2021–2022 Technical Manual

Pennsylvania Supplement

January 2023

Acknowledgements

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

1. Overview

During the 2021–2022 academic year, the Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System offered assessments of student achievement in mathematics, English language arts (ELA), and science for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3 through 8 and high school.

A complete technical manual was created in 2021–2022 for ELA and mathematics (Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium [DLM Consortium], 2022). This volume provides state-specific information for two of those chapters. For a complete description of the DLM system for ELA and mathematics, refer to the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

1.1. Data Suppression

In order to ensure that individual students cannot be identified, disaggregated counts have been randomly rounded to the nearest 10, the suppression threshold specified by Pennsylvania. Random rounding means that a single value could round up or down, with the probability equal to the distance to each rounded value (Matthews & Harel, 2011). For example, a value of 17 would have a 30% chance of rounding down to 10 and a 70% chance of rounding up to 20 (i.e., values are more likely to round to their nearest end point). This method ensures that all the data is properly deidentified, while providing the maximum amount of information. That is, when using simple data suppression, groups that are above the suppression threshold must often be complementarily suppressed in order to ensure that groups below the suppression threshold are properly deidentified. Random rounding allows for results to be reported for all groups, while preserving student confidentiality.

1.2. State-Specific Supplement Overview

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the contents of the Pennsylvania state-specific supplement.

Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 do not include data specific to a single state and are not included in the state-specific supplement.

Chapter 4 provides an update on assessment delivery for Pennsylvania during the 2021–2022 year. The chapter provides a summary of administration time and device usage, update analyses of blueprint coverage and adaptive delivery, a summary of updated Personal Needs and Preferences Profile selections, and test administrator survey results regarding user experience and.

Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 do not include data specific to a single state and are not included in the state-specific supplement.

Chapter 7 reports the 2021–2022 operational results for Pennsylvania, including student participation data. The chapter details the percentage of students at each performance level; subgroup performance by gender, race, ethnicity, and English learner status; and the percentage of students who showed mastery at each linkage level. Finally, the chapter provides descriptions of changes to score reports and data files during the 2021–2022 administration.

Chapter 8, Chapter 9, and Chapter 10 do not include data specific to a single states and are not included in the state-specific supplement. For a complete summary, see the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

2. Content Structures

Learning maps are a unique key feature of the Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System and drive the development of all other components. For a description of the process used to develop the map models, including the detailed work necessary to establish and refine the DLM maps in light of the Common Core State Standards and the needs of the student population, see Chapter 2 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

3. Assessment Design and Development

For a description of updates to the Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System's item and test development for the 2021–2022 academic year, including a summary of external reviews of items and testlets for content, bias, and accessibility; a description of the operational assessments; and a description of field tests, see Chapter 3 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

For a complete description of item and test development, including information on the use of evidence-centered design and Universal Design for Learning in the creation of concept maps to guide test development; external review of content; and information on the pool of items available for field tests and the 2021–2022 administration, see the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

4. Assessment Delivery

Chapter 4 of the Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022) describes general test administration and monitoring procedures. This chapter describes updated procedures and data collected in 2021–2022, including a summary of administration time, adaptive routing, Personal Needs and Preferences Profile selections, and test administrator survey responses regarding user experience and accessibility.

Overall, administration features remained consistent with the 2020–2021 intended implementation, including the availability of instructionally embedded testlets, spring operational administration of testlets, the use of adaptive delivery during the spring window, and the availability of accessibility supports.

For a complete description of test administration for DLM assessments, including information on available resources and materials and information on monitoring assessment administration, see the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

4.1. Key Features of the Year-End Assessment Model

This section describes DLM test administration for 2021–2022. For a complete description of key administration features, including information on assessment delivery, the Kite Suite®, and linkage level assignment, see Chapter 4 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022). Additional information about changes in administration can also be found in the *Test Administration Manual* (DLM Consortium, 2021a) and the *Educator Portal User Guide* (DLM Consortium, 2021c).

4.1.1. Assessment Administration Windows

Assessments are administered in the spring assessment window for operational reporting. Optional assessments are available during the instructionally embedded assessment window for educators to administer for formative information.

4.1.1.1. Instructionally Embedded Assessment Window

During the instructionally embedded assessment window, testlets are optionally available for test administrators to assign to their students. When choosing to administer the optional testlets during the instructionally embedded assessment window, educators decide which EEs and linkage levels to assess for each student. The assessment delivery system recommends a linkage level for each EE based on the educator's responses to the student's First Contact survey, but educators can choose a different linkage level based on their own professional judgment. In 2021–2022, the instructionally embedded assessment window occurred between September 13, 2021, and February 23, 2022. States were given the option of using the entire window or setting their own dates within the larger window. In Pennsylvania, the instructionally embedded assessment window occurred between September 13, 2021, and February 23, 2022.

4.1.1.2. Spring Assessment Window

During the spring assessment window, students are assessed on all of the EEs on the assessment blueprint in ELA and mathematics. The linkage level for each EE is determined by the system. In 2021–2022, the spring assessment window occurred between March 14, 2022, and June 10, 2022. States

were given the option of using the entire window or setting their own dates within the larger window. In Pennsylvania, the spring assessment window occurred between March 14, 2022, and May 20, 2022.

4.2. Evidence from the DLM System

This section describes evidence collected by the DLM System during the 2021–2022 operational administration of the DLM alternate assessment. The categories of evidence include data relating to administration time, device usage, adaptive routing, and accessibility support selections.

4.2.1. Administration Time

Estimated administration time varies by student and subject. Testlets can be administered separately across multiple testing sessions as long as they are all completed within the testing window.

The published estimated total testing time per testlet is around 5–10 minutes in mathematics, 10–15 minutes in reading, and 10–20 minutes for writing. The estimated total testing time is 60–75 minutes per student in ELA and 35–50 minutes in mathematics in the spring assessment window. Published estimates are slightly longer than anticipated real testing times because of the assumption that test administrators need time for setup. Actual testing time per testlet varies depending on each student's unique characteristics.

Kite Student Portal captured start dates, end dates, and time stamps for every testlet. The difference between these start and end times was calculated for each completed testlet. Table 4.1 summarizes the distribution of test times per testlet for students in Pennsylvania. The distribution of test times in Table 4.1 is consistent with the distribution observed in prior years. Most testlets took around nine minutes or less to complete, with mathematics testlets generally taking less time than ELA testlets. Time per testlet may have been impacted by student breaks during the assessment. Testlets with shorter than expected administration times are included in an extract made available to each state. States can use this information to monitor assessment administration and address as necessary. For a description of the administration time monitoring extract, see section 4.3.1 of this chapter.

Table 4.1

Distribution of Response Times per Testlet in Minutes

Grade	Min	Median	Mean	Max	25Q	75Q	IQR
English language arts							
3	0.13	3.73	4.59	73.37	2.52	5.65	3.13
4	0.20	3.97	4.94	89.28	2.67	6.08	3.42
5	0.13	4.10	5.07	67.18	2.73	6.30	3.57
6	0.17	4.03	5.04	83.65	2.63	6.18	3.55
7	0.20	4.67	5.73	83.27	2.92	7.26	4.34
8	0.18	4.03	4.96	83.20	2.67	6.13	3.47
9	4.63	8.63	8.70	14.98	5.95	10.64	4.69
11	0.18	4.75	6.30	83.80	2.97	7.58	4.62
Mathematics							
3	0.15	1.75	2.47	76.77	1.05	2.98	1.93
4	0.12	1.37	1.94	53.52	0.88	2.22	1.33
5	0.10	1.52	2.17	53.80	0.97	2.52	1.55
6	0.07	1.55	2.20	85.47	1.02	2.55	1.53
7	0.08	1.52	2.12	80.15	0.92	2.52	1.60
8	0.10	1.47	2.13	87.98	0.92	2.45	1.53
9	0.57	1.60	2.27	5.88	1.12	2.90	1.78
11	0.10	1.62	2.35	79.02	1.03	2.72	1.68

Note. Min = minimum, Max = maximum, 25Q = lower quartile, 75Q = upper quartile, IQR = interquartile range.

4.2.2. Device Usage

Testlets may be administered on a variety of devices. Kite Student Portal captured the operating system used for each testlet completed. Although these data do not capture specific devices used to complete each testlet (e.g., SMART Board, switch system, etc.), they provide high-level information about how students access assessment content. For example, we can identify how often an iPad is used relative to a Chromebook or traditional PC. Figure 4.1 shows the number of testlets completed on each operating system by subject and linkage level for 2021–2022. In Pennsylvania, 51% of testlets were completed on a Chromebook, 26% were completed on an iPad, 19% were completed on a PC, and 4% were completed on a Mac.

Figure 4.1

Distribution of Devices Used for Completed Testlets

4.2.3. Blueprint Coverage

Each student is assessed on all EEs included on the assessment blueprint.[1] Table 4.2 summarizes the number of EEs required for each grade and subject.

Table 4.2

Essential Elements Required for Blueprint Coverage

Grade	English language arts (*n*)	Mathematics (*n*)
3	10	8
4	11	8
5	10	8
6	11	7
7	13	7
8	13	8
9	14	7
10	14	8
11	14	6

Across all grades in Pennsylvania, 96% of students in ELA and 97% of students in mathematics were assessed on all of the EEs and met blueprint requirements. Table 4.3 summarizes the total number of students and the percentage of students meeting blueprint requirements based on their complexity band for each subject. When comparing complexity band distributions, there was a slightly lower percentage of Foundational students not meeting requirements. However, all complexity band groups had over 90% of students meeting the coverage requirements.

Table 4.3

Student Blueprint Coverage by Complexity Band

Complexity Band	*n*	% meeting requirements
English language arts		
Foundational	1,980	90.4
Band 1	5,330	96.4
Band 2	6,520	98.1
Band 3	2,800	97.2
Mathematics		
Foundational	1,980	91.0
Band 1	5,060	96.3
Band 2	7,440	98.1
Band 3	2,150	98.7

Note. Counts were randomly rounded to the nearest 10.

---

[1] For a description of the assessment blueprints see Chapter 2 of this manual.

4.2.4. Adaptive Delivery

During the spring 2022 test administration, the ELA and mathematics assessments were adaptive between testlets, following the same routing rules applied in prior years. That is, the linkage level associated with the next testlet a student received was based on the student's performance on the most recently administered testlet, with the specific goal of maximizing the match of student knowledge and skill to the appropriate linkage level content.

- The system adapted up one linkage level if the student responded correctly to at least 80% of the items measuring the previously tested EE. If the previous testlet was at the highest linkage level (i.e., Successor), the student remained at that level.
- The system adapted down one linkage level if the student responded correctly to less than 35% of the items measuring the previously tested EE. If the previous testlet was at the lowest linkage level (i.e., Initial Precursor), the student remained at that level.
- Testlets remained at the same linkage level if the student responded correctly to between 35% and 80% of the items on the previously tested EE.

The linkage level of the first testlet assigned to a student was based on First Contact survey responses. The correspondence between the First Contact complexity bands and first assigned linkage levels are shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

Correspondence of Complexity Bands and Linkage Levels

First Contact complexity band	Linkage level
Foundational	Initial Precursor
Band 1	Distal Precursor
Band 2	Proximal Precursor
Band 3	Target

Following the spring 2022 administration, analyses were conducted to determine the mean percentage of testlets that adapted from the first to second testlet administered for students within a grade, subject, and complexity band. The aggregated results can be seen in Table 4.5 and Table 4.6 for ELA and mathematics, respectively.

Due to small sample size, data regarding the adaptation of linkage levels in Pennsylvania was unavailable for grade 9 across both subjects and for Complexity Band 3 in grade 3 ELA. For the majority of students across grades 3 through 8 and 11 who were assigned to the Foundational Complexity Band by the First Contact survey, testlets did not adapt to a higher linkage level after the first assigned testlet (ranging from 55% to 87% across both subjects). Consistent patterns were not as apparent for students who were assigned Complexity Band 1, Complexity Band 2, or Complexity Band 3. Distributions across the three categories were more variable across grades and subjects. Results indicate that linkage levels of students assigned to higher complexity bands are more variable with respect to the direction in which students move between the first and second testlets. However, this finding of more variability in the higher complexity bands is consistent with prior years, which showed the same trend. Several factors may help

explain these results, including more variability in student characteristics within this group and content-based differences across grades and subjects. Further exploration is needed in this area.

Table 4.5

Adaptation of Linkage Levels Between First and Second English Language Arts Testlets (N = 16,641)

Grade	Foundational		Band 1			Band 2			Band 3		
	Adapted up (%)	Did not adapt (%)	Adapted up (%)	Did not adapt (%)	Adapted down (%)	Adapted up (%)	Did not adapt (%)	Adapted down (%)	Adapted up (%)	Did not adapt (%)	Adapted down (%)
Grade 3	15.9	84.1	63.4	19.3	17.3	80.0	12.7	7.3	96.2	3.8	<0.1
Grade 4	26.2	73.8	15.4	27.1	57.5	64.9	25.5	9.6	52.5	17.8	29.7
Grade 5	26.8	73.2	26.1	28.7	45.3	65.6	28.8	5.6	91.3	6.8	1.9
Grade 6	33.6	66.4	11.3	21.3	67.4	22.5	41.3	36.2	34.4	51.2	14.3
Grade 7	31.3	68.7	25.6	26.7	47.7	47.7	37.6	14.6	68.8	25.9	5.4
Grade 8	36.8	63.2	23.2	21.6	55.2	67.6	21.5	10.9	85.9	10.3	3.9
Grade 9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 11	43.8	56.2	7.7	34.9	57.4	57.6	28.6	13.8	68.6	18.5	12.9
Grade 12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

[*] These data were suppressed because *n* < 50.

Note. Foundational is the lowest complexity band, so testlets could not adapt down a linkage level.

r} \end{table}

Table 4.6

Adaptation of Linkage Levels Between First and Second Mathematics Testlets (N = 16,629)

Grade	Foundational		Band 1			Band 2			Band 3		
	Adapted up (%)	Did not adapt (%)	Adapted up (%)	Did not adapt (%)	Adapted down (%)	Adapted up (%)	Did not adapt (%)	Adapted down (%)	Adapted up (%)	Did not adapt (%)	Adapted down (%)
Grade 3	12.9	87.1	9.4	31.1	59.4	17.0	52.6	30.4	68.5	20.2	11.2
Grade 4	14.9	85.1	21.2	31.2	47.6	72.7	22.7	4.6	83.0	14.2	2.8
Grade 5	17.2	82.8	10.3	32.1	57.6	42.3	27.2	30.5	69.4	20.9	9.7
Grade 6	19.6	80.4	11.4	42.2	46.4	26.7	37.8	35.5	46.8	45.4	7.8
Grade 7	26.6	73.4	10.1	25.3	64.6	15.8	20.6	63.5	71.9	21.7	6.4
Grade 8	21.7	78.3	10.3	50.2	39.4	25.7	59.2	15.1	47.9	23.4	28.7
Grade 9	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grade 11	45.4	54.6	9.0	30.4	60.6	27.6	33.2	39.2	12.5	10.2	77.3
Grade 12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

[*] These data were suppressed because *n* < 50.

Note. Foundational is the lowest complexity band, so testlets could not adapt down a linkage level.

4.2.5. Administration Incidents

DLM staff annually evaluates testlet assignment to ensure students are correctly assigned to testlets. Administration incidents that have the potential to affect scoring are reported to state education agencies in a supplemental Incident File. No incidents were observed during the 2021–2022 operational assessment windows. Assignment of testlets will continue to be monitored in subsequent years to track any potential incidents and report them to state education agencies.

4.2.6. Accessibility Support Selections

Accessibility supports provided in 2021–2022 were the same as those available in previous years. The DLM *Accessibility Manual* (DLM Consortium, 2021b) distinguishes accessibility supports that are provided in Kite Student Portal via the Personal Needs and Preferences Profile, require additional tools or materials, or are provided by the test administrator outside the system. Table 4.7 shows selection rates for the three categories of accessibility supports. Overall, 15,035 students (82%) had at least one support selected. The most commonly selected supports in 2021–2022 were human read aloud, spoken audio, and test administrator enters responses for student. For a complete description of the available accessibility supports, see Chapter 4 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022). Additionally, educators reported in the First Contact survey that 47% of students in Pennsylvania were able to access a computer independently, with or without assistive technology.

Table 4.7

*Accessibility Supports Selected for Pennsylvania Students (*N = 18,377*)*

Support	*n*	%
Supports provided in Kite Student Portal		
Spoken audio	8,430	45.9
Magnification	2,400	13.1
Color contrast	1,350	7.3
Overlay color	550	3.0
Invert color choice	430	2.3
Supports requiring additional tools/materials		
Calculator	4,600	25.0
Individualized manipulatives	4,040	22.0
Single-switch system	620	3.4
Alternate form - visual impairment	340	1.9
Two-switch system	120	0.7
Uncontracted braille	20	0.1
Supports provided outside the system		
Human read aloud	12,550	68.3
Test administrator enters responses for student	7,680	41.8
Partner-assisted scanning	740	4.0
Sign interpretation of text	240	1.3
Language translation of text	130	0.7

Note. Counts were randomly rounded to the nearest 10.

4.3. Evidence From Monitoring Assessment Administration

Monitoring of assessment administration was conducted using various materials and strategies. DLM project staff developed an assessment administration monitoring protocol for use by DLM staff, state education agency staff, and local education agency staff. Project staff also reviewed Service Desk contacts and hosted regular check-in calls to monitor common issues and concerns during the assessment window. This section provides an overview of all resources and supports as well as more detail regarding the assessment administration observation protocol and its use, check-in calls with states, and methods for monitoring testlet delivery.

4.3.1. Data Forensics Monitoring

Two data forensics monitoring reports are available in Educator Portal. The first report includes information about testlets completed outside of normal business hours. The second report includes information about testlets that were completed within a short period of time.

The Testing Outside of Hours report allows state education agencies to specify days and hours within a day that testlets are expected to be completed. Each state can select its own days and hours for setting expectations. For example, a state could elect to flag any testlet completed outside of Monday through

Friday from 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. local time. The Testing Outside of Hours report then identifies students who completed assessments outside of the defined expected hours. Overall, 1,484 (1%) ELA and mathematics testlets were completed outside of the expected hours by 1,240 (7%) students in Pennsylvania.

The Testing Completed in a Short Period of Time report identifies students who completed a testlet within an unexpectedly short period of time. The threshold for inclusion in the report was testlet completion time of less than 30 seconds in mathematics and 60 seconds in ELA. The report is intended for state users to identify potentially aberrant response patterns; however there are many legitimate reasons a testlet may be submitted in a short time period. Overall, 8,127 (3%) testlets were completed in a short period of time by 3,507 (21%) students in Pennsylvania.

4.4. Evidence From Test Administrators

This section first describes evidence collected from the spring 2022 test administrator survey. Data on user experience with the DLM System as well as student opportunity to learn is evaluated annually through a survey that test administrators are invited to complete after administration of the spring assessment. Test administrators receive one survey per rostered DLM student, which collects information about that student's assessment experience. As in previous years, the survey was distributed to test administrators in Kite Student Portal, where students completed assessments. The survey consisted of four blocks. Blocks 1 and 4 were administered in every survey. Block 1 included questions about the test administrator's perceptions of the assessments and the student's interaction with the content, and Block 4 included questions about the test administrator's background. Block 2 was spiraled, so test administrators received one randomly assigned section. In these sections, test administrators were asked about one of the following topics per survey: relationship to ELA instruction, relationship to mathematics instruction, or relationship to science instruction. Block 3 was added in 2021 and remained in the survey in 2022 to gather information about educational experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. After evidence from the spring 2022 test administrator survey is presented, this section also presents evidence collected from First Contact survey responses and educator cognitive labs.

4.4.1. User Experience With the DLM System

A total of 3,740 test administrators from Pennsylvania responded to the survey (85%) about 13,181 students' experiences. Test administrators are instructed to respond to the survey separately for each of their students. Participating Pennsylvania test administrators responded to surveys for a median of three students. Pennsylvania test administrators reported having an average of 11 years of experience in ELA, 11 years in mathematics, and 10 years with students with significant cognitive disabilities.

The following sections summarize responses regarding both educator and student experience with the system.

4.4.1.1. Educator Experience

Test administrators were asked to reflect on their own experience with the assessments as well as their comfort level and knowledge administering them. Most of the questions required test administrators to respond on a 4-point scale: *strongly disagree, disagree, agree,* or *strongly agree*. Responses are summarized in Table 4.8.

Nearly all Pennsylvania test administrators (96%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were confident administering DLM testlets. Most respondents (90%) agreed or strongly agreed that the required test administrator training prepared them for their responsibilities as test administrators. Most test administrators also responded that they had access to curriculum aligned with the content that was measured by the assessments (83%) and that they used the manuals and the Educator Resources page (88%).

Table 4.8

Test Administrator Responses Regarding Test Administration

Statement	SD		D		A		SA		A+SA	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
I was confident in my ability to deliver DLM testlets.	35	1.0	110	3.3	1,642	48.9	1,569	46.8	3,211	95.7
Required test administrator training prepared me for the responsibilities of a test administrator.	80	2.4	272	8.1	1,828	54.5	1,172	35.0	3,000	89.5
I have access to curriculum aligned with the content measured by DLM assessments.	120	3.6	457	13.7	1,828	54.6	942	28.1	2,770	82.7
I used manuals and/or the DLM Educator Resource Page materials.	82	2.4	331	9.9	1,973	58.9	966	28.8	2,939	87.7

Note. SD = strongly disagree; D = disagree; A = agree; SA = strongly agree; A+SA = agree and strongly agree.

4.5. Conclusion

Delivery of the DLM System was designed to align with instructional practice and be responsive to individual student needs. Assessment delivery options allow for necessary flexibility to reflect student needs while also including constraints to maximize comparability and support valid interpretation of results. The dynamic nature of DLM assessment administration is reflected in the initial input through the First Contact survey, as well as adaptive routing between testlets. Evidence collected from the DLM System, test administration monitoring, and test administrators indicates that students are able to successfully interact with the system to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and understandings.

5. Modeling

The Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System draws upon a well-established research base in cognition and learning theory but relatively uncommon operational psychometric methods to provide feedback about student performance. The approach uses innovative operational psychometric methods to provide feedback about student mastery of skills. For modeling evidence from 2021–2022, including a complete description of the psychometric model used to calibrate and score the DLM assessments, the psychometric background, the structure of the assessment system suitability for diagnostic modeling, and a detailed summary of the procedures used to calibrate and score DLM assessments, see Chapter 5 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

6. Standard Setting

The standard setting process for the Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics derived cut points for assigning students to four performance levels based on results from the 2014–2015 DLM alternate assessments and an adjustment process in spring 2022. For a description of the process, including the development of policy performance level descriptors, the 4-day standard setting meeting, follow-up evaluation of impact data and cut points, the 2022 standards adjustment process, and specification of grade- and content-specific performance level descriptors, see Chapter 6 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

7. Reporting and Results

Chapter 7 of the Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022) describes assessment results for the 2021–2022 academic year, including student participation and performance summaries, and an overview of data files and score reports delivered to state education agencies. Technical Manual updates provide a description of data files, score reports, and results for each corresponding academic year.

This chapter presents Pennsylvania-specific 2021–2022 student participation data; the percentage of students achieving at each performance level; and subgroup performance by gender, race, ethnicity, and English learner status. This chapter also reports the distribution of students by the highest linkage level mastered during 2021–2022. Finally, this chapter describes updates made to score reports during the 2021–2022 operational year. For a complete description of score reports and interpretive guides, see Chapter 7 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

7.1. Student Participation

During spring 2022, assessments were administered to 16,650 students in Pennsylvania. The assessments were administered by 4,186 educators in 2,034 schools and 705 school districts. A total of 268,082 test sessions were administered during the spring assessment window. One test session is one testlet taken by one student. Only test sessions that were complete at the close of the spring assessment window counted toward the total sessions.

Table 7.1 summarizes the number of students assessed in each grade. In grades 3–8, over 2,350 students participated in each grade. In high school, the largest number of students participated in grade 11, and the smallest number participated in grade 9.

Table 7.1

*Student Participation by Grade (*N = 16,650*)*

Grade	Students (*n*)
3	2,380
4	2,460
5	2,410
6	2,440
7	2,450
8	2,350
9	10
11	2,160

Note. Counts were randomly rounded to the nearest 10.

Table 7.2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the students who participated in the spring 2022 administration. The distribution of students across the different subgroups was fairly consistent with prior years' distributions. The majority of participants were male (69%) and white (53%). About 7% of students were monitored or eligible for English learning services.

Table 7.2

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 16,650)

Subgroup	*n*	%
Gender		
Male	11,420	68.6
Female	5,230	31.4
Race		
White	8,830	53.0
African American	3,740	22.4
Two or more races	3,270	19.6
Asian	700	4.2
American Indian	90	0.5
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	20	0.1
Alaska Native	10	0.1
Hispanic ethnicity		
Non-Hispanic	14,020	84.2
Hispanic	2,630	15.8
English learning (EL) participation		
Not EL eligible or monitored	15,560	93.5
EL eligible or monitored	1,090	6.5

Note. Counts were randomly rounded to the nearest 10.

In addition to the spring assessment window, instructionally embedded assessments are also made available for educators to optionally administer to students during the year. Results from the instructionally embedded assessments do not contribute to final summative scoring but can be used to guide instructional decision-making. No students in Pennsylvania took an instructionally embedded testlet during 2021–2022.

7.2. Student Performance

Student performance on DLM assessments is interpreted using cut points,[2] which describe student achievement using four performance levels. A student's performance level is determined based on the total number of linkage levels mastered across the assessed EEs.

For the spring 2022 administration, student performance was reported using four performance levels:

- The student demonstrates *Emerging* understanding of and ability to apply content knowledge and skills represented by the EEs.
- The student's understanding of and ability to apply targeted content knowledge and skills represented by the EEs is *Approaching the Target*.

---

[2] For a description of the standard setting process used to determine the cut points, see Chapter 6 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

- The student's understanding of and ability to apply content knowledge and skills represented by the EEs is *At Target*. This performance level is considered to be meeting achievement expectations.
- The student demonstrates *Advanced* understanding of and ability to apply targeted content knowledge and skills represented by the EEs.

7.2.1. Overall Performance

Table 7.3 reports the percentage of Pennsylvania students achieving at each performance level from the spring 2022 administration for ELA and mathematics. In ELA, the percentage of students who achieved at the At Target or Advanced levels (i.e., proficient) ranged from approximately <1% to 40%. In mathematics, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding At Target expectations ranged from approximately 11% to 45%.

Table 7.3

Percentage of Students by Grade and Performance Level

Grade	Emerging (%)	Approaching (%)	At Target (%)	Advanced (%)	At Target + Advanced (%)
English language arts					
3 (*n* = 2,390)	53.1	16.7	28.5	1.7	30.1
4 (*n* = 2,470)	53.0	24.7	20.6	1.6	22.3
5 (*n* = 2,420)	44.2	16.1	31.4	8.3	39.7
6 (*n* = 2,440)	41.4	26.2	25.0	7.4	32.4
7 (*n* = 2,460)	35.4	28.9	28.5	7.3	35.8
8 (*n* = 2,330)	35.6	33.0	30.9	0.4	31.3
9 (*n* = 20)	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11 (*n* = 2,140)	29.4	33.6	31.3	5.6	36.9
Mathematics					
3 (*n* = 2,380)	56.7	16.8	17.6	8.8	26.5
4 (*n* = 2,470)	43.3	12.1	32.4	12.1	44.5
5 (*n* = 2,400)	41.2	25.4	16.7	16.7	33.3
6 (*n* = 2,430)	54.3	25.9	12.8	7.0	19.8
7 (*n* = 2,440)	62.3	23.0	8.6	6.1	14.8
8 (*n* = 2,330)	53.6	35.2	7.3	3.9	11.2
9 (*n* = 10)	—	—	—	—	—
11 (*n* = 2,150)	44.7	24.7	29.8	0.9	30.7

Note. Counts were randomly rounded to the nearest 10.

7.2.2. Subgroup Performance

Data collection for DLM assessments includes demographic data on gender, race, ethnicity, and English learning status. Table 7.4 and Table 7.5 summarize the Pennsylvania disaggregated frequency distributions for ELA and mathematics, respectively, collapsed across all assessed grade levels.

Table 7.4

ELA Performance Level Distributions by Demographic Subgroup (N = 16,641)

Subgroup	Emerging		Approaching		At Target		Advanced		At Target + Advanced	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender										
Male	4,860	42.6	2,850	25.0	3,170	27.8	540	4.7	3,710	32.5
Female	2,120	40.5	1,390	26.5	1,470	28.1	260	5.0	1,730	33.0
Race										
White	3,550	40.2	2,200	24.9	2,630	29.8	440	5.0	3,070	34.8
African American	1,560	41.7	1,020	27.3	1,000	26.7	160	4.3	1,160	31.0
Two or more races	1,460	44.6	850	26.0	810	24.8	150	4.6	960	29.4
Asian	390	55.7	140	20.0	140	20.0	30	4.3	170	24.3
American Indian	10	11.1	30	33.3	40	44.4	10	11.1	50	55.6
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	10	25.0	10	25.0	10	25.0	10	25.0	20	50.0
Alaska Native	10	33.3	10	33.3	10	33.3	0	0.0	10	33.3
Hispanic ethnicity										
Non-Hispanic	5,780	41.3	3,530	25.2	4,020	28.7	680	4.9	4,700	33.5
Hispanic	1,190	45.2	710	27.0	610	23.2	120	4.6	730	27.8
English learning (EL) participation										
Not EL eligible or monitored	6,480	41.7	3,910	25.2	4,390	28.2	760	4.9	5,150	33.1
EL eligible or monitored	490	45.0	320	29.4	250	22.9	30	2.8	280	25.7

Note. Counts were randomly rounded to the nearest 10.

Table 7.5

Mathematics Performance Level Distributions by Demographic Subgroup (N = 16,629)

Subgroup	Emerging		Approaching		At Target		Advanced		At Target + Advanced	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Gender										
Male	5,720	50.1	2,570	22.5	2,120	18.6	1,000	8.8	3,120	27.3
Female	2,760	52.7	1,280	24.4	850	16.2	350	6.7	1,200	22.9
Race										
White	4,370	49.5	2,090	23.7	1,610	18.3	750	8.5	2,360	26.8
African American	1,940	51.9	900	24.1	630	16.8	270	7.2	900	24.1
Two or more races	1,710	52.5	710	21.8	590	18.1	250	7.7	840	25.8
Asian	410	58.6	120	17.1	100	14.3	70	10.0	170	24.3
American Indian	40	40.0	30	30.0	20	20.0	10	10.0	30	30.0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	10	25.0	10	25.0	10	25.0	10	25.0	20	50.0
Alaska Native	10	33.3	10	33.3	0	0.0	10	33.3	10	33.3
Hispanic ethnicity										
Non-Hispanic	7,070	50.5	3,300	23.6	2,490	17.8	1,140	8.1	3,630	25.9
Hispanic	1,400	53.0	550	20.8	480	18.2	210	8.0	690	26.1
English learning (EL) participation										
Not EL eligible or monitored	7,900	50.9	3,590	23.1	2,780	17.9	1,260	8.1	4,040	26.0
EL eligible or monitored	570	51.8	260	23.6	190	17.3	80	7.3	270	24.5

Note. Counts were randomly rounded to the nearest 10.

7.3. Mastery Results

As described above, the student performance levels are determined by applying cut points to the total number of linkage levels mastered in each subject. In this section, we summarize student mastery of assessed EEs and linkage levels.

7.3.1. Linkage Level Mastery

Scoring for DLM assessments determines the highest linkage level mastered for each EE. The linkage levels are (in order): Initial Precursor, Distal Precursor, Proximal Precursor, Target, and Successor. A student can be a master of zero, one, two, three, four, or all five linkage levels, within the order constraints. For example, if a student masters the Proximal Precursor level, they also master all linkage levels lower in the order (i.e., Initial Precursor and Distal Precursor). This section summarizes the distribution of students by highest linkage level mastered across all EEs. For each student, the highest linkage level mastered across all tested EEs was calculated. Then, for each grade and subject, the number of students with each linkage level as their highest mastered linkage level across all EEs was summed and then divided by the total number of students who tested in the grade and subject. This resulted in the proportion of students for whom each linkage level was the highest level mastered.

Figure 7.1 displays the percentage of Pennsylvania students who mastered each linkage level as the highest linkage level across all assessed EEs for ELA and mathematics. For example, across all grade 3 ELA EEs, the Successor level was the highest level that students mastered 40% of the time. The percentage of students who mastered the Target or Successor linkage level ranged from approximately 50% to 62% in ELA and ranged from approximately 25% to 54% in mathematics.

Figure 7.1

Students' Highest Linkage Level Mastered Across English Language Arts and Mathematics Essential Elements by Grade

Note. Grades with fewer than 10 students are suppressed.

7.4. Data Files

DLM assessment results were made available to DLM state education agencies following the spring 2022 administration. Similar to prior years, the General Research File (GRF) contained student results, including each student's highest linkage level mastered for each EE and final performance level for the subject for all students who completed any testlets. In addition to the GRF, the states received several supplemental files. Consistent with prior years, the special circumstances file provided information about which students and EEs were affected by extenuating circumstances (e.g., chronic absences), as defined by each state. State education agencies also received a supplemental file to identify exited students. The exited students file included all students who exited at any point during the academic year. In the event of observed incidents during assessment delivery, state education agencies are provided with an incident file describing students impacted; however, no incidents occurred during 2021–2022.

Consistent with prior delivery cycles, state education agencies were provided with a 2-week window following data file delivery to review the files and invalidate student records in the GRF. Decisions about whether to invalidate student records are informed by individual state policy. If changes were made to the GRF, state education agencies submitted final GRFs via Educator Portal. The final GRF was used to generate score reports.

7.5. Score Reports

Assessment results were provided to state education agencies to report to parents/guardians, educators, and local education agencies. Individual Student Score Reports summarized student performance on the assessment by subject. Several aggregated reports were provided to state and local education agencies, including reports for the classroom, school, district, and state. No changes were made to the structure of aggregated reports during spring 2022. One change to the Individual Student Score Reports is summarized below. For a complete description of score reports, including aggregated reports, see Chapter 7 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

7.5.1. Individual Student Score Reports

Because of continued impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on instruction and assessment, during 2021–2022, state education agencies were given the option to add a cautionary statement to Individual Student Score Reports, which indicated that the results may reflect the continued effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on student performance. However, Pennsylvania did not opt to include the cautionary statement on individual student score reports.

7.6. Quality-Control Procedures for Data Files and Score Reports

Changes to the quality-control procedures were made only to the extent of accommodating the revised score reports for 2021–2022 (i.e., checking to be sure the cautionary statement was correctly applied for states who opted to include it on score reports). For a complete description of quality-control procedures, see Chapter 7 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

7.7. Conclusion

Results for DLM assessments include students' overall performance levels and linkage level mastery decisions for each assessed EE and linkage level. During spring 2022, assessments were administered to 16,650 students in Pennsylvania. Between 0% and 45% of Pennsylvania students achieved at the At Target or Advanced levels across all grades and subjects.

Following the spring 2022 administration, three data files were delivered to state education agencies: GRF, special circumstance code file, and exited students file. Lastly, state education agencies could opt to include cautionary text to score reports to aid in interpretation.

8. Reliability

The Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System uses diagnostic classification models to produce student score reports. As such, evidence for the reliability of results is based on methods that are commensurate with the models used to produce score reports. For reliability evidence from 2021–2022, including a complete description of the simulation-based methods used to calculate reliability for DLM assessments and the psychometric background for these methods, see Chapter 8 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

9. Training and Professional Development

To support the instruction and the implementation of the Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System, training is offered for state and local education agency staff and test administrators. Additionally, optional professional development is provided for teachers and other staff.

For a complete description of facilitated and self-directed training for DLM assessments, including a description of training for state and local education agency staff, see Chapter 9 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

For a description of the optional professional development available for the Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System during 2021–2022, see Chapter 9 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

10. Validity Argument

The Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Alternate Assessment System is based on the core belief that all students should have access to challenging, grade-level academic content. Therefore, the DLM assessments provide students with the most significant cognitive disabilities the opportunity to demonstrate what they know and can do. It is designed to map students' learning after a full year of instruction.

The DLM system completed its eighth operational administration year in 2021–2022. The chapters of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022) provide updated evidence from the 2021–2022 year to support the propositions and assumptions that undergird the assessment system as described at the onset of its design in the DLM theory of action. Chapter 10 of the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022) summarizes that manual's contents and describes plans for future studies. For a complete summary of evidence collected for the DLM theory of action, also see the *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model* (DLM Consortium, 2022).

11. References

DLM Consortium. (2021a). *Test Administration Manual 2021–2022*. University of Kansas, Accessible Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Systems.

Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium. (2021b). *Accessibility Manual 2021–2022*. University of Kansas, Accessible Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Systems.

Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium. (2021c). *Educator Portal User Guide*. University of Kansas, Accessible Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Systems.

Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium. (2022). *2021–2022 Technical Manual—Year-End Model*. University of Kansas, Accessible Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Systems.

Matthews, G. J., & Harel, O. (2011). Data confidentiality: A review of methods for statistical disclosure limitation and methods for assessing privacy. *Statistics Surveys*, *5*, 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1214/11-SS074