]:													
1.5.11 [2]:													
1.5.12 [2]:	20:1 [1]	21:3 [2]	27:5 [1.8]										
1.5.13 [3]:	13:1 [2]												
1.5.14 [3]:													
1.5.15 [2]:													
1C [2]:	16:5 [2]												
1.5.16 [2]:	1:4 [1]	5:1 [2]	6:5 [1.2]	8:5 [1]	9:4 [1.75]	11:5 [1.2]	12:5 [2]	17:5 [1]	19:4 [1.5]	20:4 [1.25]	22:2 [1]	26:5 [1]	29:3 [1]
	30:5 [1]	31:5 [1]	36:1 [1]	37:4 [1]	38:3 [1.67]	39:3 [1.33]	43:5 [2]	48:4 [1]	49:2 [1]	50:4 [1.75]	51:4 [1]		
1.5.17 [2]:	1:1 [2]	23:1 [2]											
1.5.18	9:1	18:1											

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

[2]:	[2]	[2]								
1.5.19 [2]:										
1.5.20 [2]:	22:1 [1]	49:3 [1.33]								
1.5.21 [2]:	22:2 [1.5]	34:1 [2]	48:1 [1]	50:1 [1]						
1.5.22 [3]:	5:4 [2.5]	10:1 [2]	15:2 [2.5]	19:1 [2]	21:1 [2]	28:1 [3]	42:5 [1.8]	45:5 [2]	47:4 [3]	
1.5.23 [2]:										
1.5.24 [2]:										
1.5.25 [2]:										
1.5.26 [2]:	29:2 [2]	51:1 [2]								
1.5.27 [2]:	4:3 [2]	15:1 [2]	18:3 [2.33]	23:3 [2.33]	28:4 [2]					
1.5.28 [3]:	4:2 [2]									
Goal 2 [2]:										
2A [2]:	14:4 [1.75]									
2.5.01 [2]:										
2.5.02 [2]:										
2.5.03 [2]:	14:1 [2]	32:1 [2]	39:2 [1]							
2.5.04 [3]:	23:1 [2]									
2.5.05 [3]:										
2.5.06 [3]:										
2.5.07 [2]:										
2.5.08 [3]:	3:5 [2]	32:4 [2]	33:1 [2]	36:1 [3]	47:4 [3]					
2.5.09 [3]:	2:5 [2]	34:5 [1.8]	36:4 [2]							
2.5.10 [3]:	38:1 [1]									
2.5.11 [2]:	38:1 [2]	44:5 [1.6]								
2.5.12 [2]:	21:1 [2]	33:4 [2]	37:1 [1]	40:4 [2]						
2.5.13 [1]:										

Table 5.13

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

2B [2]:		
2.5.14 [2]:	13:4 [1.75]	46:1 [2]
2.5.15 [2]:	46:4 [2]	

Table 6.1
Categorical Concurrence Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Level by Objective			Hits		Cat. Concurr.
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Level	# of objs by Level	% w/in std by Level	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	25	1	3	12	42.8	2.32	YES
			2	18	75			
			3	3	12			
Goal 2 - Literature	2	15	2	6	40	11.4	2.42	YES
			3	9	60			
Total	5	40	1	3	7	54.2	0.4	
			2	24	61			
			3	12	30			

Table 6.2
Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Level of Item w.r.t. Standard						DOK Consistency
					% Under		% At		% Above		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	25	42.8	2.32	23	35	77	35	1	6	YES
Goal 2 - Literature	2	15	11.4	2.42	38	47	62	47	0	0	YES
Total	5	40	54.2	0.4	28	40	71	40	1	5	

Table 6.3

Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence and Balance of Representation Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Range of Objectives				Rng. of Know.	Balance Index				Bal. of Represent.
					# Objs Hit		% of Total			% Hits in Std/Ttl Hits		Index		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	25	42.8	2.32	11.8	1.33	47	5	WEAK	79	4	0.59	0.04	NO
Goal 2 - Literature	2	15	11.4	2.42	6.8	0.75	45	5	WEAK	21	4	0.77	0.05	YES
Total	5	40	54.2	0.4	9.3	2.72	46	5		50	29	0.68	0.10	

Table 6.4

*Summary of Attainment of Acceptable Alignment Level on Four Content Focus Criteria
as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51*

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	WEAK	NO
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	YES	WEAK	YES

Table 6.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
1	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	2	2	2	2	2
4	2	2	2	2	2
5	1	1	2	1	1
6	2	2	1	2	2
7	1	1	1	1	1
8	2	2	2	2	1
9	1	1	1	1	1
10	2	2	2	2	2
11	2	2	2	2	2
12	2	1	2	2	2
13	2	1	2	2	1
14	1	1	2	1	1
15	2	2	2	2	2
16	2	2	2	2	3
17	1	2	1	1	1
18	2	2	2	2	1
19	2	2	2	2	2
20	2	2	2	2	2
21	2	2	2	2	2
22	2	2	3	2	2
23	2	2	2	2	2
24	3	1	3	2	2
25	2	2	2	2	2
26	1	1	1	1	1
27	2	2	2	2	2
28	2	2	2	2	2
29	2	2	2	2	2
30	2	2	2	2	2
31	2	2	3	2	2
32	2	2	2	2	2
33	2	2	2	2	1
34	2	2	2	2	1
35	2	2	3	2	1
36	2	2	2	2	2
37	3	2	3	2	2
38	2	1	2	2	1
39	2	2	3	2	2
40	1	1	2	2	1

Table 6.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
41	3	3	3	2	2
42	2	2	2	2	1
43	3	2	2	2	1
44	2	2	3	3	2
45	3	2	2	3	2
46	2	2	2	2	2
47	3	3	3	2	3
48	1	1	2	1	1
49	2	1	2	2	1
50	2	2	2	2	2
51	2	1	2	2	1

Intraclass Correlation: 0.8375

Pairwise Comparison: 0.7255

Table 6.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
1	2	2.6.08		2	2.6.08		2	1.6.14		2	2.6.08		2	2.6.08	
2	2	2.6.10		2	2.6.02		2	2.6.10		2	2.6.10		2	2.6.10	
3	2	2.6.14		2	2.6.14		2	2.6.14		2	2.6.14		2	2.6.14	
4	2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC	
5	1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		2	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	
6	2	1.6.14		2	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.14	
7	1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	
8	2	1.6.03		2	1.6.03		2	1.6.03		2	1.6.03		1	1.6.05	
9	1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	
10	2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19	
11	2	1.6.19		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.07		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.14	
12	2	2.6.08		1	1.6.08		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.08		2	1.6.08	
13	2	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		2	1.6.08		2	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	
14	1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		2	1.6.22		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	
15	2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.14	
16	2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	1.6.12		2	IB, IC		3	1.6.12	
17	1	1.6.14		2	1.6.18		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	
18	2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		1	1.6.19	
19	2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC	
20	2	1.6.12		2	1.6.12		2	1.6.16		2	1.6.15		2	1.6.12	
21	2	2.6.11		2	2.6.11		2	1.6.03		2	2.6.11		2	1.6.23	
22	2	1.6.14		2	2.6.07		3	1.6.23		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.23	
23	2	1.6.14		2	2.6.08		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.18	
24	3	1.6.23		1	1.6.23		3	1.6.23		2	1.6.23		2	1.6.23	
25	2	2.6.07		2	2.6.07		2	2.6.07		2	2.6.07		2	2.6.07	
26	1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	
27	2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.14	
28	2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19	
29	2	1.6.07		2	1.6.08		2	1.6.07		2	1.6.07		2	1.6.07	
30	2	1.6.07		2	1.6.07		2	1.6.07		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.07	
31	2	2.6.09		2	2.6.09		3	2.6.09		2	2.6.09		2	2.6.09	
32	2	2.6.08		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.15		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.14	
33	2	1.6.04		2	1.6.03		2	1.6.04		2	1.6.04		1	1.6.04	
34	2	1.6.03		2	1.6.03		2	1.6.03		2	1.6.03		1	1.6.03	
35	2	2.6.08		2	2.6.08		3	2.6.08		2	2.6.08		1	2.6.08	
36	2	1.6.18		2	1.6.18		2	1.6.18		2	1.6.18		2	1.6.18	
37	3	2.6.07		2	1.6.19		3	2.6.07		2	2.6.07		2	2.6.07	
38	2	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	

Table 6.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
39	2	1.6.23		2	1.6.23	2.6.07	3	1.6.23		2	1.6.23		2	1.6.23	
40	1	1.6.14		1	1.6.14		2	2.6.07		2	1.6.17		1	1.6.14	
41	3	1.6.19		3	1.6.19		3	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19	
42	2	1.6.03		2	1.6.03		2	1.6.06		2	1.6.03		1	1.6.05	
43	3	2.6.08		2	2.6.08		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	
44	2	2.6.09		2	2.6.09		3	2.6.09		3	1.6.19		2	1.6.14	
45	3	2.6.04		2	1.6.19		2	1.6.19		3	1.6.19		2	1.6.19	
46	2	2.6.15		2	2.6.15		2	2.6.15		2	2.6.14		2	2.6.15	
47	3	1.6.19		3	1.6.19		3	2.6.04		2	1.6.19		3	1.6.19	
48	1	1.6.22		1	1.6.14		2	1.6.22		1	1.6.14		1	1.6.22	
49	2	1.6.19		1	1.6.14		2	1.6.14		2	1.6.14		1	1.6.14	
50	2	1.6.22		2	1.6.22		2	1.6.22		2	1.6.22		2	1.6.22	
51	2	1.6.03		1	1.6.05		2	1.6.03		2	1.6.03		1	1.6.05	

Objective Pairwise Comparison: 0.6673

Standard Pairwise Comparison: 0.8872

Table 6.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Low		Medium		High
5		5.313725		20

1	1.6.14	2.6.08	2.6.08	2.6.08	2.6.08
2	2.6.02	2.6.10	2.6.10	2.6.10	2.6.10
3	2.6.14	2.6.14	2.6.14	2.6.14	2.6.14
4	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC
5	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14
6	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14
7	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14
8	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.05
9	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14
10	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19
11	1.6.07	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.19
12	1.6.08	1.6.08	1.6.08	1.6.19	2.6.08
13	1.6.08	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14
14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.22
15	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19
16	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	1.6.12	1.6.12
17	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.18
18	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19
19	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC
20	1.6.12	1.6.12	1.6.12	1.6.15	1.6.16
21	1.6.03	1.6.23	2.6.11	2.6.11	2.6.11
22	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.23	1.6.23	2.6.07
23	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.18	2.6.08
24	1.6.23	1.6.23	1.6.23	1.6.23	1.6.23
25	2.6.07	2.6.07	2.6.07	2.6.07	2.6.07
26	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14
27	1.6.14	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19
28	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19
29	1.6.07	1.6.07	1.6.07	1.6.07	1.6.08
30	1.6.07	1.6.07	1.6.07	1.6.07	1.6.14
31	2.6.09	2.6.09	2.6.09	2.6.09	2.6.09
32	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.15	2.6.08
33	1.6.03	1.6.04	1.6.04	1.6.04	1.6.04
34	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.03
35	2.6.08	2.6.08	2.6.08	2.6.08	2.6.08
36	1.6.18	1.6.18	1.6.18	1.6.18	1.6.18
37	1.6.19	2.6.07	2.6.07	2.6.07	2.6.07
38	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.19

Table 6.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

39	1.6.23	1.6.23	1.6.23	1.6.23	1.6.23	2.6.07				
40	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.17	2.6.07					
41	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19					
42	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.05	1.6.06					
43	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	2.6.08	2.6.08					
44	1.6.14	1.6.19	2.6.09	2.6.09	2.6.09					
45	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	2.6.04					
46	2.6.14	2.6.15	2.6.15	2.6.15	2.6.15					
47	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19
	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	1.6.19	2.6.04	2.6.04	2.6.04	
	2.6.04									
48	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.22	1.6.22	1.6.22					
49	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.14	1.6.19					
50	1.6.22	1.6.22	1.6.22	1.6.22	1.6.22					
51	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.03	1.6.05	1.6.05					

Table 6.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Low		Medium		High
0		5.765957		70

Goal 1																				
1A																				
1.6.01																				
1.6.02																				
1.6.03	8	8	8	8	21	33	34	34	34	34	34	42	42	42	51	51	51			
1.6.04	33	33	33	33																
1.6.05	8	42	51	51																
1.6.06	42																			
IB, IC	4	4	4	4	4	16	16	16	19	19	19	19	19							
1.6.07	11	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	30											
1.6.08	12	12	12	13	29															
1.6.09																				
1.6.10																				
1.6.11																				
1.6.12	16	16	20	20	20															
1.6.13																				
1C																				
1.6.14	1	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	9	9	9	9
	9	11	11	11	13	13	13	13	14	14	14	14	15	15	17	17	17	17	22	
	22	23	23	23	26	26	26	26	26	27	30	32	32	32	38	38	38	38	40	
	40	40	43	43	43	44	48	48	49	49	49	49								
1.6.15	20	32																		
1.6.16	20																			
1.6.17	40																			
1.6.18	17	23	36	36	36	36	36													
1.6.19	10	10	10	10	10	11	12	15	15	15	18	18	18	18	18	27	27	27	27	28
	28	28	28	28	37	38	41	41	41	41	41	44	45	45	45	45	47	47	47	
	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	49					
1.6.20																				
1.6.21																				
1.6.22	14	48	48	48	50	50	50	50	50											
1.6.23	21	22	22	24	24	24	24	24	39	39	39	39	39							
1.6.24																				
Goal 2																				
2A																				
2.6.01																				
2.6.02	2																			
2.6.03																				

Table 6.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

2.6.04	45	47	47	47	47										
2.6.05															
2.6.06															
2.6.07	22	25	25	25	25	25	37	37	37	37	39	40			
2.6.08	1	1	1	1	12	23	32	35	35	35	35	35	43	43	
2.6.09	31	31	31	31	31	44	44	44							
2.6.10	2	2	2	2											
2.6.11	21	21	21												
2.6.12															
2.6.13															
2B															
2.6.14	3	3	3	3	3	46									
2.6.15	46	46	46	46											

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Goal 1														
1A														
1.6.01														
1.6.02														
1.6.03	8:4	21:1	33:1	34:5	42:3	51:3								
1.6.04	33:4													
1.6.05	8:1	42:1	51:2											
1.6.06	42:1													
IB, IC	4:5	16:3	19:5											
1.6.07	11:1	29:4	30:4											
1.6.08	12:3	13:1	29:1											
1.6.09														
1.6.10														
1.6.11														
1.6.12	16:2	20:3												
1.6.13														
1C														
1.6.14	1:1	5:5	6:5	7:5	9:5	11:3	13:4	14:4	15:2	17:4	22:2	23:3	26:5	
	27:1	30:1	32:3	38:4	40:3	43:3	44:1	48:2	49:4					
1.6.15	20:1	32:1												
1.6.16	20:1													
1.6.17	40:1													
1.6.18	17:1	23:1	36:5											
1.6.19	10:5	11:1	12:1	15:3	18:5	27:4	28:5	37:1	38:1	41:5	44:1	45:4	47:4	
	49:1													
1.6.20														
1.6.21														
1.6.22	14:1	48:3	50:5											
1.6.23	21:1	22:2	24:5	39:5										
1.6.24														
Goal 2														
2A														
2.6.01														
2.6.02	2:1													
2.6.03														
2.6.04	45:1	47:1												
2.6.05														
2.6.06														

Table 6.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

2.6.07	22:1	25:5	37:4	39:1	40:1	
2.6.08	1:4	12:1	23:1	32:1	35:5	43:2
2.6.09	31:5	44:3				
2.6.10	2:4					
2.6.11	21:3					
2.6.12						
2.6.13						
2B						
2.6.14	3:5	46:1				
2.6.15	46:4					

Table 6.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Low		Medium		High
1		2		5

1	1.6.14:1	2.6.08:4	
2	2.6.02:1	2.6.10:4	
3	2.6.14:5		
4	IB, IC:5		
5	1.6.14:5		
6	1.6.14:5		
7	1.6.14:5		
8	1.6.03:4	1.6.05:1	
9	1.6.14:5		
10	1.6.19:5		
11	1.6.07:1	1.6.14:3	1.6.19:1
12	1.6.08:3	1.6.19:1	2.6.08:1
13	1.6.08:1	1.6.14:4	
14	1.6.14:4	1.6.22:1	
15	1.6.14:2	1.6.19:3	
16	IB, IC:3	1.6.12:2	
17	1.6.14:4	1.6.18:1	
18	1.6.19:5		
19	IB, IC:5		
20	1.6.12:3	1.6.15:1	1.6.16:1
21	1.6.03:1	1.6.23:1	2.6.11:3
22	1.6.14:2	1.6.23:2	2.6.07:1
23	1.6.14:3	1.6.18:1	2.6.08:1
24	1.6.23:5		
25	2.6.07:5		
26	1.6.14:5		
27	1.6.14:1	1.6.19:4	
28	1.6.19:5		
29	1.6.07:4	1.6.08:1	
30	1.6.07:4	1.6.14:1	
31	2.6.09:5		
32	1.6.14:3	1.6.15:1	2.6.08:1
33	1.6.03:1	1.6.04:4	
34	1.6.03:5		
35	2.6.08:5		
36	1.6.18:5		
37	1.6.19:1	2.6.07:4	
38	1.6.14:4	1.6.19:1	

Table 6.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

39	1.6.23:5	2.6.07:1	
40	1.6.14:3	1.6.17:1	2.6.07:1
41	1.6.19:5		
42	1.6.03:3	1.6.05:1	1.6.06:1
43	1.6.14:3	2.6.08:2	
44	1.6.14:1	1.6.19:1	2.6.09:3
45	1.6.19:4	2.6.04:1	
46	2.6.14:1	2.6.15:4	
47	1.6.19:4	2.6.04:1	
48	1.6.14:2	1.6.22:3	
49	1.6.14:4	1.6.19:1	
50	1.6.22:5		
51	1.6.03:3	1.6.05:2	

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

Low DOK		Matched DOK		High DOK
1		2		5

														Goal 1 [2]:																					
														1A [2]:																					
														1.6.01 [2]:																					
														1.6.02 [1]:																					
1.6.03 [2]:		8:4 [2]		21:1 [2]		33:1 [2]		34:5 [1.8]		42:3 [2]		51:3 [2]																							
														1.6.04 [2]:		33:4 [1.75]																			
														1.6.05 [1]:		8:1 [1]		42:1 [1]		51:2 [1]															
														1.6.06 [2]:		42:1 [2]																			
														IB, IC [2]:		4:5 [2]		16:3 [2]		19:5 [2]															
														1.6.07 [2]:		11:1 [2]		29:4 [2]		30:4 [2]															
														1.6.08 [2]:		12:3 [1.67]		13:1 [2]		29:1 [2]															
														1.6.09 [1]:																					
														1.6.10 [2]:																					
														1.6.11 [2]:																					
														1.6.12 [2]:		16:2 [2.5]		20:3 [2]																	
														1.6.13 [2]:																					
														1C [2]:																					
1.6.14 [2]:		1:1 [2]		5:5 [1.2]		6:5 [1.8]		7:5 [1]		9:5 [1]		11:3 [2]		13:4 [1.5]		14:4 [1]		15:2 [2]		17:4 [1]		22:2 [2]		23:3 [2]		26:5 [1]									
																27:1 [2]		30:1 [2]		32:3 [2]		38:4 [1.5]		40:3 [1]		43:3 [1.67]		44:1 [2]		48:2 [1]		49:4 [1.5]			
														1.6.15 [2]:		20:1 [2]		32:1 [2]																	
														1.6.16 [2]:		20:1 [2]																			
														1.6.17 [2]:		40:1 [2]																			
														1.6.18 [2]:		17:1 [2]		23:1 [2]		36:5 [2]															

Table 6.13

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

					[2]:	[2]	[2]	[2]						
1.6.19	10:5	11:1	12:1	15:3	18:5	27:4	28:5	37:1	38:1	41:5	44:1	45:4	47:4	
[3]:	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[1.8]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2.6]	[3]	[2.25]	[2.75]	
							49:1							
							[2]							
							1.6.20							
							[2]:							
							1.6.21							
							[2]:							
						1.6.22	14:1	48:3	50:5					
						[2]:	[2]	[1.33]	[2]					
						1.6.23	21:1	22:2	24:5	39:5				
						[3]:	[2]	[2.5]	[2.2]	[2.2]				
							1.6.24							
							[3]:							
							Goal							
							2 [3]:							
							2A							
							[3]:							
							2.6.01							
							[2]:							
						2.6.02	2:1							
						[3]:	[2]							
							2.6.03							
							[3]:							
						2.6.04	45:1	47:1						
						[3]:	[3]	[3]						
							2.6.05							
							[3]:							
							2.6.06							
							[2]:							
						2.6.07	22:1	25:5	37:4	39:1	40:1			
						[3]:	[2]	[2]	[2.5]	[2]	[2]			
						2.6.08	1:4	12:1	23:1	32:1	35:5	43:2		
						[3]:	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2.5]		
							2.6.09	31:5	44:3					
							[3]:	[2.2]	[2.33]					
							2.6.10	2:4						
							[2]:	[2]						
							2.6.11	21:3						
							[2]:	[2]						
							2.6.12							
							[3]:							
							2.6.13							
							[3]:							
							2B							
							[2]:							
						2.6.14	3:5	46:1						
						[2]:	[2]	[2]						
							2.6.15	46:4						
							[2]:	[2]						

Table 7.1

Categorical Concurrence Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers

IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Level by Objective			Hits		Cat. Concurr.
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Level	# of objs by Level	% w/in std by Level	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	25	1	1	4	40.8	1.17	YES
			2	17	70			
			3	6	25			
Goal 2 - Literature	2	14	2	6	42	17.6	3.14	YES
			3	8	57			
Total	5	39	1	1	2	58.4	3.83	
			2	23	60			
			3	14	36			

Table 7.2

Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers

IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Level of Item w.r.t. Standard						DOK Consistency
					% Under		% At		% Above		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	25	40.8	1.17	35	45	59	46	6	24	YES
Goal 2 - Literature	2	14	17.6	3.14	55	44	45	44	0	0	WEAK
Total	5	39	58.4	3.83	44	46	53	46	4	18	

Table 7.3

Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence and Balance of Representation Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Range of Objectives				Rng. of Know.	Balance Index				Bal. of Represent.
					# Objs Hit		% of Total			% Hits in Std/Ttl Hits		Index		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	25	40.8	1.17	13.2	0.75	53	3	YES	70	4	0.60	0.03	WEAK
Goal 2 - Literature	2	14	17.6	3.14	9.4	0.8	67	6	YES	30	4	0.71	0.08	YES
Total	5	39	58.4	3.83	11.3	2.05	60	8		50	20	0.65	0.08	

Table 7.4

*Summary of Attainment of Acceptable Alignment Level on Four Content Focus Criteria
as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51*

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	YES	WEAK
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	WEAK	YES	YES

Table 7.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	2	2	2	2	2
4	2	2	2	2	2
5	2	2	2	2	1
6	2	2	1	2	2
7	2	2	1	2	2
8	2	2	2	2	3
9	2	2	2	2	1
10	2	2	3	2	2
11	1	1	1	1	1
12	2	2	2	2	2
13	3	1	2	1	1
14	2	2	2	2	1
15	2	2	2	2	2
16	1	1	1	1	1
17	2	2	3	2	2
18	2	2	2	2	2
19	2	2	2	2	2
20	2	2	3	2	2
21	1	1	1	1	1
22	2	2	2	1	1
23	2	2	2	2	2
24	2	1	1	1	1
25	2	2	1	2	2
26	2	2	2	2	1
27	1	1	1	1	1
28	2	2	2	2	2
29	2	2	2	3	2
30	2	2	2	2	2
31	2	2	2	2	1
32	1	1	1	1	1
33	3	3	2	2	2
34	2	2	2	2	2
35	3	3	3	2	3
36	2	2	2	2	2
37	2	2	2	2	2
38	2	2	2	2	1
39	3	3	3	2	3
40	3	1	2	2	2

Table 7.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
41	2	2	2	2	2
42	2	2	2	3	2
43	2	2	2	2	2
44	2	2	2	2	1
45	3	3	3	3	2
46	2	2	2	2	1
47	3	3	2	3	3
48	2	1	2	1	1
49	2	1	2	1	1
50	2	1	2	2	1
51	2	2	2	2	2

Intraclass Correlation: 0.8758

Pairwise Comparison: 0.7412

Table 7.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj 0	S2Obj 0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj 1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj 2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj 3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj 4
1	1	1.7.15			1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15	
2	2	1.7.20			2	1.7.20		2	1.7.15		2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20	
3	2	IB, IC			2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC	
4	2	1.7.21			2	1.7.21		2	1.7.21		2	1.7.21		2	1.7.21	
5	2	1.7.15			2	1.7.15		2	1.7.15		2	1.7.15		1	1.7.15	
6	2	2.7.03			2	2.7.03		1	2.7.03		2	2.7.03		2	2.7.03	
7	2	2.7.11			2	1.7.04		1	1.7.15		2	2.7.11		2	2.7.11	
8	2	1.7.20			2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20		3	2.7.11	
9	2	2.7.10			2	1.7.23	2.7.10	2	2.7.10		2	2.7.10		1	2.7.10	
10	2	1.7.23			2	1.7.23		3	1.7.23		2	1.7.23		2	1.7.23	
11	1	1.7.15			1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15	
12	2	1.7.03			2	1.7.03		2	1.7.03		2	IB, IC		2	1.7.03	
13	3	1.7.20			1	1.7.15		2	1.7.22		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15	
14	2	1.7.08			2	1.7.08		2	1.7.08		2	1.7.08		1	1.7.08	
15	2	1.7.20			2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20	
16	1	1.7.15			1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.18	
17	2	1.7.07			2	1.7.20		3	2.7.03		2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20	
18	2	2.7.06			2	2.7.06		2	2.7.06		2	2.7.06		2	2.7.06	
19	2	1.7.07			2	1.7.07		2	1.7.07		2	1.7.07		2	1.7.07	
20	2	1.7.12			2	1.7.20		3	1.7.12		2	1.7.12		2	1.7.12	
21	1	2.7.01			1	2.7.01		1	2.7.01		1	2.7.01		1	2.7.01	
22	2	2.7.09			2	1.7.16		2	2.7.09		1	2.7.09		1	2.7.09	
23	2	1.7.19			2	2.7.09		2	1.7.19		2	2.7.07		2	1.7.19	
24	2	2.7.07			1	1.7.15	2.7.07	1	1.7.15		1	2.7.06		1	2.7.07	
25	2	1.7.03			2	1.7.03		1	1.7.03		2	IB, IC		2	1.7.03	
26	2	1.7.03			2	1.7.03		2	1.7.03		2	1.7.03		1	1.7.04	
27	1	1.7.15			1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15	
28	2	1.7.07			2	1.7.20		2	1.7.07		2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20	
29	2	1.7.15			2	2.7.07	1.7.20	2	1.7.15		3	1.7.15		2	1.7.15	
30	2	1.7.15			2	1.7.15		2	1.7.15		2	1.7.15		2	1.7.15	
31	2	1.7.05			2	1.7.03		2	1.7.03		2	1.7.03		1	1.7.03	
32	1	1.7.15			1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15		1	1.7.15	
33	3	2.7.08			3	2.7.08		2	2.7.08		2	2.7.08		2	1.7.20	
34	2	1.7.24			2	1.7.24		2	1.7.09		2	1.7.24		2	2.7.06	
35	3	2.7.06			3	2.7.02		3	1.7.20		2	2.7.06		3	1.7.20	
36	2	1.7.20			2	1.7.20	2.7.06	2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20		2	1.7.20	
37	2	1.7.20			2	2.7.07		2	2.7.10		2	2.7.07		2	2.7.07	

Table 7.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj 0	S2Obj 0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj 1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj 2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj 3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj 4
38	2	1.7.05			2	1.7.03		2	2.7.10		2	1.7.03		1	1.7.03	
39	3	2.7.08			3	2.7.08		3	2.7.08		2	1.7.20		3	2.7.12	
40	3	1.7.20			1	1.7.15		2	1.7.19		2	1.7.15		2	1.7.15	
41	2	1.7.07			2	1.7.07		2	1.7.07		2	1.7.07		2	1.7.07	
42	2	2.7.06			2	2.7.06		2	2.7.06		3	2.7.06		2	1.7.20	
43	2	2.7.08			2	2.7.08		2	2.7.08		2	2.7.08		2	2.7.08	
44	2	1.7.05			2	1.7.05		2	1.7.05		2	1.7.05		1	1.7.15	
45	3	2.7.12			3	2.7.12		3	2.7.12		3	2.7.12		2	2.7.12	
46	2	2.7.13			2	1.7.13		2	2.7.13		2	2.7.13		1	2.7.13	
47	3	1.7.20	2.7.03	2.7.06	3	2.7.07	1.7.20	2	1.7.20		3	1.7.20	2.7.07	3	1.7.20	
48	2	1.7.09			1	1.7.09		2	1.7.10		1	1.7.09		1	1.7.09	
49	2	1.7.09			1	1.7.09		2	1.7.10		1	1.7.09		1	1.7.09	
50	2	1.7.09			1	1.7.09		2	1.7.10		2	1.7.09		1	1.7.09	
51	2	1.7.09	1.7.15		2	1.7.15		2	1.7.09		2	1.7.09	1.7.15	2	1.7.15	

Objective Pairwise Comparison: 0.6374
Standard Pairwise Comparison: 0.8449

Table 7.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Low		Medium		High
5		5.72549		36

1	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	
2	1.7.15	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	
3	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	
4	1.7.21	1.7.21	1.7.21	1.7.21	1.7.21	
5	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	
6	2.7.03	2.7.03	2.7.03	2.7.03	2.7.03	
7	1.7.04	1.7.15	2.7.11	2.7.11	2.7.11	
8	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	2.7.11	
9	1.7.23	2.7.10	2.7.10	2.7.10	2.7.10	2.7.10
10	1.7.23	1.7.23	1.7.23	1.7.23	1.7.23	
11	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	
12	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.03	IB, IC	
13	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.20	1.7.22	
14	1.7.08	1.7.08	1.7.08	1.7.08	1.7.08	
15	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	
16	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.18	
17	1.7.07	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	2.7.03	
18	2.7.06	2.7.06	2.7.06	2.7.06	2.7.06	
19	1.7.07	1.7.07	1.7.07	1.7.07	1.7.07	
20	1.7.12	1.7.12	1.7.12	1.7.12	1.7.20	
21	2.7.01	2.7.01	2.7.01	2.7.01	2.7.01	
22	1.7.16	2.7.09	2.7.09	2.7.09	2.7.09	
23	1.7.19	1.7.19	1.7.19	2.7.07	2.7.09	
24	1.7.15	1.7.15	2.7.06	2.7.07	2.7.07	2.7.07
25	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.03	IB, IC	
26	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.04	
27	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	
28	1.7.07	1.7.07	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	
29	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.20	2.7.07
30	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	
31	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.05	
32	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	
33	1.7.20	2.7.08	2.7.08	2.7.08	2.7.08	
34	1.7.09	1.7.24	1.7.24	1.7.24	2.7.06	
35	1.7.20	1.7.20	2.7.02	2.7.06	2.7.06	
36	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	2.7.06
37	1.7.20	2.7.07	2.7.07	2.7.07	2.7.10	
38	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.03	1.7.05	2.7.10	

Table 7.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

39	1.7.20	2.7.08	2.7.08	2.7.08	2.7.12					
40	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.19	1.7.20					
41	1.7.07	1.7.07	1.7.07	1.7.07	1.7.07					
42	1.7.20	2.7.06	2.7.06	2.7.06	2.7.06					
43	2.7.08	2.7.08	2.7.08	2.7.08	2.7.08					
44	1.7.05	1.7.05	1.7.05	1.7.05	1.7.15					
45	2.7.12	2.7.12	2.7.12	2.7.12	2.7.12					
46	1.7.13	2.7.13	2.7.13	2.7.13	2.7.13					
47	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20
	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	1.7.20	
	1.7.20	2.7.03	2.7.03	2.7.03	2.7.03	2.7.06	2.7.06	2.7.06	2.7.06	
	2.7.07	2.7.07	2.7.07	2.7.07	2.7.07	2.7.07	2.7.07	2.7.07		
48	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.10					
49	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.10					
50	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.10					
51	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.09	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15	1.7.15			

Table 7.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Low		Medium		High
0		6.347826		54

Goal 1																				
1A																				
1.7.01																				
1.7.02																				
1.7.03	12	12	12	12	25	25	25	25	26	26	26	26	31	31	31	31	38	38	38	
1.7.04	7	26																		
1.7.05	31	38	44	44	44	44														
1.7.06																				
IB, IC	3	3	3	3	3	12	25													
1.7.07	17	19	19	19	19	19	28	28	41	41	41	41	41							
1.7.08	14	14	14	14	14															
1.7.09	34	48	48	48	48	49	49	49	49	50	50	50	50	51	51	51				
1.7.10	48	49	50																	
1.7.11																				
1.7.12	20	20	20	20																
1.7.13	46																			
1.7.14																				
1C																				
1.7.15	1	1	1	1	1	2	5	5	5	5	5	7	11	11	11	11	11	13	13	13
	16	16	16	16	24	24	27	27	27	27	27	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	
	30	32	32	32	32	32	40	40	40	44	51	51	51	51						
1.7.16	22																			
1.7.17																				
1.7.18	16																			
1.7.19	23	23	23	40																
1.7.20	2	2	2	2	8	8	8	8	13	15	15	15	15	15	17	17	17	20	28	28
	28	29	33	35	35	36	36	36	36	36	37	39	40	42	47	47	47	47	47	
	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47					
1.7.21	4	4	4	4	4															
1.7.22	13																			
1.7.23	9	10	10	10	10	10														
1.7.24	34	34	34																	
Goal 2																				
2A																				
2.7.01	21	21	21	21	21															
2.7.02	35																			
2.7.03	6	6	6	6	6	17	47	47	47	47										
2.7.04																				

Table 7.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

2.7.05																		
2.7.06	18	18	18	18	18	24	34	35	35	36	42	42	42	42	47	47	47	47
2.7.07	23	24	24	24	29	37	37	37	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47		
2.7.08	33	33	33	33	39	39	39	43	43	43	43	43						
2.7.09	22	22	22	22	23													
2.7.10	9	9	9	9	9	37	38											
2.7.11	7	7	7	8														
2.7.12	39	45	45	45	45	45												
2B																		
2.7.13	46	46	46	46														
2.7.14																		

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Goal 1														
1A														
1.7.01														
1.7.02														
1.7.03	12:4	25:4	26:4	31:4	38:3									
1.7.04	7:1	26:1												
1.7.05	31:1	38:1	44:4											
1.7.06														
IB, IC	3:5	12:1	25:1											
1.7.07	17:1	19:5	28:2	41:5										
1.7.08	14:5													
1.7.09	34:1	48:4	49:4	50:4	51:3									
1.7.10	48:1	49:1	50:1											
1.7.11														
1.7.12	20:4													
1.7.13	46:1													
1.7.14														
1C														
1.7.15	1:5	2:1	5:5	7:1	11:5	13:3	16:4	24:2	27:5	29:4	30:5	32:5	40:3	
	44:1	51:4												
1.7.16	22:1													
1.7.17														
1.7.18	16:1													
1.7.19	23:3	40:1												
1.7.20	2:4	8:4	13:1	15:5	17:3	20:1	28:3	29:1	33:1	35:2	36:5	37:1	39:1	
	40:1	42:1	47:5											
1.7.21	4:5													
1.7.22	13:1													
1.7.23	9:1	10:5												
1.7.24	34:3													
Goal 2														
2A														
2.7.01	21:5													
2.7.02	35:1													
2.7.03	6:5	17:1	47:1											
2.7.04														
2.7.05														
2.7.06	18:5	24:1	34:1	35:2	36:1	42:4	47:1							

Table 7.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

2.7.07	23:1	24:3	29:1	37:3	47:2
2.7.08	33:4	39:3	43:5		
2.7.09	22:4	23:1			
2.7.10	9:5	37:1	38:1		
2.7.11	7:3	8:1			
2.7.12	39:1	45:5			
2B					
2.7.13	46:4				
2.7.14					

Table 7.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Low		Medium		High
1		2		5

1	1.7.15:5		
2	1.7.15:1	1.7.20:4	
3	IB, IC:5		
4	1.7.21:5		
5	1.7.15:5		
6	2.7.03:5		
7	1.7.04:1	1.7.15:1	2.7.11:3
8	1.7.20:4	2.7.11:1	
9	1.7.23:1	2.7.10:5	
10	1.7.23:5		
11	1.7.15:5		
12	1.7.03:4	IB, IC:1	
13	1.7.15:3	1.7.20:1	1.7.22:1
14	1.7.08:5		
15	1.7.20:5		
16	1.7.15:4	1.7.18:1	
17	1.7.07:1	1.7.20:3	2.7.03:1
18	2.7.06:5		
19	1.7.07:5		
20	1.7.12:4	1.7.20:1	
21	2.7.01:5		
22	1.7.16:1	2.7.09:4	
23	1.7.19:3	2.7.07:1	2.7.09:1
24	1.7.15:2	2.7.06:1	2.7.07:3
25	1.7.03:4	IB, IC:1	
26	1.7.03:4	1.7.04:1	
27	1.7.15:5		
28	1.7.07:2	1.7.20:3	
29	1.7.15:4	1.7.20:1	2.7.07:1
30	1.7.15:5		
31	1.7.03:4	1.7.05:1	
32	1.7.15:5		
33	1.7.20:1	2.7.08:4	
34	1.7.09:1	1.7.24:3	2.7.06:1
35	1.7.20:2	2.7.02:1	2.7.06:2
36	1.7.20:5	2.7.06:1	
37	1.7.20:1	2.7.07:3	2.7.10:1
38	1.7.03:3	1.7.05:1	2.7.10:1

Table 7.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

39	1.7.20:1	2.7.08:3	2.7.12:1
40	1.7.15:3	1.7.19:1	1.7.20:1
41	1.7.07:5		
42	1.7.20:1	2.7.06:4	
43	2.7.08:5		
44	1.7.05:4	1.7.15:1	
45	2.7.12:5		
46	1.7.13:1	2.7.13:4	
47	1.7.20:5	2.7.03:1	2.7.06:1 2.7.07:2
48	1.7.09:4	1.7.10:1	
49	1.7.09:4	1.7.10:1	
50	1.7.09:4	1.7.10:1	
51	1.7.09:3	1.7.15:4	

[3]:	[2]	[2]	[3]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[3]	[2]	[2]	[2]
	40:1 [3]	42:1 [2]	47:5 [2.8]										
1.7.21 [2]:	4:5 [2]												
1.7.22 [2]:	13:1 [2]												
1.7.23 [3]:	9:1 [2]	10:5 [2.2]											
1.7.24 [3]:	34:3 [2]												
Goal 2 [3]:													
2A [3]:													
2.7.01 [2]:	21:5 [1]												
2.7.02 [3]:	35:1 [3]												
2.7.03 [3]:	6:5 [1.8]	17:1 [3]	47:1 [3]										
2.7.04 [3]:													
2.7.05 [2]:													
2.7.06 [3]:	18:5 [2]	24:1 [1]	34:1 [2]	35:2 [2.5]	36:1 [2]	42:4 [2.25]	47:1 [3]						
2.7.07 [3]:	23:1 [2]	24:3 [1.33]	29:1 [2]	37:3 [2]	47:2 [3]								
2.7.08 [3]:	33:4 [2.5]	39:3 [3]	43:5 [2]										
2.7.09 [2]:	22:4 [1.5]	23:1 [2]											
2.7.10 [2]:	9:5 [1.8]	37:1 [2]	38:1 [2]										
2.7.11 [3]:	7:3 [2]	8:1 [3]											
2.7.12 [3]:	39:1 [3]	45:5 [2.8]											
2B [2]:													
2.7.13 [2]:	46:4 [1.75]												
2.7.14 [2]:													

Table 8.1
Categorical Concurrence Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Level by Objective			Hits		Cat. Concurr.
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Level	# of objs by Level	% w/in std by Level	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	26	2 3	19 6	76 24	35.2	0.75	YES
Goal 2 - Literature	2	13	1 2 3	1 4 8	7 30 61	20.8	2.14	YES
Total	5	39	1 2 3	1 23 14	2 60 36	56	1.79	

Table 8.2

Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers

IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Level of Item w.r.t. Standard						DOK Consistency
					% Under		% At		% Above		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	26	35.2	0.75	33	41	67	41	0	0	YES
Goal 2 - Literature	2	13	20.8	2.14	41	45	58	44	1	8	YES
Total	5	39	56	1.79	36	43	64	43	0	5	

Table 8.3

Range-of-Knowledge Correspondence and Balance of Representation Between Standards and Assessment as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51

Standards			Hits		Range of Objectives				Rng. of Know.	Balance Index				Bal. of Represent.
					# Objs Hit		% of Total			% Hits in Std/Ttl Hits		Index		
Title	Goals #	Objs #	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Goal 1 - Reading	3	26	35.2	0.75	13.6	1.50	52	6	YES	63	3	0.63	0.03	WEAK
Goal 2 - Literature	2	13	20.8	2.14	7.6	0.8	58	6	YES	37	3	0.71	0.05	YES
Total	5	39	56	1.79	10.6	3.23	55	7		50	13	0.67	0.06	

Table 8.4

*Summary of Attainment of Acceptable Alignment Level on Four Content Focus Criteria
as Rated by Five Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006
Number of Assessment Items - 51*

Standards	Alignment Criteria			
	Categorical Concurrence	Depth-of-Knowledge Consistency	Range of Knowledge	Balance of Representation
Goal 1 - Reading	YES	YES	YES	WEAK
Goal 2 - Literature	YES	YES	YES	YES

Table 8.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
1	2	2	2	2	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	2	2	3	2	2
4	2	2	2	2	2
5	3	2	3	2	3
6	2	2	3	2	1
7	2	2	2	2	2
8	2	2	2	2	2
9	2	1	2	1	2
10	2	2	2	2	2
11	1	1	2	1	2
12	2	1	2	1	2
13	2	2	2	2	2
14	2	2	2	2	3
15	2	2	3	2	2
16	3	2	2	3	3
17	2	2	3	2	2
18	2	2	3	2	2
19	2	2	3	2	2
20	1	1	1	2	1
21	2	2	2	2	2
22	2	1	2	2	1
23	2	2	3	2	2
24	1	2	2	2	1
25	2	1	2	1	1
26	2	2	2	2	2
27	2	2	2	1	1
28	2	2	3	2	2
29	2	2	3	2	2
30	2	2	2	2	1
31	3	2	3	3	2
32	2	1	2	2	1
33	3	2	3	2	2
34	2	1	1	2	1
35	2	2	2	2	1
36	2	2	3	2	2
37	2	2	3	2	2
38	1	1	1	1	1
39	2	2	2	2	2
40	2	2	3	2	2

Table 8.6
Depth-of-Knowledge Levels by Item and Reviewers
Intraclass Correlation
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Item	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Rater 5
41	2	1	3	1	1
42	2	2	2	2	2
43	1	1	1	1	1
44	2	2	3	2	2
45	2	2	3	3	2
46	2	2	2	2	1
47	3	3	3	3	3
48	1	1	1	1	1
49	1	1	1	1	2
50	2	2	1	1	1
51	2	2	2	2	2

Intraclass Correlation: 0.8412

Pairwise Comparison: 0.6471

Table 8.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
1	2	IB, IC		2	1.8.12		2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		1	IB, IC	
2	2	2.8.07		2	2.8.06		2	2.8.07		2	2.8.07		2	2.8.07	
3	2	2.8.06		2	1.8.19		3	2.8.06		2	2.8.06		2	2.8.06	
4	2	2.8.09		2	2.8.06		2	2.8.11		2	2.8.09		2	2.8.09	
5	3	2.8.11		2	2.8.11		3	2.8.06		2	2.8.11		3	2.8.11	
6	2	1.8.21		2	1.8.21		3	1.8.21		2	1.8.21		1	1.8.21	
7	2	1.8.09		2	1.8.09		2	1.8.10		2	1.8.09		2	1.8.09	
8	2	1.8.24		2	1.8.24		2	1.8.14		2	1.8.09		2	1.8.24	
9	2	1.8.21		1	1.8.14		2	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		2	1.8.12	
10	2	1.8.19		2	1.8.19		2	1.8.19		2	1.8.19		2	1.8.19	
11	1	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		2	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		2	1.8.18	
12	2	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		2	1.8.20		1	1.8.14		2	1.8.14	
13	2	1.8.21		2	1.8.21		2	1.8.21		2	1.8.21		2	1.8.21	
14	2	1.8.06		2	1.8.06		2	1.8.06		2	1.8.19		3	1.8.19	
15	2	IB, IC		2	IB, IC		3	1.8.10		2	1.8.06		2	IB, IC	
16	3	2.8.11		2	2.8.11		2	2.8.09		3	2.8.11		3	2.8.06	
17	2	2.8.11		2	1.8.24		3	2.8.11		2	2.8.11		2	2.8.11	
18	2	2.8.11		2	1.8.19		3	2.8.04		2	2.8.11		2	1.8.11	
19	2	2.8.06		2	1.8.19		3	2.8.06		2	2.8.06		2	2.8.06	
20	1	2.8.10		1	2.8.10		1	2.8.10		2	2.8.10		1	2.8.10	
21	2	1.8.13		2	1.8.13		2	1.8.13		2	1.8.13		2	1.8.13	
22	2	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		2	1.8.24		2	1.8.21		1	1.8.14	
23	2	1.8.24		2	1.8.24		3	2.8.03		2	1.8.24		2	1.8.19	
24	1	1.8.14		2	1.8.14		2	1.8.14		2	1.8.14		1	1.8.14	
25	2	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		2	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		1	1.8.14	
26	2	2.8.13		2	2.8.13		2	1.8.24		2	2.8.13		2	2.8.13	
27	2	1.8.14		2	1.8.19		2	1.8.19		1	1.8.14		1	1.8.14	
28	2	1.8.21		2	2.8.06		3	1.8.21		2	1.8.21		2	1.8.21	
29	2	IB, IC		2	1.8.21		3	1.8.21		2	1.8.06		2	1.8.21	
30	2	1.8.03		2	1.8.03		2	1.8.03		2	1.8.03		1	1.8.03	
31	3	1.8.24		2	1.8.24		3	2.8.03		3	1.8.24		2	1.8.24	
32	2	1.8.01		1	1.8.01		2	1.8.01		2	1.8.03		1	1.8.01	
33	3	2.8.12		2	2.8.12	1.8.19	3	2.8.12		2	2.8.12		2	2.8.12	
34	2	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		2	1.8.14		1	1.8.14	
35	2	1.8.18		2	1.8.18		2	1.8.18		2	1.8.18		1	1.8.18	
36	2	1.8.24		2	2.8.03		3	1.8.24		2	2.8.11		2	1.8.24	
37	2	2.8.06		2	2.8.06		3	1.8.19		2	2.8.06		2	2.8.06	
38	1	1.8.18		1	1.8.19		1	2.8.07		1	2.8.07		1	2.8.07	

Table 8.8
DOK Levels and Objectives Coded by Each Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Item	DOK0	PObj0	S1Obj0	DOK1	PObj1	S1Obj1	DOK2	PObj2	S1Obj2	DOK3	PObj3	S1Obj3	DOK4	PObj4	S1Obj4
39	2	1.8.25		2	1.8.25		2	1.8.25		2	1.8.25		2	1.8.25	
40	2	2.8.11		2	2.8.11	2.8.12	3	2.8.11		2	2.8.11		2	2.8.11	
41	2	2.8.11		1	2.8.04		3	2.8.11		1	2.8.11		1	2.8.11	
42	2	1.8.05		2	1.8.05		2	1.8.03		2	1.8.03		2	1.8.05	
43	1	2.8.10		1	2.8.10		1	2.8.10		1	2.8.10		1	2.8.10	
44	2	2.8.06		2	2.8.06		3	2.8.06		2	2.8.06		2	2.8.06	
45	2	2.8.11		2	2.8.11		3	2.8.11		3	2.8.11		2	2.8.11	
46	2	2.8.13		2	2.8.13		2	2.8.13		2	2.8.13		1	2.8.13	
47	3	1.8.19	2.8.07	3	2.8.07		3	1.8.19		3	1.8.19	2.8.06	3	1.8.19	
48	1	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		1	1.8.21		1	1.8.14	
49	1	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		1	1.8.14		1	1.8.21		2	1.8.23	
50	2	1.8.14		2	1.8.19		1	1.8.14		1	1.8.21		1	1.8.14	
51	2	1.8.21		2	1.8.23		2	1.8.23		2	1.8.14		2	1.8.23	

Objective Pairwise Comparison: 0.6007

Standard Pairwise Comparison: 0.881

Table 8.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Low		Medium		High
5		5.490196		28

1	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	1.8.12
2	2.8.06	2.8.07	2.8.07	2.8.07	2.8.07
3	1.8.19	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06
4	2.8.06	2.8.09	2.8.09	2.8.09	2.8.11
5	2.8.06	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11
6	1.8.21	1.8.21	1.8.21	1.8.21	1.8.21
7	1.8.09	1.8.09	1.8.09	1.8.09	1.8.10
8	1.8.09	1.8.14	1.8.24	1.8.24	1.8.24
9	1.8.12	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.21
10	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19
11	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.18
12	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.20
13	1.8.21	1.8.21	1.8.21	1.8.21	1.8.21
14	1.8.06	1.8.06	1.8.06	1.8.19	1.8.19
15	IB, IC	IB, IC	IB, IC	1.8.06	1.8.10
16	2.8.06	2.8.09	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11
17	1.8.24	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11
18	1.8.11	1.8.19	2.8.04	2.8.11	2.8.11
19	1.8.19	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06
20	2.8.10	2.8.10	2.8.10	2.8.10	2.8.10
21	1.8.13	1.8.13	1.8.13	1.8.13	1.8.13
22	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.21	1.8.24
23	1.8.19	1.8.24	1.8.24	1.8.24	2.8.03
24	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14
25	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14
26	1.8.24	2.8.13	2.8.13	2.8.13	2.8.13
27	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.19	1.8.19
28	1.8.21	1.8.21	1.8.21	1.8.21	2.8.06
29	IB, IC	1.8.06	1.8.21	1.8.21	1.8.21
30	1.8.03	1.8.03	1.8.03	1.8.03	1.8.03
31	1.8.24	1.8.24	1.8.24	1.8.24	2.8.03
32	1.8.01	1.8.01	1.8.01	1.8.01	1.8.03
33	1.8.19	2.8.12	2.8.12	2.8.12	2.8.12
34	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14
35	1.8.18	1.8.18	1.8.18	1.8.18	1.8.18
36	1.8.24	1.8.24	1.8.24	2.8.03	2.8.11
37	1.8.19	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06
38	1.8.18	1.8.19	2.8.07	2.8.07	2.8.07

Table 8.9
Objectives Coded to Each Item by Reviewers
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

39	1.8.25	1.8.25	1.8.25	1.8.25	1.8.25					
40	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.12				
41	2.8.04	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11					
42	1.8.03	1.8.03	1.8.05	1.8.05	1.8.05					
43	2.8.10	2.8.10	2.8.10	2.8.10	2.8.10					
44	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06					
45	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11	2.8.11					
46	2.8.13	2.8.13	2.8.13	2.8.13	2.8.13					
47	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19
	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	1.8.19	2.8.06	2.8.06	2.8.06	
	2.8.06	2.8.07	2.8.07	2.8.07	2.8.07	2.8.07	2.8.07	2.8.07	2.8.07	
48	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.21					
49	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.21	1.8.23					
50	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.14	1.8.19	1.8.21					
51	1.8.14	1.8.21	1.8.23	1.8.23	1.8.23					

Table 8.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Low		Medium		High
0		6.086957		44

Goal 1																				
1A																				
1.8.01	32	32	32	32																
1.8.02																				
1.8.03	30	30	30	30	30	32	42	42												
1.8.04																				
1.8.05	42	42	42																	
IB, IC	1	1	1	1	15	15	15	29												
1.8.06	14	14	14	15	29															
1.8.07																				
1.8.08																				
1.8.09	7	7	7	7	8															
1.8.10	7	15																		
1.8.11	18																			
1.8.12	1	9																		
1.8.13	21	21	21	21	21															
1C																				
1.8.14	8	9	9	9	11	11	11	11	12	12	12	12	22	22	22	24	24	24	24	24
	25	25	25	25	25	27	27	27	34	34	34	34	34	48	48	48	48	49	49	
	49	50	50	50	51															
1.8.15																				
1.8.16																				
1.8.17																				
1.8.18	11	35	35	35	35	35	38													
1.8.19	3	10	10	10	10	10	14	14	18	19	23	27	27	33	37	38	47	47	47	47
	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	50							
1.8.20	12																			
1.8.21	6	6	6	6	6	9	13	13	13	13	13	22	28	28	28	28	29	29	29	48
	49	50	51																	
1.8.22																				
1.8.23	49	51	51	51																
1.8.24	8	8	8	17	22	23	23	23	26	31	31	31	31	36	36	36				
1.8.25	39	39	39	39	39															
Goal 2																				
2A																				
2.8.01																				
2.8.02																				
2.8.03	23	31	36																	

Table 8.10
Items Coded by Reviewers to Each Objective
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

2.8.04	18	41																			
2.8.05																					
2.8.06	2	3	3	3	3	4	5	16	19	19	19	19	28	37	37	37	37	44	44	44	
	44	44	47	47	47	47															
2.8.07	2	2	2	2	38	38	38	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47						
2.8.08																					
2.8.09	4	4	4	16																	
2.8.10	20	20	20	20	20	43	43	43	43	43											
2.8.11	4	5	5	5	5	16	16	16	17	17	17	17	18	18	36	40	40	40	40	40	
	41	41	41	41	45	45	45	45	45												
2.8.12	33	33	33	33	33	40															
2B																					
2.8.13	26	26	26	26	46	46	46	46	46												

Table 8.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Low		Medium		High
1		2		5

Goal 1	
1A	
1.8.01	32:4
1.8.02	
1.8.03	30:5 32:1 42:2
1.8.04	
1.8.05	42:3
IB, IC	1:4 15:3 29:1
1.8.06	14:3 15:1 29:1
1.8.07	
1.8.08	
1.8.09	7:4 8:1
1.8.10	7:1 15:1
1.8.11	18:1
1.8.12	1:1 9:1
1.8.13	21:5
1C	
1.8.14	8:1 9:3 11:4 12:4 22:3 24:5 25:5 27:3 34:5 48:4 49:3 50:3 51:1
1.8.15	
1.8.16	
1.8.17	
1.8.18	11:1 35:5 38:1
1.8.19	3:1 10:5 14:2 18:1 19:1 23:1 27:2 33:1 37:1 38:1 47:4 50:1
1.8.20	12:1
1.8.21	6:5 9:1 13:5 22:1 28:4 29:3 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1
1.8.22	
1.8.23	49:1 51:3
1.8.24	8:3 17:1 22:1 23:3 26:1 31:4 36:3
1.8.25	39:5
Goal 2	
2A	
2.8.01	
2.8.02	
2.8.03	23:1 31:1 36:1
2.8.04	18:1 41:1
2.8.05	
2.8.06	2:1 3:4 4:1 5:1 16:1 19:4 28:1 37:4 44:5 47:1
2.8.07	2:4 38:3 47:2

Table 8.11

Number of Reviewers Coding an Item by Objective (Item Number: Number of Reviewers)

IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

2.8.08										
2.8.09	4:3	16:1								
2.8.10	20:5	43:5								
2.8.11	4:1	5:4	16:3	17:4	18:2	36:1	40:5	41:4	45:5	
2.8.12	33:5	40:1								
2B										
2.8.13	26:4	46:5								

Table 8.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Low		Medium		High
1		2		5

1	IB, IC:4	1.8.12:1		
2	2.8.06:1	2.8.07:4		
3	1.8.19:1	2.8.06:4		
4	2.8.06:1	2.8.09:3	2.8.11:1	
5	2.8.06:1	2.8.11:4		
6	1.8.21:5			
7	1.8.09:4	1.8.10:1		
8	1.8.09:1	1.8.14:1	1.8.24:3	
9	1.8.12:1	1.8.14:3	1.8.21:1	
10	1.8.19:5			
11	1.8.14:4	1.8.18:1		
12	1.8.14:4	1.8.20:1		
13	1.8.21:5			
14	1.8.06:3	1.8.19:2		
15	IB, IC:3	1.8.06:1	1.8.10:1	
16	2.8.06:1	2.8.09:1	2.8.11:3	
17	1.8.24:1	2.8.11:4		
18	1.8.11:1	1.8.19:1	2.8.04:1	2.8.11:2
19	1.8.19:1	2.8.06:4		
20	2.8.10:5			
21	1.8.13:5			
22	1.8.14:3	1.8.21:1	1.8.24:1	
23	1.8.19:1	1.8.24:3	2.8.03:1	
24	1.8.14:5			
25	1.8.14:5			
26	1.8.24:1	2.8.13:4		
27	1.8.14:3	1.8.19:2		
28	1.8.21:4	2.8.06:1		
29	IB, IC:1	1.8.06:1	1.8.21:3	
30	1.8.03:5			
31	1.8.24:4	2.8.03:1		
32	1.8.01:4	1.8.03:1		
33	1.8.19:1	2.8.12:5		
34	1.8.14:5			
35	1.8.18:5			
36	1.8.24:3	2.8.03:1	2.8.11:1	
37	1.8.19:1	2.8.06:4		
38	1.8.18:1	1.8.19:1	2.8.07:3	

Table 8.12

Number of Reviewers Coding an Objective by Item (Objective: Number of Reviewers)
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

39	1.8.25:5		
40	2.8.11:5	2.8.12:1	
41	2.8.04:1	2.8.11:4	
42	1.8.03:2	1.8.05:3	
43	2.8.10:5		
44	2.8.06:5		
45	2.8.11:5		
46	2.8.13:5		
47	1.8.19:4	2.8.06:1	2.8.07:2
48	1.8.14:4	1.8.21:1	
49	1.8.14:3	1.8.21:1	1.8.23:1
50	1.8.14:3	1.8.19:1	1.8.21:1
51	1.8.14:1	1.8.21:1	1.8.23:3

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Goal 1 [2]:														
1A [2]:														
1.8.01 [2]:	32:4 [1.5]													
1.8.02 [2]:														
1.8.03 [2]:	30:5 [1.8]	32:1 [2]	42:2 [2]											
1.8.04 [2]:														
1.8.05 [2]:	42:3 [2]													
IB, IC [2]:	1:4 [1.75]	15:3 [2]	29:1 [2]											
1.8.06 [2]:	14:3 [2]	15:1 [2]	29:1 [2]											
1.8.07 [2]:														
1.8.08 [2]:														
1.8.09 [3]:	7:4 [2]	8:1 [2]												
1.8.10 [3]:	7:1 [2]	15:1 [3]												
1.8.11 [2]:	18:1 [2]													
1.8.12 [2]:	1:1 [2]	9:1 [2]												
1.8.13 [2]:	21:5 [2]													
1C [2]:														
1.8.14 [2]:	8:1 [2]	9:3 [1.33]	11:4 [1.25]	12:4 [1.5]	22:3 [1.33]	24:5 [1.6]	25:5 [1.4]	27:3 [1.33]	34:5 [1.4]	48:4 [1]	49:3 [1]	50:3 [1.33]	51:1 [2]	
1.8.15 [2]:														
1.8.16 [2]:														
1.8.17 [2]:														
1.8.18 [2]:	11:1 [2]	35:5 [1.8]	38:1 [1]											
1.8.19 [3]:	3:1 [2]	10:5 [2]	14:2 [2.5]	18:1 [2]	19:1 [2]	23:1 [2]	27:2 [2]	33:1 [2]	37:1 [3]	38:1 [1]	47:4 [3]	50:1 [2]		
1.8.20	12:1													

Assessment Item DOK vs Consensus DOK (Item Number: Number of Reviewers [Average DOK])

[2]:	[2]									
1.8.21 [3]:	6:5 [2]	9:1 [2]	13:5 [2]	22:1 [2]	28:4 [2.25]	29:3 [2.33]	48:1 [1]	49:1 [1]	50:1 [1]	51:1 [2]
1.8.22 [3]:										
1.8.23 [2]:	49:1 [2]	51:3 [2]								
1.8.24 [3]:	8:3 [2]	17:1 [2]	22:1 [2]	23:3 [2]	26:1 [2]	31:4 [2.5]	36:3 [2.33]			
1.8.25 [2]:	39:5 [2]									
Goal 2 [3]:										
2A [3]:										
2.8.01 [2]:										
2.8.02 [3]:										
2.8.03 [3]:	23:1 [3]	31:1 [3]	36:1 [2]							
2.8.04 [3]:	18:1 [3]	41:1 [1]								
2.8.05 [2]:										
2.8.06 [3]:	2:1 [2]	3:4 [2.25]	4:1 [2]	5:1 [3]	16:1 [3]	19:4 [2.25]	28:1 [2]	37:4 [2]	44:5 [2.2]	47:1 [3]
2.8.07 [3]:	2:4 [2]	38:3 [1]	47:2 [3]							
2.8.08 [3]:										
2.8.09 [2]:	4:3 [2]	16:1 [2]								
2.8.10 [1]:	20:5 [1.2]	43:5 [1]								
2.8.11 [3]:	4:1 [2]	5:4 [2.5]	16:3 [2.67]	17:4 [2.25]	18:2 [2]	36:1 [2]	40:5 [2.2]	41:4 [1.75]	45:5 [2.4]	
2.8.12 [3]:	33:5 [2.4]	40:1 [2]								
2B [2]:										
2.8.13 [2]:	26:4 [2]	46:5 [1.8]								

Appendix C

Reviewers Notes and Source of Challenge Comments

Illinois Grades 3-8 Reading

Brief Explanation of Data in the Alignment Tables by Column

Tables *grade.5*

Comments made by reviewers on items identified as having a Source-of-Challenge issue by item number.

Tables *grade.7*

All notes made by reviewers on items by item number.

Table 3.5
Source-of-Challenge Issues by Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
-------------	----------------------

Table 3.7
Notes by Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
4	Do items 2 and 4 cue each other? Are they assessing the same thing?
22	Generic used as no specific objective lists this information.
46	The possible answers for this item do not seem appropriate for the question. Comparing a story to kinds of books.
49	Any of the answers would make the instruction clearer. The item should ask which would be the BEST answer.

Table 4.5
Source-of-Challenge Issues by Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
11	note sure of the best answer
27	really thought 2 other answers could be correct
37	really not a good answer choice
47	1.422

Table 4.7

Notes by Reviewer

IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
12	cannot find anything about organization in standards so coded to generic
15	The article doesn't really say they are alike, the reader needs to infer that.
17	reading or number recognition?

Table 5.5
Source-of-Challenge Issues by Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
6	A and C are both correct
47	2508

Table 5.7
Notes by Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
4	None of the foils are actually correct.
14	not a specific standard to address this item
16	generic used as item not specifically addressed in standards
24	not specifically addressed in standards
25	not specifically addressed in standards
28	Item addresses audience, not purpose, but they are often taken together.

Table 6.5
Source-of-Challenge Issues by Reviewer
IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
11	c and d are both correct
13	Actually b is also correct because the age is 10-15

Table 6.7

Notes by Reviewer

IL Reading Study Grade 6 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
4	Generic used as no specific standard fits this item.
16	This is a strategy item, but none of the objectives address this skill. Therefore I am putting it to the generic standard.
16	Used generic as standards do not mention outlining; do not like this item as an outline may not be the best way to remember the important ideas in this story.
19	Standards do not address concept/definition structure of expository wrtg., only cause/effect.
21	6.2.11 and 6.2.12 are very similar
24	How does the reader know that the speaker is a "he"? as stated in the item? In item 22 a pronoun is not used.
28	nothing in standards on purpose so inference used

Table 7.5

Source-of-Challenge Issues by Reviewer

IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
7	I think there is more than one answer choice that is correct.
17	I don't think this is addressed on the framework. It is about author motivation.
30	Used, damaged and antique would all fit.

Table 7.7

Notes by Reviewer

IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
3	Generic used as specific statement not found.
12	Generic used as no specific statement addresses this idea. also, more than 1 correct answer as we generally teach students more than 1 self-correcting strategy.
16	could also be considered sequence but this not an objective on this framework
20	Poor correct answer as by 7th grade we would want students to go beyond the encyclopedia for doing research.
25	Not necessarily correct as students are usually taught to use more than 1 strategy to determine the meaning of an unknown word; default standard used as no other statement refers to this.
28	more than 1 correct answer
29	Is this a reading comprehension item? Based on prior knowledge but not text based.
32	there is no sequence objective
35	The connotation of the term "use" in answer c may not be familiar to all readers.

Table 8.5

Source-of-Challenge Issues by Reviewer

IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
5	1814
8	1824
31	Not a clear right answer
40	No answer choice is really correct-the answer should have to do with their inability to get someone out as well as getting the ball where it needs to go.

Table 8.7

Notes by Reviewer

IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

Item Number	Comments by Reviewer
1	Generic used because chronological order is not among the 3 statements on organizational patterns listed.
10	Notice that all of the items refer either both passages or the passage on Zing and nothing on Mountain Air.
15	This is a prereading strategy or technique not covered.
29	Wording of stem of item is confusing. "Which would have best helped the reader understand...?" Difficult to see what item is really getting at.

Appendix D

Debrief Summary Notes

Illinois Grades 3-8 Reading

Table 3.15
Debriefing Summary
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

A. For each standard, did the items cover the most important topics you expected by the standard? If not, what topics were not assessed that should have been?

- Quite a large number of objectives were not addressed by items. In standard One, there were few items on anything but vocabulary in context: 1.3.07 and 1.3.08. Nothing much on illustrations or graphs charts, etc. for standard two. Standard three is covered fairly well. Few items on the objectives in Standard 4. Too many items for Objective 1.3.20.
- Few of the literary elements were addressed like plot, setting, character. There were not questions on root words or antonyms and synonyms. No questions about illustrations. There were no charts or graphs to read. Part of the issue is that not every objective is assessed because the guideline is for a percentage from that standard not so much for each specific objective. Anything that requires sounds is not part of the test due to a disadvantage to handicapped children with hearing loss.
- Yes, I thought it was thought provoking for children. They need to and will be thinking during the test.
- Yes. main idea, alternative titles, vocab, inference, details, drawing conclusions, genre, sequence, and setting all used.

B. For each standard, did the items cover the most important performance (DOK levels) you expected by the standard? If not, what performance was not assessed?

- Most items were at levels one and two. Only a couple at level three. Could have more at that level.
- There was a nice mix of 1 and 2. I only found two 3s.
- Yes
- DOK Level 1, 2, and some 3 were used.

C. Were the standards written at an appropriate level of specificity and directed towards expectations appropriate for the grade level?

- The standards and objectives were quite specific. There is some overlap in objectives dealing with vocabulary in context.
- Yes, although the reading comprehension questions should have more depth of thought.
- Yes
- Yes. Standards are specific.

D. What is your general opinion of the alignment between the standards and assessment:

- ii. Acceptable Alignment (3) : 60%
- iii. Needs slight improvement (1) : 20%
- iv. Needs major improvement (1) : 20%

Table 3.15
Debriefing Summary
IL Reading Study Grade 3 2006

E. Comments

- A couple of the passages were not too good. "Time" for example, was very poorly organized and rambled a bit.
- The framework needs to be more specific as to reading strategies cause and effect, draw conclusion, compare-not present for the objectives. 1.3.20 becomes too big a category.
- This has been a real learning experience for me...down to using a mouse which I never use.....I appreciate more how much thinking 3rd graders need to and will do.....
- Selections varied as to genre and length; many items coded to detail and slight inference. A limited range of other objectives were used.
- No standard exists related to figurative language.

A. For each standard, did the items cover the most important topics you expected by the standard? If not, what topics were not assessed that should have been?

- A number of objectives were addressed in this grade that were not addressed at grade three. Still, there are a number of objectives in the vocabulary, strategy, and comprehension standards that are not addressed. A number of the author technique objectives were addressed.
- There are too many questions that fit 1.4.17. This objective should be expanded to include, draw conclusions, cause and effect, more complex inferences. These strategies do not fit in 1.4.22
- Yes. Main idea, details, prediction, alternative titles, inference, drawing conclusions, vocabulary, extended response, purpose, message, figurative language were all used.

B. For each standard, did the items cover the most important performance (DOK levels) you expected by the standard? If not, what performance was not assessed?

- Still a preponderance of items at DOK 1 and 2, although much more toward 2 at this level. Still relatively few threes.
- I only had a few 3s. There seemed to be a good balance of 1s and 2s.
- Yes
- Yes. DOK 1 and 2 were used and a few Level 3. Several Level 1s could be made into level 2 with a little work.

C. Were the standards written at an appropriate level of specificity and directed towards expectations appropriate for the grade level?

- Clear standards and objectives with some overlap. This is particularly true of the context and main idea objectives.
- Because the framework must be covered, deeper thinking questions are not asked often. Many questions are surface questions-simple inference, recall, simple knowledge.
- Some thinking was harder or awkward with this test.
- Yes. Standards are specific, but organization is one example of some that are missing.

D. What is your general opinion of the alignment between the standards and assessment:

- ii. Acceptable Alignment (2) : 40%
- iii. Needs slight improvement (3) : 60%

E. Comments

Table 4.15
Debriefing Summary
IL Reading Study Grade 4 2006

- I thought the long passage in part two was very good and offered a wide range of possibilities for items addressing objectives, particularly those dealing with author technique.
- Fewer level 1 and more Level 2 for inference needed at this grade level; balance of genres present.

Table 5.15
Debriefing Summary
IL Reading Study Grade 5 2006

A. For each standard, did the items cover the most important topics you expected by the standard? If not, what topics were not assessed that should have been?

- There are no items for 1.5.01, 1.5.03 & 4, 1.5.05, 1.5.06, 1.5.09, 1.5.10, 1.5.11, 1.5.14, 1.5.15, 1.5.19, 1.5.20, 1.5.23, 1.5.24, 1.5.25, 1.5.26, 2.5.01, 2.5.05, 2.5.06, 2.5.07, 2.5.10, 2.5.11, 2.5.13. That constitutes a lot of gaps.
- More literary questions that were good. Still too many items fall into 1.5.16
- Yes. Main idea, vocab, constructed response, vocab, synonyms, character items, inference, genre, and so on.

B. For each standard, did the items cover the most important performance (DOK levels) you expected by the standard? If not, what performance was not assessed?

- Mostly 1s and 2s. Almost no 3s.
- Less 1s- mostly 2s. only a few 3s. The literary questions could have been more complex to raise some of the 2s to 3s.
- yes
- Not exactly. Level 1 and 2; Level 3 in constructed response. I think there should be more Level 3 items; also many level 1 could be made into level 2.

C. Were the standards written at an appropriate level of specificity and directed towards expectations appropriate for the grade level?

- Clear and specific, but for the most part not addressed by items on the test.
- yes
- yes
- Yes, but none related to organization.

D. What is your general opinion of the alignment between the standards and assessment:

- ii. Acceptable Alignment (3) : 60%
- iii. Needs slight improvement (1) : 20%
- iv. Needs major improvement (1) : 20%

E. Comments

- Passages fairly interesting, but not as compelling or susceptible to item variation as in Grade 4.
- rework this grade level to have more level 2 and level 3 items; many items were "right there."

A. For each standard, did the items cover the most important topics you expected by the standard? If not, what topics were not assessed that should have been?

- Still many objectives in all standards that are not addressed by items.
- There were no summary questions but several objectives. No charts or graphs present. 1.6.07 and 1.6.08 are very close.
- Yes. The usual expectation of topics as in previous grade levels was addressed.

B. For each standard, did the items cover the most important performance (DOK levels) you expected by the standard? If not, what performance was not assessed?

- I found a few more three level items on this test.
- only one 3. 2s were plentiful but easy. answer stems did not discriminate very well.
- Yes. Mostly DOK 2 and some level 3; some level 1

C. Were the standards written at an appropriate level of specificity and directed towards expectations appropriate for the grade level?

- There are a number of places where items might logically be assigned to any one of several objectives. It is usually not the case that all are discrete and necessary to answer the question, but rather that one might interpret the items placement in different ways. The greatest problems involve character motivation, cause and effect, and complex inference.
- I think they could have been more difficult.
- Yes, but characters are still spread over at least 3 objectives making coding difficult; other topics are also spread over more than 1 objective with the same result.

D. What is your general opinion of the alignment between the standards and assessment:

- ii. Acceptable Alignment (3) : 75%
- iv. Needs major improvement (1) : 25%

E. Comments

- The long passage on this test is very interesting and offers potential for good items.
- Standards still are missing some imp. ideas. Author's purpose was not included in this grade level so items coded to inference. A variety of literary selections was presented.

A. For each standard, did the items cover the most important topics you expected by the standard? If not, what topics were not assessed that should have been?

- Better than earlier grades. Some objectives addressed that have not been addressed in earlier tests. Still, many objectives in all standards are not addressed which will probably affect range.
- There were no questions that addressed main idea. Also cause and effect questions were lacking. No questions about figurative language. Because there was no sequencing objective-those questions had to go to drawing conclusions or inferencing.
- yes
- Yes, items covered a variety of reading comprehension, strategy, vocab, literary techniques and elements. And there were some questions from a chart and use of irony which were new.

B. For each standard, did the items cover the most important performance (DOK levels) you expected by the standard? If not, what performance was not assessed?

- More threes and fewer ones. Seems better balanced than some earlier tests.
- Yes all levels were covered.
- yes
- Yes, More DOK level 2 than in earlier grade levels. Still several 1s and a few level 3.

C. Were the standards written at an appropriate level of specificity and directed towards expectations appropriate for the grade level?

- Still a few overlap problems. Seems better in this respect than earlier tests, but still we had difficulty agreeing on where to place some items.
- I think there could have been more difficult items that required more thought.
- yes
- Yes, but no author's purpose or sequence statements; vocab reduced to fewer choices; still characters are divided into at least 3 statements making coding still hard.

D. What is your general opinion of the alignment between the standards and assessment:

- ii. Acceptable Alignment (4) : 80%
- iv. Needs major improvement (1) : 20%

E. Comments

Table 7.15
Debriefing Summary
IL Reading Study Grade 7 2006

- Did not like the long passage as well as the ones on the two previous tests. Did not have as much potential for literarily focused items.
- Seemed a bit easier to code.

A. For each standard, did the items cover the most important topics you expected by the standard? If not, what topics were not assessed that should have been?

- I expected more objectives to be covered at this level, but that was not the case. Many objectives are still not addressed and this hurts alignment in terms of range.
- all the objectives for organizational patterns are not present. No summaries questions. Most questions focused on a few objectives. 1.8.14.,1.8.19.,2.8.06
- YES
- Yes. The usual range of topics was covered.

B. For each standard, did the items cover the most important performance (DOK levels) you expected by the standard? If not, what performance was not assessed?

- A predominance of twos. Some ones and threes. Need more three level items owing to the complexity of the objectives, particularly in the literature standard.
- Mostly 2s. Not complexity of many 3s.
- YES
- Level 1 and 2; mostly level 2; a few level 3.

C. Were the standards written at an appropriate level of specificity and directed towards expectations appropriate for the grade level?

- Still some potential for overlap. There is some difficulty in arriving at agreement among the raters on where to assign items, even after considerable discussion.
- I think there were too many surface questions. Longer passage was amazing but questions failed to support the great ideas and ironies presented.
- YES
- Yes, but some omissions in specific statements that items addressed; in some cases new statements helped with the coding.

D. What is your general opinion of the alignment between the standards and assessment:

- ii. Acceptable Alignment (3) : 60%
- iii. Needs slight improvement (1) : 20%
- iv. Needs major improvement (1) : 20%

E. Comments

Table 8.15
Debriefing Summary
IL Reading Study Grade 8 2006

- A very good long passage in this test. Challenging reading.

