Appendix 2-H: Pilot Development Partner Report: Pilot Phase 2 Test Writing Constructed-Response Hand Scoring Plan

Introduction

The NCSC consortium and the test development partner developed a scoring plan describing the procedures for pre-range finding, range finding, and scoring of the writing constructed –response items administered in the NCSC Pilot Phase 2 ELA test. This section describes timelines, processes, materials, and details for these activities. The implementation of handscoring activities from pre-range finding through scoring occurred through the test development partner's electronic imaging system. This allowed student responses to writing constructed-response items to be scored online at the scoring site.

Development of Writing Scoring Rubrics

As is a common practice for test developers, NCSC developed grade and text type analytic rubrics. *The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014) states that those responsible for test scoring that involve human scorers should include rubrics, procedures and criteria for scoring (AERA, APA, & NCME, Standard 6.8). NCSC collaborated with the test development partner to develop a scoring plan detailing processes that addressed the scoring criteria and guidance developed by the NCSC content experts. NCSC also developed NCSC Writing Scoring Rubrics specifying the required evidence associated with each of four achievable score levels (i.e., Full, Partial, Limited, Unrelated). These rubrics were written to provide a clear "picture" of the meaning of the assigned score in each of three traits (a) organization, (b) idea development, and (c) conventions.

The writing items assessed expectations of writing skills specific for each grade related to the production of a text type (i.e., narrative text, informative/explanatory, or argument). The combination of the writing items and rubrics is designed to measure the degree to which students write effectively to represent and organize ideas across text types applying grammatical strategies and conventions of standard English.

During handscoring, the readers applied numeric scores for each of the three traits according to trait- and evidence- specific criteria as shown in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1. NCSC Writing Scoring Rubric Evidence Categories

Rubric Evidence Category	Numeric Score
Full Evidence	3
Partial Evidence	2
Limited Evidence	1
Unrelated Evidence	0

Assignment of the numeric scores resulted in quantitative and interpretable scoring quality reports (i.e., identification of adjacent vs. discrepant scores, high/low trends in validity & inter-rater reliability, patterns in "missed" score points, etc.). The use of numeric scores did not affect the determination of

the students' final score based on the NCSC generated Writing Scoring Plans for each text type. The narrative writing scoring plan is shown in Exhibit 2 below.

Exhibit 2. Narrative Writing Scoring Plan – Pilot Phase 2

Tier	Writing Score							
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	UUU	PUF, PUP PUL, PUU UPF, UPP, UPL, UPU LUF, LUP LUL, LUU	LFF, LFP, LFL, LFU LPF, LPP, LPL, LPU LLF, LLP LLL, LLU	FFU FPU, PFU PPU FLU PLU	PPF, PPP, PPL FLF, FLP, FLL PLF, PLP, PLL	FFL FPL, PFL	FFP, FPF FPP PFF PFP	FFF
2	UUU	ULF, ULP ULL, ULU UUF, UUP UUL	PPU, PLU LFF, LFP, LFL LFU LPF, LPP, LPL, LPU LLF, LLP LLL, LLU	FFU, FPU, FLU, PLF, PLP, PLL, PFF, PFP, PFL, PFU PPF, PPP, PPL	FFL FPP, FPL, FLF, FLP, FLL	FFF, FFP, FPF		

i. Pre-Range Finding

Pilot Phase 2 Pre-range Finding activities occurred from November 10-21, 2014. The objectives of these activities were to (a) identify fifteen (15) representative student responses (with scores and annotations) across a range of trait scores for each Tier 2 and Tier 3 item at each grade for use in level-setting for range finding participants, (b) identify additional student responses (unscored) for each Tier 2 and Tier 3 item at each grade level that would make up the item packets reviewed by range finding panels, and (c) familiarize the handscoring supervisors with the writing scoring rubrics for Tiers 2 and 3 at each grade and their application.

Pre-Range Finding Training Sessions

NCSC and the test development partner implemented virtual training sessions as follows:

1) Demonstration of the test development partner's electronic imaging and data management system,
2) NCSC Writing Items and Rubric Training for Handscoring Supervisors, and
3) Scoring procedures using the test development partner's electronic imaging and data management system for the NCSC Pilot Phase 2 student responses.

Electronic Imaging and Data Management System Demonstration

The test development partner demonstrated the electronic scoring system to provide an opportunity for NCSC to view the process steps, ask questions, and finalize procedures utilized during range finding. The

online scoring system maintained a database of actual student responses and the scores associated with those responses. The system also provided continuous up-to-date monitoring of all scoring activities.

Training of Handscoring Supervisors

The NCSC content experts provided three Writing Items and Rubric Trainings for Handscoring Supervisors/Facilitators using grade-specific training materials (i.e., grades 3-5, grades 6 and 7, and grades 8 and 11) including examples of test takers' responses for each grade at each score level for Tiers 2 and 3 constructed-response items. The purposes of the three grade-specific trainings were to (a) provide information about the NCSC writing items and potential student products, (b) support a common understanding of the intended application of the NCSC Writing Scoring Rubrics, and (c) ensure consistency among pre-range finding selections and outcomes. The employed process included training on a (a) description of constructed-response items, (b) description of three-trait analytic rubric, (c) Explanation of the potential rubric scores, and (d) application of scoring rules. Pre-range finding resulted in a set of student papers the test development partner used with range finding panelists to define the application of the scoring rubrics and to provide panelists with an understanding of the tier and grade-level expectations.

Scoring Procedures

The test development partner presented a detailed overview of the procedures to be used for scoring the NCSC Pilot Phase 2 student responses in the electronic imaging and data management system. Topics included accessing, scoring (i.e., practice application of rubric to student responses), and recording procedures. Each participant received user names and passwords to access the secure system.

Pre-Range Finding Process

With the completion of the three training sessions, NCSC content experts and test development partner Handscoring Supervisors reviewed student responses for their assigned, grade-specific items and selected samples to represent the range and diversity of performance. Selections also included representative responses to serve as anchors as well as a range of responses that the range finding panelists could identify for training material selection. NCSC content experts and Handscoring Supervisors worked individually having received schedules to coordinate their reviews. All pre-range finding selections were identified and scores recorded in the online electronic scoring system subsequent to NCSC content experts' approval.

Range finding

The Pilot Phase 2 Range Finding Meeting was held at the test development partner's scoring facility December 2 – 5, 2014 and included both on-site and virtual participation. The facilitation of the panels mirrored that of pre-range finding with the same Handscoring Supervisors leading the grade-specific panel discussions. The objective of this activity was to develop the sets of student papers—anchors, training, qualification, and validity sets— to help ensure that the test development partner's reader training and scoring was consistent with NCSC standards and guidelines.

Prior to the meeting, the Handscoring Supervisors team assembled the sets of scored and annotated items to provide content training for each panel. The range finding packets for each panel also contained the selected unscored responses. The responses were arranged into sets for range finding panelists to review. As much as possible, responses were selected to span the full range of quality as described in the rubric.

Range Finding Meeting Organization

The range finding meeting participants included NCSC partner states who participated on-site or virtually. Exhibit 3 indicates the range finding meeting organization determined by the NCSC consortium.

Exhibit 3. NCSC Range Finding Meeting Participant Distribution

Grade Span	Tier 2		Tier 3	
Grades 3-5	**Onsite** 1 NCSC State Partner 1 NCSC Organizational Partner 1 Handscoring Supervisor	**Virtual** 2 States	**Onsite** 1 NCSC State Partner 1 NCSC Organizational Partner 1 Handscoring Supervisor	**Virtual** 2 State Partners
Grades 6, 7	**Onsite** 1 NCSC State Partner 1 NCSC Organizational Partner 1 Handscoring Supervisor	**Virtual** 2 States	**Onsite** 1 NCSC State Partner 1 NCSC Organizational Partner 1 Handscoring Supervisor	**Virtual** 2 States
Grades 8, 11	**Onsite** 1 NCSC State Partner 1 NCSC Organizational Partner 1 Handscoring Supervisor	**Virtual** 2 States	**Onsite** 1 NCSC State Partner 1 NCSC Organizational Partner 1 Handscoring Supervisor	**Virtual** 2 States

Range Finding Process

Handscoring Supervisors facilitated the meetings, in coordination with on-site NCSC content experts, and recorded their panel's assigned scores, scoring rationale, annotations, and training-use designations. The test development partner conducted all meeting activities via WebEx for virtual participants. All panelists signed security agreements.

The content training involved application of the NCSC Writing Scoring Rubric to the first five items from pre-range finding for each grade, tier, and trait. Subsequently, the panelists were expected to assign rubric scores to the remaining papers. The Handscoring Supervisors each implemented a replicable process for all panelists to provide input during the meeting. Initially, each panelist took turns reading the item stimulus and writing item aloud. The Handscoring Supervisor then reviewed the NCSC Writing Scoring Rubric for the item. Time was given to the participants to score and record independently a set of papers, followed by a discussion of the assigned scores. The Handscoring Supervisor recorded the consensus scores, rationales, and comments for each paper. Panelists also provided suggestions to, which papers to consider using in Anchors, training, qualification, or validity sets. Other papers were flagged as not recommended for these sets. (The original fifteen (15) responses from the Content Training set were also considered for these sets). At the end of each day, the Handscoring Supervisors, NCSC content experts and the NCSC Assessment Director, and the test development partner's Scoring Manager discussed each day's progress, challenges, and suggestions for the subsequent days.

Following range finding, the test development partner's Handscoring Supervisors met on Friday, December 5, with the NCSC team to review the Anchor selections from each panel and check for cross-panel consistency in scoring. Additionally, the larger team addressed any issues or remaining questions from the previous meeting days. If necessary, handscoring supervisors filled in, with consultation from and approval by the NCSC content experts, the sets using panel-scored responses in order to reach the required numbers for each set of papers. Ultimately, each grade, tier and item had a panel-scored set of

responses approved for use as Anchors (6-8 student responses), Training Sets (10 student responses), Qualification Rounds (2 rounds of 10 student responses each), and Validity Sets (10 student responses).

Scoring

Handscoring activities took place at the test development partner's facility between December 8- 19, 2014. NCSC team members remained on-site or were available virtually for the duration of scoring to work in partnership with the Handscoring Supervisors and ensure that rubrics, procedures and criteria for scoring were implemented as intended. The selection of a pool of potential readers occurred prior to the week of December 8th. The pool was made up of qualified, trained, professional scorers experienced in scoring a wide-range of writing assessments.

Readers selected to score the writing items were recruited and trained by the test development partner's staffing agency and were required to have at least a four-year college degree. All applicants for scorer positions were required to provide resumes and documentation of completed higher education. In addition, all applicants were required to have basic computer skills and knowledge of standard English-language writing conventions and/or other content-specific knowledge. The Handscoring Supervisors were recruited from the pool of experts who had successfully completed other large-scale assessment projects and were therefore familiar with high quality processes and expectations.

Security

All assessment material, including writing constructed-response items and student responses were not removed from the test development partner's secure facility. Additionally, restricted access ensured that only authorized personnel were allowed entry into the facility limited by locked doors and protected by security alarm systems.

All staff and readers were required to sign the applicable security agreement and sign confidentiality/non-disclosure forms. The Scoring Manager ensured that all nondisclosures were signed and maintained on file.

During the scoring window all NCSC Pilot Phase 2 writing assessment and scoring materials were secured at the end of each day. Any paper copies that were not needed were shredded under secure conditions or destroyed by a secure shredding company.

Preparation for Handscoring

Following the range finding meetings and NCSC approval of all reader training sets, handscoring teams finalized the reader training sets in the electronic scoring system based on the documented instructions from the range finding panels. Reader training materials for each item included:

1. NCSC Writing Scoring Rubric,
2. Anchor Sets,
3. Training Sets,
4. Qualification Sets (2 Rounds), and
5. Validity sets.

Training and Qualification Process

The test development partner and NCSC content experts provided training to the entire group of readers and Handscoring Supervisors on December 8, 2014. The readers were presented with a Handscoring Overview PowerPoint, which detailed security, confidentiality, an electronic time keeping system for daily work time, attendance policies, roles and responsibilities, and handscoring processes.

NCSC content experts training included background information about the NCSC consortium and its Theory of Action and goals, characteristics of students participating in the assessment and their writing skills, and a general description of the writing items and their administration. Subsequently, the readers were organized into smaller groups and received grade- and tier- specific training led by assigned Handscoring Supervisors for each item. All readers were required to qualify before scoring each set of Pilot Phase 2 writing items. For instance, Handscoring Supervisor A's team trained, qualified, and scored all student responses to item 1 before training and qualifying on item 2. As a result, training was on going throughout the scoring period. The qualification standard was 80 percent exact agreement with the predetermined score as shown in Exhibit 4.

Exhibit 4. Pilot Phase 2 Qualification Standards

Writing Tier	Item	Validity Standard (Exact Agreement %)
2	Organization (full, partial limited, unrelated)	80
2	Idea Development (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80
2	Conventions (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80
3	Organization (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80
3	Idea Development (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80
3	Conventions (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80

The electronically based training began with an overview of the item and the scoring rubric. Handscoring Supervisors led the readers in a review of the student responses in the Anchor Set. In this set, the scores were identified on the student responses. Annotations detailed how the responses differed from one another in quality, how each response reflected the rubric description of its score point, and how each reflected the NCSC standard for application of each score point. Once readers indicated comfort with the anchor set to the Handscoring Supervisor, they scored the first training set, consisting of previously scored student responses arranged in random order. Each scorer independently read and scored the responses in the training set. After the readers had finished scoring the training set, the NCSC-approved scores and annotations were provided. The same format was followed for each training set. During this process, the reader's job was to internalize the NCSC Writing Scoring Rubric and to adjust his/her individual scoring to conform to that rubric. Once all the training papers were scored and all annotations were reviewed, readers began the qualifying process.

The qualifying standard was 80 percent exact agreement for each predetermined score for each trait. If the scorer failed to pass on any analytic skill after taking all three qualifying sets, he/she was dismissed from scoring that item.

Condition Codes, Alerts, and Testing Irregularities

Consistent with the NCSC Writing Scoring Rubrics, all non-scorable responses fell under the scoring category "Unrelated Evidence". Students could receive one of seven condition codes as shown in Exhibit

5. The condition code was applied across all trait scores and a score of “0” was applied to these responses.

Exhibit 5: NCSC Student Writing Product Nonscorable Condition Codes

Condition	Code
Graphic Organizer submitted	**G**
No Annotation	**N**
Foreign Language	**L**
Corrupt Data	**C**
Direct Replication	**D**
Blank Document	**B**
Screen Capture error	**S**

Reader training included information related to indications in student responses of “troubled students” and/or cheating. Such information can require urgent attention prior to the completion of hand-scoring. A student response to any hand-scored test item that may be of a sensitive nature was assigned a score and identified as an “Alert” in the electronic scoring system.

Student Alerts include, but were not limited to, responses that indicated the following:

- Thoughts of suicide,
- Criminal activity,
- Alcohol or drug use,
- Extreme depression,
- Violence,
- Rape, sexual or physical abuse,
- Self-harm or intent to harm others, and
- Neglect.

The readers were instructed to flag and report any statements related to the above alert categories. The readers were instructed; however, that they could at their discretion flag and report any other material that they believed may reflect a serious situation requiring action. Continuously during each day, Handscoring Supervisors reviewed for any alerted responses and informed the Handscoring Manager if an alerted response required immediate attention. The Handscoring Manager then provided the NCSC Assessment Director with the student information and item content of any alert paper. The NCSC Assessment Director then would notify and provide a copy of the response and student information to the appropriate NCSC State Lead. Other testing Irregularities included, but were not limited to, assistance/Intervention in which the student admits to having received assistance during the test administration.

Scoring of Student Responses

Readers independently scored all three NCSC Writing Scoring Rubric traits (organization, idea development, and conventions) at individual workstations. Each Handscoring Supervisor oversaw a team of approximately five readers. Images of each student's response was automatically routed to a reader based on his/her assigned grade and tier. All student responses at each grade were selected for backreading to review a specific reader's work or a specific score point. Backreading was useful in tracking specific areas of confusion for a given reader or group of readers and assisted the Handscoring Supervisor in knowing how to direct retraining activities.

The first and second reads were randomly distributed by the electronic scoring system and the second reader was unaware of the first reader's scores. If Reader 1 and Reader 2's trait scores were not in exact agreement, the response was routed for a third read by the Handscoring Supervisor. The Handscoring Supervisor and NCSC content experts considered this resolution read the final read, resulting in the recorded score.

Quality Monitoring

A range of handscoring quality processes included administration of validity sets, monitoring validity, inter-rater reliability data, and resetting scores for identified anomalous scoring patterns. The test development partner's supervisors conducted activities to monitor scoring shift that were reviewed daily by the NCSC staff including:

1. Handscoring Supervisors administer validity sets, monitor performance, and counsel readers as necessary.
2. Handscoring Supervisors and NCSC staff review scoring accuracy (inter-rater reliability reports).
3. Readers requiring remediation are coached by a supervisor or released.
4. Debrief meetings with NCSC on-site staff to provide progress updates and discuss any scoring concerns.

Validity Sets

One of the key measures of reader accuracy is agreement rates on validity sets. Validity sets assist in monitoring scoring accuracy and maintain a consistent focus on the established rubric and guidelines. The responses included in the validity sets were pre-scored and pre-approved by Handscoring Supervisors and NCSC content experts and were administered to readers during each shift.

Validity sets appeared to readers in the same format as did other student responses. When a reader mis-scored a validity response, the electronic scoring system provided immediate feedback by displaying a notification that included the correct score and any annotation from the Handscoring Supervisor.

Handscoring Supervisors used validity set performance data to evaluate the accuracy and reliability of readers' scores and whether the scoring team/individuals were drifting from the original score criteria. Generally, corrective actions included team-wide discussions led by the Handscoring Supervisor as well as one-on-one sessions with individual readers.

Readers who did maintain the pre-determined scoring quality standard were retrained or disqualified from scoring the item in question. The quality standards are shown below in Exhibit 6. Exact Agreement Standards and are equal to the qualification standards the readers had to meet in order to score (Exhibit 4. Pilot Phase 2 Qualification Standards). When a reader's performance fell below the validity quality

standard, the Handscoring Manager reviewed the reader's scoring patterns for the validity data and inter-rater reliability data from the time period in question, consulted with NCSC content experts, and made a determination about rescoring the reader's work. Additionally, Handscoring Supervisors used validity data to determine whether or not a reader was suited to continue to train on additional items.

Exhibit 6: Exact Agreement Standards

Writing Tier	Trait	Validity Standard (Exact Agreement %)
2	Organization (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80
2	Idea Development (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80
2	Conventions (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80
3	Organization (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80
3	Idea Development (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80
3	Conventions (full, partial, limited, unrelated)	80

Handscoring Reports

The test development partner's Handscoring Supervisors and Handscoring Manager created daily Inter-rater reliability reports and validity reports to monitor reader performance and to provide feedback to readers and the NCSC onsite staff. NCSC staff assessed the data for trends and implemented strategies to correct any revealed problems. These included re-training readers, moving readers to another group, or releasing a reader from scoring the item.

Quality data that was available included:

- Inter-rater reliability (item level and reader level with exact, adjacent, and non-adjacent rates),
- Validity results (item level and reader level with exact, adjacent, and non-adjacent rates),
- Third read adjudication results (reader level comparisons to third read score),
- Item-level and reader-level reports on item score-point frequencies, and
- Item-level reports showing mean scores.

Exhibit 7 presents the inter-rater reliability and validity results by grade, tier, form, and trait name (A = Organization, B = Idea Development, C = Conventions). The total number of responses and percentage of perfect, adjacent, and non-adjacent agreements are included.

Exhibit 7. Inter-rate Reliability and Validity Results for Writing Constructed-Response Items

Item	Trait Name	Total Responses	Total Exact Percent	Total Adjacent Percent	Total Non-adjacent Percent
Grade 3 Tier 2 Form 1	A	187	**91.4%**	4.3%	2.7%
	B	187	**87.7%**	8.0%	2.7%
	C	187	**88.8%**	8.0%	1.6%
Grade 3 Tier 2 Form 2	A	172	**82.6%**	8.7%	4.1%
	B	172	**78.5%**	13.4%	3.5%
	C	172	**84.3%**	8.1%	2.9%
Grade 3 Tier 3 Form 1	A	187	**92.0%**	4.8%	2.7%
	B	187	**86.6%**	9.6%	3.2%
	C	187	**89.8%**	7.5%	2.1%
Grade 3 Tier 3 Form 2	A	172	**95.3%**	1.7%	2.9%
	B	172	**88.4%**	8.1%	3.5%
	C	172	**90.7%**	7.0%	2.3%
Grade 4 Tier 2 Form 1	A	232	**84.9%**	9.1%	4.3%
	B	232	**83.6%**	11.6%	3.0%
	C	232	**90.9%**	4.3%	3.0%
Grade 4 Tier 2 Form 2	A	191	**85.9%**	8.4%	5.8%
	B	191	**84.8%**	10.5%	4.7%
	C	191	**88.0%**	7.3%	4.7%
Grade 4 Tier 3 Form 1	A	174	**77.6%**	19.5%	2.9%
	B	174	**70.7%**	16.7%	12.6%
	C	174	**77.0%**	19.0%	4.0%
Grade 4 Tier 3 Form 2	A	191	**79.6%**	13.6%	6.8%
	B	191	**80.6%**	10.5%	8.9%
	C	191	**85.9%**	8.9%	5.2%
Grade 5 Tier 2 Form 1	A	152	**88.8%**	7.9%	2.6%
	B	152	**84.9%**	10.5%	3.9%
	C	152	**88.2%**	7.2%	3.9%
Grade 5 Tier 2 Form 2	A	153	**81.0%**	13.7%	4.6%
	B	153	**78.4%**	16.3%	4.6%
	C	153	**85.0%**	11.1%	3.3%
Grade 5 Tier 3 Form 1	A	152	**85.5%**	10.5%	3.9%
	B	152	**79.6%**	13.8%	6.6%
	C	152	**87.5%**	8.6%	3.9%
Grade 5 Tier 3 Form 2	A	153	**82.4%**	15.0%	2.6%
	B	153	**79.7%**	15.0%	5.2%
	C	153	**88.9%**	7.8%	3.3%
Grade 6 Tier 2 Form	A	154	**91.6%**	4.5%	3.2%

Item	Trait Name	Total Responses	Total Exact Percent	Total Adjacent Percent	Total Non-adjacent Percent
1	B	154	**84.4%**	8.4%	6.5%
	C	154	**85.7%**	7.1%	6.5%
Grade 6 Tier 2 Form 2	A	134	**90.3%**	7.5%	1.5%
	B	134	**88.8%**	6.7%	3.7%
	C	134	**90.3%**	6.7%	2.2%
Grade 6 Tier 3 Form 1	A	154	**85.7%**	12.3%	1.9%
	B	154	**74.7%**	24.0%	1.3%
	C	154	**83.1%**	12.3%	4.5%
Grade 6 Tier 3 Form 2	A	134	**91.0%**	7.5%	1.5%
	B	134	**76.9%**	20.1%	3.0%
	C	134	**85.1%**	14.2%	0.7%
Grade 7 Tier 2 Form 1	A	167	**93.4%**	3.6%	1.8%
	B	167	**93.4%**	3.6%	1.8%
	C	167	**92.2%**	3.6%	3.0%
Grade 7 Tier 2 Form 2	A	173	**83.8%**	8.7%	6.9%
	B	173	**86.7%**	2.9%	9.8%
	C	173	**87.3%**	5.2%	6.9%
Grade 7 Tier 3 Form 1	A	131	**80.9%**	15.3%	3.8%
	B	131	**77.9%**	16.8%	5.3%
	C	131	**77.1%**	19.8%	3.1%
Grade 7 Tier 3 Form 2	A	149	**78.5%**	18.1%	3.4%
	B	149	**72.5%**	21.5%	6.0%
	C	149	**89.9%**	8.1%	2.0%
Grade 8 Tier 2 Form 1	A	193	**82.4%**	14.0%	3.1%
	B	193	**87.0%**	5.7%	6.7%
	C	193	**89.6%**	3.6%	6.2%
Grade 8 Tier 2 Form 2	A	253	**95.3%**	4.3%	0.4%
	B	253	**92.1%**	2.8%	5.1%
	C	253	**91.3%**	4.3%	4.3%
Grade 8 Tier 3 Form 1	A	165	**86.7%**	10.3%	3.0%
	B	165	**77.6%**	15.8%	6.7%
	C	165	**85.5%**	12.1%	2.4%
Grade 8 Tier 3 Form 2	A	197	**78.7%**	18.3%	3.0%
	B	197	**61.9%**	34.5%	3.6%
	C	197	**75.1%**	20.8%	4.1%
Grade 11 Tier 2 Form 1	A	184	**86.4%**	7.6%	6.0%
	B	184	**78.8%**	14.1%	7.1%
	C	184	**84.8%**	7.1%	8.2%
Grade 11 Tier 2 Form	A	202	**89.1%**	7.4%	3.0%

Item	Trait Name	Total Responses	Total Exact Percent	Total Adjacent Percent	Total Non-adjacent Percent
2	B	202	**83.2%**	13.4%	3.0%
	C	202	**91.1%**	3.5%	5.0%
Grade 11 Tier 3 Form 1	A	147	**87.1%**	9.5%	3.4%
	B	147	**72.8%**	19.7%	7.5%
	C	147	**76.9%**	19.0%	4.1%
Grade 11 Tier 3 Form 2	A	154	**78.6%**	19.5%	1.9%
	B	154	**81.2%**	13.6%	5.2%
	C	154	**70.8%**	18.8%	10.4%