TO: Matriculation Coordinators
    Assessment Directors
    Research Coordinators

FROM: Kimberly McDaniel

SUBJECT: Locally Constructed or Managed Tests- Revised form

SYNOPSIS: At its January 1998 meeting, the Matriculation Assessment Workgroup recommended revisions to the Standards, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Assessment Instruments Used in the California Community Colleges and to the form previously known as, Request for Approval for the Use of a Writing Sample or Locally Constructed or Managed Test. All materials in regard to direct Assessment of Writing have been changed to reference the more general domain of Direct Performance Assessment. The revised Standards, January 1998, speak specifically to the criteria required for the Chancellor’s Office to approve the use of such instruments.

There are two minimal requirements that the college must address in the test’s technical report(s) in order to attain the entry level of approval status. In the absence of such information, the test will not be approved for use in the California Community Colleges. From the Standards document

1. There must be validity evidence available (content, criterion, or consequential) that demonstrates the usefulness of the instrument on that particular campus for placement into a course sequence; and,

2. There must be evidence that the test minimizes cultural/linguistic bias, insensitivity and offensiveness.

Meeting the requirements listed above do not constitute consideration for full approval, rather, it is sufficient for consideration in the lowest level approval category. Note: Colleges need not provide consequential evidence during the initial approval cycle for an instrument. It is only to be provided when the approval status of an instrument is being “renewed.”
With respect to the approval categories, as with second party instruments, colleges submitting summaries for locally managed or developed tests will be placed in one of four categories (Standards, 1998, pg. 48):

**A1 Full Approval**—The summary of evidence provided indicates that all standards are being addressed adequately and supports the continued use of the test at the local college without the need to submit any further evidence to support this request.

**A2 Provisional Approval**—The summary of evidence for an instrument in this category generally supported the use of the test. However, some criteria were inadequately addressed in the summary. In all likelihood, additional and sufficient documentation should be provided in a relatively short time period to address these criteria and the colleges should be allowed time to meet them. In this conditional category the expectancy is that the test, in time, will achieve a “Full Approval” recommendation. Recommendation in this category means that the college must supply the specified additional clarifying information within one academic year. Failure to submit the required clarifications within one academic year will result in reclassification into the “Probationary” category.

**A3 Probationary Approval**—The summary of evidence for an instrument in this category provided some support for the use of the test. However, instruments in this category are missing critical information and thus a clear-cut recommendation for full approval cannot be established; or from the information that is available, deficiencies are noted. The intended purpose for use of these instruments is clearly stated and some positive information supporting its use is available, but the necessary evidence available for a final judgment is incomplete. For tests in this classification, additional data collection must be provided for further evaluation. Such instruments can only be maintained in the “Probationary Approval” designation for a maximum of two academic years.

**B Not Approval**—Instruments in this category are those for which the evidence provided in the summaries indicates that they have failed to meet one or more of the standards or criteria considered essential by the reviewing bodies or have failed to meet a condition of AB 3 or Title 5. What is considered essential is likely to vary among applications (that is, tests can be disapproved for differing reasons), but the specific deficiency is identified in the report of the Matriculation Assessment Work Group to the Chancellor.

Below are suggestions to guide colleges through the process for developing summary statements for locally managed and developed instruments. Additionally, to simplify its use, modifications have been made to the original form for submitting requests for approval of locally managed or developed instruments and is also attached. Please note that this form is available at the Chancellor’s Office Web Site, http://www.cccco.edu.

**Contact Persons:** Kimberly McDaniel, (916) 323-0799, Matriculation Unit.
Suggestions for Preparing Summary Statements to Accompany the Request for Approval of or the Use or Renewal of a Performance Assessment or Locally Constructed or Managed Test

As indicated on the Request for Approval Form, a brief narrative must be submitted summarizing the evidence supporting the use of the test. Based on reviews of previous material submitted, a set of suggestions have been developed to help clarify what should be included in these summary statements.

1. This narrative should not be a lengthy, detailed report. It is anticipated that the summaries across all five standards (validity, reliability, test bias, cut or placement scores, and disproportionate impact) will not exceed five pages for any one test.

2. According to the Standards (p.17, paragraph 5), a test will not be approved for use unless evidence is provided that supports at least one aspect of validity and its lack of bias. Therefore, at a minimum to attain the lowest level of approval, a college must provide sufficient evidence in these two areas to support the use of the test.

3. It is the college’s responsibility to provide an integrated argument for claims concerning a standard rather than just presenting facts and letting the reviewer draw conclusions.

4. For content validity evidence, describe the procedure used to make decisions for the selection of a test in terms of its match to the content of course for which it is to be used as a placement device. A well-documented content validity study that links test items or performance tasks and scoring rubrics to course content based on instructor ratings provides powerful validity data supporting that the test is being used appropriately. The revised Standards expand and clarify the type of content validity evidence expected.

5. For the other types of validity evidence required, an option is provided to submit either criterion-related or consequential-related validity evidence. The revised Standards provide detailed information on consequential-related validity. If criterion-related validity is collected, it should not necessarily be restricted to test and end-of-course grade correlation coefficients (e.g. studies seeking a .35 correlation). Other criteria and types of analyses may be used as the primary evidence when arguing for the validity of the instrument.
6. Logical bias review procedures should be conducted at the individual item level rather than at an overall test level. A diverse panel reflecting the college’s student population (not necessarily comprised entirely of students) should be used and should include a description of the number and type of each affected group that is included in the review.

7. If items are identified as being biased, a description of the procedures and response to deal with the biased items should be presented.

8. Data collected on students for item bias and disproportionate impact studies should be provided for each affected group. For tests used to place students into ESL courses, the groups would be based on linguistic differences.

9. The type of data to be submitted as Cut-Score validity or Disproportionate Impact evidence may be different depending on whether or not the application is an “initial” or “renewal” request. For initial requests, success ratio data are not a necessity to validate cut-scores (Standards, II.A.1.e and III.C.1.e). Colleges are responsible for submitting documentation that indicates that appropriate procedures were used to determine cut-scores. Similarly, only a description of the plan to monitor Disproportionate Impact is required for initial requests. For renewal applications, some evidence that the cut-scores have been re-examined or monitored is required as is direct evidence (data) on disproportionate impact.

10. Evidence needs to be presented that allows for generalization of results across the forms, courses, and colleges for which approval for use is being requested.

   a. If two or more forms of a test or prompt are in use, evidence that the forms or prompts are parallel and equated must be provided or evidence in each of the Standards’ areas must be presented.

   b. If multiple courses are involved, evidence needs to be presented for each course.

   c. If the request is for approval at two or more colleges, evidence must be presented to support that the colleges are parallel (the same) in course content, delivery of instruction and student populations served. Otherwise, each college must submit evidence specific to their campus.
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
Request for Approval for the Use or Renewal of a Performance Assessment or Locally Constructed or Managed Test

Directions: Provide all requested information. Attach additional pages as needed. Note that this form is to be signed by the identified individuals of the college and submitted with supporting material. When requested, indicate which Standards' areas have been investigated or addressed and those areas not as yet addressed. **Note: Studies addressing all of the Standards' areas need not be completed in order to request approval of an instrument.** The minimum requirements are that you provide at least one type of validity evidence and that the test bias standard be addressed. If information exists in a technical report or other sources, summarize the information for this report and draw conclusions from the information on whether you feel a specific standard has been met at a minimal level for your instrument. Submission of extended reports or exhaustive documentation evidence to support your claims is not required or desired for review of this request.

1. Identify the test with its complete title: ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

2. For which course(s) is this test used to assist with the placement of students? Please identify:
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

3. Have there been investigations of the validity of the use of scores obtained from this test? (If your response is no to this question, do not submit this request until some validity evidence is available.)
   ______ YES, all required studies have been completed. Attach a brief narrative that summarizes the procedures and findings from all such investigations.
   ______ YES, but not all required studies have been completed. Attach a brief narrative that summarizes the procedures and findings from all such investigations.
   ______ Projected completion date for required studies not completed: __________

4. Have there been investigations of the reliability of scores obtained from this test?
   ______ YES. Attach a brief narrative that summarizes the procedures and findings from all such investigations.
   ______ NO. Projected completion date: ______
5. Have there been investigations of test bias? (If your response is “no” to this question, do not submit this request until some test bias evidence is available.) Note also that the required evidence may be different depending on whether this is an initial or renewal request for an instrument.

______ YES. Attach a brief narrative that summarizes the procedures and findings from all such investigations.

6. Have there been investigations of the adequacy of the cut or placement score(s) used with this test?

______ YES. Attach a brief narrative that summarizes the procedures and findings from all such investigations.

______ NO. Projected completion date: ___________

7. Have there been investigations planned (for first-time submissions) or conducted (for renewal) of disproportionate impact in those courses that rely on this test to assist in placement decisions?

______ YES. Attach a brief narrative that summarizes the procedures and findings from all such investigations.

______ NO. Projected completion date: ___________

There is documented evidence in the appropriate college or district office to support the adequacy, suitability and usefulness of this test to provide fair and equitable course placement information to our students as described in the California Community College Standards. At a minimum, evidence from at least one validity study (content, criterion-related or consequential) and bias study must be sufficient to support the continued use of the instrument for placement advisement.

*NOTICE: Locally Managing a Second Party Test*
The California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office assumes that the local college has received authorization from the publisher for use of this test as a locally managed, second party test.

__________________________________________  ______________
College Superintendent/President   Date

__________________________________________  ______________
College Assessment Officer    Date

__________________________________________  ______________
College Research Officer    Date

__________________________________________  ______________
College Subject Discipline Faculty/Chair    Date