## EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

September 10, 2002

TO: Board of Trustees

FROM: A. McBeath, Superintendent of Schools

SUBJECT: Results from the Audit of the HLAT Writing Task: 2002

ORIGINATOR: Bob Holt, Executive Director

**RESOURCE** 

STAFF: Anne Mulgrew, Lorie Welk

## **INFORMATION**

During the week of April 22 to 26, 2002 all students registered in grades 1 through 8 were administered the highest level of achievement test in writing. The number of papers audited this year increased due to the fact that, for the first time in six years, students in grades 3 and 6 were included in the district HLAT writing administration. Several schools also choose to administer the HLAT writing task to grade 9 students although it was optional for the 2001-2002 school year. Any grade 9 papers that were randomly selected in the audit sample were included in the audit process so that schools would have access to the feedback.

At the time of writing, 6562 students (three per homeroom) were randomly selected to be included in the audit process. Schools were requested to submit a legible photocopy of these students' responses to the writing task.

Table 1 provides a summary of the number of students selected for audit by enrolment grade.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT PAPERS SELECTED FOR AUDITING

Enrolment	Papers		Exempt		Absent		Papers Illegible or Not sent		Total
Grade	Audited		<u> </u>				IN (		
	N	%	N	%	N	<b>%</b>	N	%	
1	807	91.1	46	5.2	30	3.4	3	0.3	886
2	763	96.0	18	2.3	13	1.6	1	0.1	795
3	756	96.9	7	0.9	15	1.9	2	0.3	780
4	751	96.0	17	2.2	10	1.3	4	0.5	782
5	785	95.6	14	1.7	16	1.9	6	0.8	821
6	765	96.1	14	1.8	14	1.8	3	0.3	796
7	716	93.9	8	1.0	23	3.0	16	2.1	763
8	700	92.3	7	0.9	37	4.9	14	1.9	758
9	159	87.8	1	0.6	17	9.4	4	2.2	181
2002 Total	6202	94.5	132	2.0	175	2.7	53	0.8	6562
2001 Total	5101	94.9	116	2.2	144	2.7	14	0.2	5375
2000 Total	4908	94.4	75	1.5	173	3.3	42	0.8	5198
1999 Total	4983	92.6	100	1.9	158	2.9	141	2.6	5382
1998 Total	4878	92.8	131	2.5	180	3.4	68	1.3	5257

Of all the papers selected, 94.5 per cent were included in the audit process. Papers which were not available for audit included papers for students who had been declared exempt (2.0 per cent); papers for students who had been absent for the writing administration (2.7 per cent); and papers which were not submitted or were illegible (0.8 per cent).

The audit process was conducted from July 8 to 10, 2002. At each enrolment grade, three classroom teachers and a group leader (consultants from consulting services and student assessment) re-scored each of 6202 samples of writing. After undergoing a marking consistency session, the audit process began. When the re-scoring matched the two scores initially submitted by the classroom teacher, the paper was considered complete. For papers where either the grade level of achievement or the performance score was different from the score submitted by the teacher, the student's paper was set aside for a third reading by a team of at least two teachers at that grade level.

Table 2 provides a summary of the audit scores for grade level of achievement in relation to the grade level of achievement submitted by the classroom teacher.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF GRADE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT SCORES
ASSIGNED DURING THE 2002 WRITING AUDIT

Teacher Assigned Grade Level of Achievement	of Achie	ade Level evement I the Same	Lev Achiev	Grade el of vement eased	Audit Lev Achiev Decr	Number of Papers Audited	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Not yet 1	149	87.6	21	12.4			170
1	772	95.5	31	3.9	5	0.6	808
2	782	94.9	29	3.5	13	1.6	824
3	732	89.1	71	8.6	19	2.3	822
4	739	93.2	46	5.8	8	1.0	793
5	728	94.3	30	3.9	14	1.8	772
6	661	97.1	13	1.9	7	1.0	681
7	583	94.0	7	1.1	30	4.9	620
8	558	95.7	8	1.4	17	2.9	583
9	119	93.7	0	0.0	8	6.3	127
10	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2
2002 Total	5825	93.9	256	4.1	121	2.0	6202
2001 Total	4743	93.0	192	3.8	166	3.2	5101
2000 Total	4593	93.6	176	3.6	139	2.8	4908
1999 Total	4638	93.1	130	2.6	215	4.3	4983
1998 Total	4500	92.3	159	3.3	217	4.4	4876

The information in Table 2 indicates that overall, 93.9 per cent of the papers stayed at the same grade level of achievement in the audit process as the grade level of achievement submitted by the classroom teacher. This represents an increase of 0.9 per cent from the 2001 results. The range in the match of grade level of achievement scores was from 87.6 per cent at "Not yet one" to 97.1 per cent at grade 6.

Table 3 provides detailed information on how grade level and performance scores changed during the audit process.

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO WRITING SCORES
AS A RESULT OF THE AUDIT PROCESS: JULY 2002

Audit Score	Percentage Distribution of Audited Papers Based on Teacher Assigned Grade Level of Achievement											
	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Grade and	87.6	81.6	80.6	74.7	74.7	76.0	81.9	77.3	76.8	77.2	100.0	78.2
Performance same												
Grade Same,	0.0	4.4	4.7	3.4	7.7	5.1	2.8	5.5	3.4	10.2	0.0	4.7
Performance Up												
Grade same,	0.0	9.5	9.6	10.9	10.8	13.2	12.3	11.3	15.4	6.3	0.0	11.1
Performance Down												
Grade Up,	11.8	1.4	2.3	4.0	3.2	2.3	1.3	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.3
Performance Same												
Grade Up,	0.6	0.0	0.2	0.9	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
Performance Up												
Grade Up,	0.0	2.5	1.0	3.8	2.1	0.9	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.5
Performance Down												
Grade Down	0.0	0.5	0.7	1.3	0.6	1.4	0.9	2.9	1.7	1.6	0.0	1.2
Performance Same												
Grade Down	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.5	0.2	1.6	0.0	0.4
Performance Up												
Grade Down,	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.5	1.0	3.1	0.0	0.4
Performance Down												

When both writing scores, grade level of achievement and performance, are taken into consideration, 78.2 percent of the papers were found in the audit process to match the teacher-assigned scores. This represents an increase of 3.4 per cent over the 2001 results. The most frequent change as a result of the audit process was for grade level to remain the same and performance scores to decrease (11.1 per cent of the papers.) This implies a tendency for teachers to judge some student papers more leniently in terms of performance than judgements by the auditors. In instances where grade either increased or decreased as a result of the audit process, the tendency was for performance to remain as it originally was.

Results from the 2002 audit will be returned to schools on August 19, 2002. Individual student scores that changed as a result of the audit process are **not changed** on the Student Information System (SIS) unless a school puts forth a request to have this done. The information on SIS reflects the score that was submitted by the classroom teacher in June.

AM:am