

**Seminars on Inclusive Assessment: Evaluating and Improving Technical Quality of Alternate Assessments (2006)**

**Summary of Standard-Setting Methodologies**

Methodology	Summary description	Test formats that work with this methodology
Modified Angoff	Panelists estimate the percentage of minimally proficient students at each performance level who are expected to answer correctly/be able to do each test item; these individual estimates are summed to produce an overall percentage of items correct that correspond to the cut score for that level.	Assessments with multiple items that are scored right/wrong
Extended Angoff	Intended for open-ended items scored with a multiple-point rubric. Panelists determine the mean score that 100 minimally proficient students at each performance level would receive on this item. Summing the estimate across items produces the cut score.	Assessments with open-ended items.
Yes/No Method	Rather than estimating a percentage, panelists simply determine whether or not a borderline student would be likely to answer correctly/be able to do each test item. Summing the number of "yesses" across items produces the cut score.	Assessments that include items that are scored right/wrong or checklists.
Bookmark or Item Mapping	Panelists mark the spot in a specially constructed test booklet (arranged in order of item difficulty) where minimally proficient (or advanced) students would be able to answer correctly the items occurring before that spot with a certain probability.	Assessments with multiple items that are scored right/wrong or with short (3-4 point) rubrics.
Performance Profile Method	Panelists mark the spot in a specially constructed booklet of score profiles (arranged from lowest to highest total points) that designates sufficient performance to be classified as proficient. Each score profile uses a pictorial bar graph to display the student's performance on each task of the assessment and two to five profiles are shown for each raw score point.	Assessments containing open-ended items, usually performance tasks, where it is difficult to provide samples of student work to show.
Reasoned Judgment	Panelists divide a score scale (e.g., 32 points into a desired number of categories (e.g., 4) in some way (equally, larger in the middle, etc.) based on expert judgment.	Any assessment that results in one overall score.
Dominant Profile	Panelists identify in writing the minimum profile that would qualify an examinee to reach the desired level of performance. The profile might include statements such as: (1) No score below 2 on any task; (2) Score at least 4 points on task 2; (3) Total score of at least 20 points.	Performance assessments that contained predominantly open-ended items
Judgmental Policy Capturing	Panelists determine which of the various components of an overall assessment are more important than others, so that components or types of evidence are weighted.	An assessment that contains multiple components.
Body of Work	Panelists examine all of the data for a student and use this information to place the student in one of the overall performance levels. Standard setters are given a set of papers that demonstrate the complete range of possible scores from low to high	Assessments that consist primarily of performance tasks or one general body of evidence, such as a portfolio.
Contrasting Groups	Teachers separate students into groups based on their observations of the students in the classroom; the scores of the students are then calculated to determine where scores will be categorized in the future.	Because this method is not tied to the test, it works with almost any test that results in an overall score.

Sources: Cizek, G. J. (2001). *Setting performance standards: Concepts, methods, and perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: LEA.  
 Livingston, S. A. & Zieky, M. J. (1982). *Passing scores: A manual for setting standards of performance on educational occupational tests*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.  
 Roeber, E. (2002). *Setting standards on alternate assessments* (Synthesis Report 42). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. <http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/Synthesis42.html>.