

**EIMAC Spring 2008 Meeting
Online Testing Concurrent Session
Wednesday, April 23, 2008**

Presenters: Kris Kaase, MS; Roberta Alley, AZ; Shelley Loving-Ryder, VA

Mississippi/Overview

- Initial excitement re technology, cost savings, administration logistics (counting booklets, security), ability to offer multiple forms
- Realities of different platforms, administrative errors
- Trade-offs between paper/pencil vs. online: authenticity of hand-written exams

Arizona

- Initial phase
 - Pressure from all stakeholders, SEA policy makers, legislators, governor, districts wanting quick turnaround on results
 - SEA capacity issues: high number of charter schools, very remote areas including reservation areas with extremely limited access to technology (e.g., one provider available)
- Alternate assessment only available online (AIMS A for 1%)
 - Teacher ratings
 - New in 2007-08 - student multiple choice (practice items available)
 - Higher functioning 1% students can be assessed independently, teachers surprised, students engaged, waiting for all results
 - Needed new server to accommodate bandwidth
 - Screen size affected some text size
- IDEAL formative assessment tool secure for teachers, working on security/protection for students by fall
 - Canned/template quizzes more popular than choosing items and developing own assessment
 - Original model not teacher-friendly, should have waited, frustrated by changes
- 2007 online field test of science at grade 8
 - Only paper and pencil in 2008
 - District and server issues
 - Disrupted class time in computer labs: schedule far in advance
- Future
 - Concerns re state budget problems and costs of supporting school technological capacity
 - Online ADP Algebra II exam

- Considering 2% modified assessment
- Long term plans: AIMS high school test, then grades 3-8

Virginia

- Writing exam is only test not administered online
- Funds provided by legislature for instruction, remediation, and assessment so daily usage, not just assessment: larger web-based initiative in state (SOL Technology Initiative)
- Phased deadlines: high schools (2003-04), then middle (2005-06), then elementary (2008-09)
- Rationale to start with end-of-course assessments required for graduation: quick results, opportunity to quickly re-take
- 11 responses to original RFP, 3 chosen to develop Demonstration Phase, Pearson/NCS selected as single contractor
- School readiness certification process re school capacity prior to receiving funds
- All divisions (districts) administering online by spring 2005 (not every school in every division)
- Voluntary initiative, positive word-of-mouth
- Middle/high schools likely to have labs, elementary likely to have five computers per classroom. Moving toward using laptops that can be moved from school to school
- What Worked
 - Governor's initiative with legislative support, key partnership between SEA chief, assessment, and technology, also support from division and school leadership
 - Incentives: flexibility with late transferring students, not counting booklets, quick results
 - Joint responsibility from SEA/district technology and assessment staff, first interaction between these departments
 - Voluntary nature of initiative
 - Strong project plan during initial development phase and demonstration phase
 - Hands-on training for test administrators (not WebEx), separate training for tech staff (turnkey)
 - Student practice test series with released test items and online tools used during test
 - Information for parents/community
 - SEA status page with updates re issues/updates/instructions in case Pearson site goes down
 - LEA secure site: checklists, guidelines, requirements
 - Pearson and SEA help desks
 - Division hardware, software, upgrades: \$60 million per year despite state budget issues
 - Flexibility in platforms, machines (e.g., PC/Apple)

- Proctor caching: through district server - tests downloaded and encrypted. Served to student machine, reduces strain on bandwidth, necessary to support audio tests
- Proactive early warning system as part of TestNav, saves student responses locally in two separate locations, protects against internet and Pearson problems
- Reduced burden on test directors, more burden on tech staff
- Challenges
 - Post-equating each test. Uncertain what to do when not enough paper/pencil students to equate
 - Local control
 - Changing technology
 - Variety in vendor support
 - Enough test items (e.g., number of writing prompts)

Online Assessment Q and A

- Affect on test accommodations
 - VA: optimistic in developing 2% assessment but current online system doesn't allow large print
 - AZ: supportive in equalizing support to special education students. Also working on ability to change print size
 - MN: unexpected benefit re math test for ELLs
- Which is preferable: paper/pencil or online?
 - VA: Online
 - AZ: Like AIMS A, not sure how rapidly to move, fear of pushing before ready, fear of moving in wrong direction because technology keeps changing. Anxiety re long-range commitment if flexibility is not there
 - MS: Online if had large budget. Lack funds to support school capacity and state capacity
- Costs
 - MS: Costs about the same for each system, no savings
 - VA: Online more efficient, no extra test booklets. Pay to launch online, pay field test variations. Base costs regardless of number of students tested. Cost per student online is declining as test more (scaled costs). PEM Solutions - vendor provides online reporting. Can print local reports, can order printed reports. If equated, immediate access to student reports.
 - OR, KS, MS: SEA and vendor share online reporting
 - MN: Saved money in printing/distribution, using savings for sophisticated, scenario-based item development
- What happens when you have a new RFP? Transition plans?
 - VA: planning for year of transition

- Student Cheating
 - VA: Informal "carrels" to block view, start on different items. Re cell phones/PDAs: school responsibility to check for devices. Will invalidate, create test violations
 - OR: Different forms
 - AZ: Require school to identify and remove devices but still occurs. Will invalidate, create test violations
 - MS: Creativity on part of administrator. Considering purchasing device-detectors for test sites