



INTERPRETIVE GUIDE FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY AND MATHEMATICS ASSESSMENTS

November 13, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE OF THE SMARTER BALANCED INTERPRETIVE GUIDE	1
OVERVIEW OF THE SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM	1
Summative Assessments	2
Interim Assessments	2
TYPES OF INTERIM ASSESSMENTS	3
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERIM ASSESSMENTS	4
Standardized	4
Non-Standardized	4
UNDERSTANDING SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENT REPORTING RESULTS	6
Group-Level Results	7
The Smarter Reporting System allows teachers to view summative and interim test results for students to which they are assigned. This is typically students in the teacher’s classes. School and district users may view results for all students in the school and/or district to which they have been granted permission to access. The reporting system allows teachers to create new customized groups to display results by demographic category and program status (e.g., IEP, EL) within a school.	7
Student-Level Results	7
Item-Level Results	7
SCALE SCORES AND ERROR BAND	7
Student-Level Information	7
Scale Scores	7
Error Band	8
Group-Level Information	8
Average Scale Scores and Standard Error of the Mean	8
REPORTING OVERALL PERFORMANCE ON SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENTS	9
Interim Assessment Blocks	9
Summative Assessments and Interim Comprehensive Assessments	10
Claim Scores	12
Target Reports (Summative Only)	12
GUIDELINES FOR APPROPRIATE USE OF TEST RESULTS	14

Tests Results are Not Perfect Measures of Student Performance	14
Use the Entire Assessment in Combination with Other Indicators	16
Validity of Results Depends on Appropriate Interpretation and Use	16
Manner of Administration Impacts the Use of Results	16
THE IAB DASHBOARD: A QUICK VIEW OF OVERALL GROUP-LEVEL RESULTS	17
EXAMPLE OF AN IAB IMPLEMENTATION: END-OF-UNIT ASSESSMENT	17
Group-Level Analysis	18
Group Item-Level Analysis	19
STUDENT-LEVEL ANALYSIS	20
Claims, Targets, Domain, and Standards	23
Depth of Knowledge	23
Item Difficulty	23
Key and Distractor Analysis	25
Writing Trait Score Report	27
USING INTERIM RESULTS TO INFORM NEXT STEPS FOR INSTRUCTION	29
SMARTER BALANCED TOOLS FOR TEACHERS	30
Tools for Teachers Interim Connections Playlists (ICPs)	30
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	32
APPENDIX A: RESOURCES TO SUPPORT THE USE OF INTERIM ASSESSMENTS	35
Test Blueprints	35
Sample Use of the IAB Blueprints	36
APPENDIX B: A PARENT AND STUDENT GUIDE TO UNDERSTANDING THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORTS	39
What Are the Interim Assessment Blocks (IABs and Fiabs)?	39
What Do the Interim Assessment Block Scores Mean?	39
What Are the Interim Comprehensive Assessments (ICAs)?	39
What Do the Interim Comprehensive Assessment Scores Mean?	39
What Are the Summative Assessments?	39
Summative Assessment Results	40
How Accurate Are the Assessment Results?	40
One Measure of a Student's Success	40
SAMPLE IAB INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT	41

SAMPLE ICP INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT*

42

REVISION LOG

43

PURPOSE OF THE SMARTER BALANCED INTERPRETIVE GUIDE

The Smarter Balanced Interpretive Guide for English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) and Mathematics is designed to help educators, parents, and other stakeholders interpret and explain Smarter Balanced interim and summative assessment results. This guide provides guidance to consider when analyzing summative assessment data for use in accountability purposes and analyzing interim assessment data for use in making decisions about classroom instruction.

This interpretive guide includes reports available in the Smarter Reporting System, however, the guidance may be applied to similar reports in a customized version of this reporting system, or a different reporting system. The names of the reporting elements in a customized version or different reporting system may be different than those described in this document.

Appendix A provides a list of helpful resources that support the use of interim assessments. Appendix B provides guidance on the Individual Student Reports (ISR) for use in student and parent discussions.

OVERVIEW OF THE SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

The Smarter Balanced assessment system is a valid, fair, and reliable approach to student assessment that provides meaningful results with actionable data for educators, students, and parents to help students succeed. The system is aligned to the Common Core State Standards ELA and mathematics and consists of three major components—summative assessments, interim assessments, and Tools for Teachers—all designed to improve teaching and learning. If your state uses the Smarter Balanced summative assessment, it is likely that you have access to the interim assessments and Tools for Teachers as well. If there is any question about access, your State Education Agency (SEA) representative can share your state's policy regarding these offerings.

The summative assessments are administered by states, as an accountability measure, at the end of the year to determine students' progress toward college and career readiness in ELA and mathematics. In contrast, interim assessments are administered throughout the year in support of the formative assessment process.

All Smarter Balanced test items for the summative and interim assessments are developed using the ELA and mathematics performance tasks and item specifications and the same item writing, review, and field-testing processes. Smarter Balanced assessment items are developed through collaboration with K-12 educators and higher education faculty. Items on interim assessments are selected from the same pool of items as the summative assessment items.

Educator involvement in the development of summative, interim, and formative resources is critical. Since 2011, hundreds of teachers from multiple states have contributed to each step of the development, from writing test questions to creating the instructional resources.

Smarter Balanced provides a variety of accessibility resources on assessments to ensure equitable access for students with diverse accessibility needs and preferences. Additionally, assessment content undergoes bias and sensitivity reviews to be inclusive and representative of diverse student populations across the Consortium.

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS

The Smarter Balanced summative assessments are available in ELA and mathematics to students in grades 3–8 and high school. Each content area of the online test consists of a computer adaptive test (CAT) as well as a performance task (PT). Summative assessments are administered in a standardized manner in accordance with the policies described in the Online Summative Test Administration Manual available on member’s assessment portals.

In the 2020-21 school year, members of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium elected to offer the option for members to use either the full form or an adjusted form summative assessment blueprint. The adjusted CAT blueprint requires that students respond to fewer items while maintaining the content coverage of the full form assessment. The primary difference is that the adjusted form does not allow for individual student claim-level scores to be reported because there are not enough items in each claim to report on them with precision. To learn about composite scores when using the adjusted blueprint, see [HYPERLINK](https://technicalreports.smarterbalanced.org/scoring_specs/_book/scoringspecs.html#mle-scoring-for-claim-scores)

"https://technicalreports.smarterbalanced.org/scoring_specs/_book/scoringspecs.html#mle-scoring-for-claim-scores" Technical Reports section 6.1.

INTERIM ASSESSMENTS

The Smarter Balanced interim assessments are available in ELA and mathematics to students in grades 3–8 and high school. Unlike the Smarter Balanced summative assessments (which are adaptive), the interim assessments are fixed-form tests, which means that each student has access to the same test questions and the tests do not adapt according to student responses. Because each student responds to the same test items, teachers may more easily interpret their students’ performance on a common set of items. Further, teachers can better manage hand scoring since all students respond to the same constructed-response questions.

Administration of the interim assessments is flexible and can serve a variety of educator and student needs. Schools and districts may establish timeframes, administration policies, and scoring practices for the interim assessments, keeping in mind any guidance from their own state department of education. Educators can use the interim assessments in a standardized manner as an assessment of learning after a period of instruction, or in a non-standardized manner (e.g., teaching tool, warm-up activity) as an assessment for learning. The interim assessments also include all the accessibility resources that are available in the summative assessments to provide accurate results for all students. The interim assessments are powerful resources to improve teaching and learning for all students.

“Assessment has two fundamental purposes: one is to provide information about student learning minute-by-minute, day-to-day, and week-to-week so teachers can continuously adapt instruction to meet students’ specific needs and secure progress. This type of assessment is intended to assist learning and is often referred to as formative assessment or assessment for learning. A second purpose of assessment is to provide information on students’ current levels of achievement after a period of learning has occurred. Such assessments – which may be

classroom-based, districtwide, or statewide – serve a summative purpose and are sometimes referred to as assessments of learning.”

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (2014)




ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
FOR CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS: KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE TWELVE

The interim assessments are student- and teacher-facing to give educators the flexibility to access the test questions and their students' responses to the test questions. As a result, the interim assessments are not appropriate to use for accountability purposes. Otherwise, interim assessments are to be kept secure. They are not for public use, display, or distribution. Any use, display, or distribution of the interim assessments that results in access to individuals beyond authorized local education agency staff and students is prohibited. Finally, interim assessment items must not be copied into third party systems without the permission of Smarter Balanced.

TYPES OF INTERIM ASSESSMENTS

Smarter Balanced offers three types of interim assessments: Interim Comprehensive Assessments (ICA), Interim Assessment Blocks (IAB), and Focused Interim Assessment Blocks (FIAB). Figure 1 describes the number of assessed targets and examples of ICAs, current IABs and FIABs

Figure 1. Interim Assessments at a Glance

<p>Interim Comprehensive Assessments</p>  <p>Assess the full range of targets, similar to the summative.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3 ELA • Grade 3 Math 	<p>Interim Assessment Blocks</p>  <p>Assess 3–8 targets in Math or ELA/literacy.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3 ELA, <i>Reading Literary Texts</i> • Grade 3 Math, <i>Operations and Algebraic Thinking</i> 	<p>Focused Interim Assessment Blocks</p>  <p>Assess 1–3 targets in Math or ELA/literacy.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3 ELA, <i>Text Analysis (Literary)</i> • Grade 3 Math: <i>Multiply and Divide Within 100</i>
--	---	--

The ICAs measure the same content and the same standards as the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment and may be used to determine the knowledge and skills of a student after a significant period of instruction. They take between 3 and 4 hours to administer (like the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment) and provide information about student performance overall (achievement levels) and for each claim in ELA and mathematics (three levels of performance). The ICA includes a performance task in each content area and may require local hand scoring of some constructed-response items and performance tasks. They may be administered as a standardized or non-standardized assessment. When administered as a standardized assessment, students can become familiar with the testing formats, tools, and question types, which makes it easier for them to demonstrate what they know.

IABs focus on specific domains, areas of a claim, or strands (e.g., Measurement and Data, Fractions, Read Informational Text). They can usually be administered in one class period and include between four and 18 items depending on grade and content area. IABs provide information about student performance in three categories:

Above Standard, Near Standard, and Below Standard. They may be administered to students in a manner consistent with the sequence of the curriculum and as a standardized or non-standardized assessment.

FIABs are designed to measure smaller bundles of content to give teachers a better understanding of students' knowledge and academic performance and provide teachers with precise next steps for instruction. Like IABs they can be administered in one class period and provide information about student performance in three categories: Above Standard, Near Standard, and Below Standard.

Some common features of the ICA, IAB, and FIABs are they contain high-quality items that are placed on the same scale as the summative assessments and use the full array of accessibility resources and supports available on the summative assessments. They use the same item types and formats as the summative assessments, and they include performance tasks. In addition, each interim assessment type is administered online using the same test delivery system as the summative assessments, but they are fixed-form test rather than computer-adaptive like the summative assessment. The interim assessments are available in ELA and mathematics and are designed for grades 3 - 8 and high school, but interim assessments may be administered to students in any grade level.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERIM ASSESSMENTS

The interim assessments can be administered flexibly by teachers to best meet their instructional needs. All student results will note the manner in which the assessment was administered (standardized/non-standardized). This information is provided when viewing results in the online reporting system.

STANDARDIZED

Standardized administration means that a student completes the interim assessment individually, following the procedure for administration used for the summative assessments. For students, the opportunity to become familiar with the procedure of standardized administration can help them approach the summative assessment with more confidence. For educators, results from a standardized administration can provide data about what an individual student knows and can do. Standardized administration affords the opportunity to use comparable data across classrooms, buildings, and subgroups based on the content assessed. The data can inform decision making about instructional next steps, professional learning needs, and curriculum gaps.

NON-STANDARDIZED

If the sole need is to inform instruction within a classroom, an educator may elect to administer an interim in a non-standardized way. Non-standardized administration refers to any administration that is not consistent with the administration requirements of the summative assessment. Some examples of non-standardized administration might include (but are not limited to):

- Administering tests while students answer cooperatively in pairs, in small groups, or as a whole class. For example, as a whole class, a teacher may elect to read each item aloud and use a think aloud strategy or include some discussion time between test items, and each student completes the assessment individually with this assisted support.

- Administering tests individually with modified standardized requirements. For example, provide scaffolded support to all student questions. Log the questions being asked during test administration to inform instruction using student misconceptions and barriers during the assessment.
- Administering tests and having students self-assess, or provide peer feedback, on short answer and extended response questions by having students hand score items.
- Administering tests by providing interim assessment resources and tools other than those approved in the Usability, Accessibility and Accommodations Guidelines (e.g., use of text to speech, a script, or multiplication table by a student who does not have an IEP and a documented need for this accommodation).

Non-standard administration does not necessarily describe the performance of individual students in a comparable manner; therefore, caution must be used when interpreting classroom results of tests administered in these ways.

When deciding how to administer an interim assessment, consider the purpose. Is it to be an assessment OF learning or an assessment FOR learning? For example, using standardized administration at the beginning of a unit can be used as an assessment FOR learning if the information informs instructional next steps. Using standardized administration at the end of an instructional unit is an assessment OF learning. Non-standardized administration can be used in the assessment OF learning, but caution should be used. when interpreting results.

Remember that data from an interim assessment, both standardized and non-standardized administrations are most useful as an assessment FOR learning. As part of a balanced assessment system, interim assessments are formative tools to identify students' learning needs and to guide instructional next steps to move learning forward. Each Interim Assessment Block, or Focused Interim Assessment Block, has a corresponding Interim Connections Playlist (ICP) available in Tools for Teachers. The ICP includes a Performance Progress chart that shows the attributes of Below/Near/Above results for each skill assessed. The ICP also includes links to Instructional Resources that have been written and vetted by teachers to use for targeted instruction with these same skills.

Table 1 below provides several examples of standardized and non-standardized administration of interim assessments

Table 1. Possible Uses of the Interim Assessments: Examples of Standardized and Non-standardized Administration

Example No.	Standardized Administration	Non-standardized Administration
1	A teacher administers the Read Informational Texts IAB to assess the degree to which students learned the targeted skills at the completion of a unit of instruction.	A teacher administers the Read Informational Text IAB to observe how well students have learned the targeted skills at the completion of a unit of instruction. During the test the teacher answers students' questions, uses scaffolds, and takes notes on the type of support provided during the assessment.
2	A grade eight mathematics teacher administers the grade seven ICA in the fall to any student who did not take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment the previous school year. The teacher uses these results, along with the grade seven summative results for the other students, as a foundation for her instructional planning at the beginning of the school year.	A teacher asks students to work in small groups and discuss the questions in a grade seven IAB to work on skills underpinning those encountered in grade eight. This is followed with a whole-class discussion.
3	Teachers administer the grade-level ELA Performance Task IAB and score the students' work. They review the results and discuss the impact their new writing program has had on student performance.	A teacher administers the grade-level ELA Performance Task IAB. Using the hand scoring materials with students, the teacher facilitates a peer feedback workshop. The teacher reviews the feedback to identify trends in student performance for instructional next steps.

UNDERSTANDING SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENT REPORTING RESULTS

The Smarter Reporting System allows educators to view results from the interim and summative assessments at the group and individual student levels. For interim assessments, the system also provides item level information to help educators meet students' needs for extra support or challenge. – including difficulty level and distractor analysis.

GROUP-LEVEL RESULTS

Group-level results can help educators adjust their instruction by analyzing areas in which students excel and areas where students need additional support. The definition of a group is locally defined. Some examples are:

- A teacher's classes
- A group of students who received similar instruction or who participate in a specific program (e.g., intervention or enrichment)

The Smarter Reporting System allows teachers to view summative and interim test results for students to which they are assigned. This is typically students in the teacher's classes. School and district users may view results for all students in the school and/or district to which they have been granted permission to access. The reporting system allows teachers to create new customized groups to display results by demographic category and program status (e.g., IEP, EL) within a school.

STUDENT-LEVEL RESULTS

Student-level results provide a roster of students with each student's overall performance on a selected summative assessment, ICA, IAB, or FIAB. The report displays individual student achievement levels and claim-level reporting categories for summative assessments and ICAs and only the reporting categories for IABs and FIABs. Student-level results can provide insight into content individual students have not yet mastered and content on which they performed well.

ITEM-LEVEL RESULTS

Interim assessments also provide information on student performance on individual items, including the student responses to test questions. The item-level view for an individual student shows the claim, target, item difficulty, standard, the maximum score, and the student's score for the item. Teachers can use results to uncover patterns within and across individual and group responses.

SCALE SCORES AND ERROR BAND

Results from the summative and interim assessments include scale scores as well as an error band for individuals and groups.


STUDENT-LEVEL INFORMATION

Scale Scores

Each student who completes a Smarter Balanced interim or summative assessment receives an overall scale score. The scale score is the basic unit of reporting. It allows for fair comparisons at both the individual student level and the aggregate or group level. This scale ranges from approximately 2000 to 3000 which includes grades 3-8 and high school.

The Smarter Balanced scale is a vertical scale, which means that student performance in all grades is reported on the same scale. This allows educators to compare a student's scale score from a test in one grade to that student's scale score from a test in another grade. However, this comparison should be done with caution, especially when interpreting or predicting scores for non-adjacent grade levels. An important aspect of a vertical scale is that the overall score range for each grade steadily increases, and the threshold scores between each level increase across grade levels. Figure 2 below shows the range of scaled scores for each grade and content area.

Figure 2. Smarter Balanced Vertical Scale



Scale scores provide information about overall student performance and can be used to evaluate student progress.

Error Band

Test scores are estimates of student achievement and come with a certain amount of measurement error for several reasons, including the sample of test questions administered, testing conditions, or student guessing. Each time a student takes a Smarter Balanced test, statistical procedures are used to calculate the scale score and the standard error of measurement (SEM) for the student's score. Since this measurement error is known, the individual student report also provides the range of scores the student is likely to earn if that student were to take the test multiple times, or a test of parallel construction and similar difficulty, without receiving further instruction. This range, called an error band, represents one standard error of measurement above and below the student's scale score.

An example of student scale score with the error band can be found in [Appendix B](#) of this document. For more examples on measurement error, please refer to "[Tests Results are Not Perfect Measures of Student Performance](#)" section.

GROUP-LEVEL INFORMATION

Average Scale Scores and Standard Error of the Mean

For group-level reports, an average scale score and error band based on the Standard Error of the Mean for that score are displayed. The average scale score is an average of the scale scores for each individual student in the

group. The average scale score is not assigned to an associated achievement level. Instead, a Student Score Distribution displays the percentage of students who performed at each achievement level. The standard error is a statistical term that measures the accuracy with which a sample distribution represents a population by using standard deviation. In statistics, the average mean deviates from the actual mean of the population—this deviation is called the Standard Error of the Mean.

REPORTING OVERALL PERFORMANCE ON SMARTER BALANCED ASSESSMENTS

INTERIM ASSESSMENT BLOCKS


Based on their individual scale scores and the error band, student results for IABs are reported as one of three reporting categories: Above Standard, Near Standard, or Below Standard. Each reporting category represents a range of scale scores. A student score distribution by reporting category is also provided for group-level reporting, providing educators with the proportion of students that performed within each reporting category.

Reporting categories used for the IABs and FIABs are different from achievement levels used to communicate overall performance on the summative and ICA tests.

The IAB reporting categories that are used to classify students are calculated using the grade-level performance standard, which is defined as the summative (and ICA) cut score between Levels 2 and 3 for each tested grade, as the starting point. The student's performance on the IAB is evaluated against the grade-level performance standard. (e.g., a student's scale score for the Grade 3 Numbers and Operations—Fractions IAB is compared to the Grade 3 mathematics summative assessment performance standard as the starting point). Since the SEM represents the uncertainty around a student's scale score, the SEM is multiplied by 1.5 to create a confidence interval that likely includes the student's true score. The confidence interval is even larger than the student's SEM, so it provides greater certainty, or confidence, in the reporting category classification.

Figure 3 below contains a dot representing the scale score for each of seven students being evaluated on a Grade 4 Math IAB. The bars above and below the scale score are the confidence interval, or 1.5 times the standard error of measurement on the test. The dark horizontal line is the performance standard for the summative and ICA Grade 4 Math assessments—a scale score of 2485. If the confidence interval for the student's scale score on the IAB is completely above the performance standard, as in Students 1, 5, and 6, the student's reporting category is Above Standard. If the confidence interval for the student's scale score is completely below the performance standard, as in Students 4 and 7, the student's reporting category is Below Standard. If the confidence interval for the student's scale score touches the performance standard, as in Students 2 and 3, the student's reporting category is Near Standard, regardless of whether the reported scale score is above or below the performance standard. Please note: The scale score of some students in the Near Standard category will be either above or below the performance standard, but not far enough above or below such that we can confidently label the performance as Above Standard or Below Standard.

Figure 3. Comparison between Performance Standard and the IAB Scale Score and Confidence Interval to Determine IAB Reporting Category



(*Smarter Balanced would like to acknowledge the Connecticut State Department of Education who designed Figures 2 and 3.)

Please note that IAB scale scores are derived using fewer items than the overall vertical scale scores on the summative and Interim Comprehensive Assessments; therefore, the standard error of measurement for an IAB or FIAB scale score will be greater than that of the overall vertical scale score.

Since the IAB reporting categories are derived in a different way from the summative and ICA achievement levels, there is not a direct comparison between reporting categories on the IABs and achievement levels on the ICA or summative test. For full technical details on the calculations used, please refer to the Smarter Balanced Scoring Specifications available on the Smarter Balanced website under Technical Documentation at <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/development/>.

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS AND INTERIM COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENTS

Based on their individual scale scores and the error band, student results for the summative assessment and ICAs are reported in one of four achievement levels, Level 4 (Exceeded the standard); Level 3 (Met the standard); Level 2 (Nearly met the standard); Level 1 (Did not meet the standard). The achievement levels were established by a committee of member state representatives, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders through a process called Achievement Level Setting, a process that asked participants to closely examine assessment content to determine threshold scores for each achievement level. Educators who work with English learners and students with disabilities were also included to help ensure that the achievement levels are fair and appropriate for all students. The panelists established the level of knowledge and skills that all students should demonstrate to be ready for high school. Smarter Balanced members voted to approve the initial college or career achievement levels for mathematics and ELA Literacy in November 2014.

Members voted to approve cut scores for grades 9 and 10 in February 2019. These cut scores may be used for summative assessments administered in grades 9 and 10 and for the high school ICAs administered in grades 9 and 10, as part of an early detection system of college readiness. Not all members use the grade 9 and 10 summative assessments.

Beginning in 2019-20, Smarter Balanced released Grade 9 and Grade 10 ICAs in ELA and mathematics.

The tables in Figure 4 below show the range of scaled scores for each achievement level in the summative assessment and ICA in mathematics and ELA.

Figure 4. Smarter Balanced Summative and ICA Scale Score Ranges by Content and Grade

Mathematics:

Grade	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
3	<2381	2381–2435	2436–2500	>2500
4	<2411	2411–2484	2485–2548	>2548
5	<2455	2455–2527	2528–2578	>2578
6	<2473	2473–2551	2552–2609	>2609
7	<2484	2484–2566	2567–2634	>2634
8	<2504	2504–2585	2586–2652	>2652
9	<2517	2517–2600	2601–2675	>2675
10	<2533	2533–2613	2614–2696	>2696
11	<2543	2543–2627	2628–2717	>2717

ELA:

Grade	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
3	<2367	2367–2431	2432–2489	>2489
4	<2416	2416–2472	2473–2532	>2532
5	<2442	2442–2501	2502–2581	>2581
6	<2457	2457–2530	2531–2617	>2617
7	<2479	2479–2551	2552–2648	>2648
8	<2487	2487–2566	2567–2667	>2667
9	<2489	2489–2570	2571–2671	>2671
10	<2491	2491–2576	2577–2677	>2677
11	<2493	2493–2582	2583–2681	>2681

Claim Scores

The Smarter Reporting System displays claim scores for the summative assessments and ICAs. A claim is a summary statement about the knowledge and skills students will be expected to demonstrate on the assessment related to an aspect of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The ELA Claims are Reading, Writing, Listening, and Research. The mathematics claims are Concepts and Procedures, Problem Solving, Communicating Reasoning, and Modeling/Data Analysis. For more information on Smarter Balanced claims, targets, and standards information, please check out the Smarter Content Explorer (<https://contentexplorer.smarterbalanced.org/>). Claim scores are reported in one of three reporting categories: Above Standard, Near Standard, or Below Standard. These reporting categories are determined using the same calculation in the summative and interim assessments.

Note, states or territories using the adjusted form summative blueprint do not have access to individual student claim scores. Individual student claim scores cannot be reliably computed based on the reduced number of items aligned to each claim on the adjusted form blueprint. Group-level claim scores may be computed for a large group of students (e.g., students in a school or district), but these data are not available in the Smarter Reporting System at this time.

Target Reports (Summative Only)

Each Smarter Balanced Claim for ELA and mathematics is comprised of a set of assessment targets (standards or partial standards that are assessed). Target reports provide more detail about the range of content and Depth of Knowledge (DOK) levels. On the summative assessment, target-level scores are calculated for each ELA claim. For mathematics, target-level scores are calculated for Claim 1 only. The reporting system displays aggregate target-level reports for each summative assessment. Target scores are reported as Performance Relative to the Entire Test and Performance Relative to Level 3 (Met the standard).

Beginning in the 2020-2021 school year, educators in states and territories using the adjusted form summative blueprint may not have access to aggregate target reports. Availability of these reports is dependent upon State Education Agency (SEA) decisions. Contact your SEA for more information.


Performance Relative to the Entire Test

Performance Relative to the Entire Test is reported in one of three reporting categories: Better, Similar or Worse. This report indicates whether a group of students' performance on a target was better than, the same as, or worse than the students' performance on the entire test. A "Worse" indicator does not necessarily mean poor performance on a target, but rather that students' performance in this area was weaker relative to their overall performance.

Performance Relative to Level 3 (Met the standard)

Performance Relative to Level 3 (Met the standard) is reported in one of three reporting categories: Above, Near, or Below. A "Below" indicator suggests that students have not yet mastered the content assessed in a target. The sample target report shown in Figure 5 below, shows the students' average scale score and standard error of the mean. On Target 1, the students performed Below standard, which is similar to their overall results. This indicates a weakness for this assessed content and an opportunity to follow up the assessment with instructional support. On Target 4, students performed Near standard and better than they did on the entire test, which indicates a possible strength for this target and may indicate where students are ready for a challenge.

Figure 5: Sample Target Report for Summative Assessment



GUIDELINES FOR APPROPRIATE USE OF TEST RESULTS

Many variables influence test results, and it is important that educators understand the following guidelines when analyzing assessment results to inform educational decisions.


TESTS RESULTS ARE NOT PERFECT MEASURES OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE

All tests include measurement error; no test is perfectly reliable. An error band is included with a student's test score as an indicator of its reliability. A statistical calculation is made by the system, determining how much worse or better the student could be expected to do on the assessment if the student took the test multiple times. Since performance could increase or decrease, the error band is represented on the report by the entry after the scale score, with a "+/-" before it.

For example, as shown in Figure 6 below, a Grade 6 student takes the ELA Interim Comprehensive Assessment and receives a score of 2384 with an error band of +/- 61 points. This means that if the student took a test with a similar difficulty again without receiving further instructions, using either a different sample of test questions, or

taking the test on a different day, his or her score would likely fall between 2323 (2384 minus 61) and 2445 (2384 plus 61).

Figure 6. Student's Scale Score and Error Band



Measurement error in testing may result from several factors, such as the sample of questions included on the test, a student's mental or emotional state during testing, or the conditions under which the student took the test. For example, student factors - whether the student was tired, hungry, or under stress, and classroom factors - noise or temperature, or technical issues with the computer - might all affect a student's test performance. In addition, any Items that require hand scoring create additional variability due to interpretive differences and human error.

REMEMBER:

Interim Assessments are fixed-form tests. Repeated exposure, leading to familiarity with the same test items, may influence a student's score; therefore, educators should be mindful about how often to the same test items administered, either in a standardized or non-standardized way



MEASUREMENT ERROR IN TESTING IS EXPECTED AND UNAVOIDABLE. USING A TEST RESULT IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER INDICATORS ABOUT STUDENT PERFORMANCE LEADS TO MORE ACCURATE JUDGMENTS ABOUT WHAT STUDENTS KNOW AND CAN DO. BETTER JUDGEMENTS IMPROVE THE VALIDITY OF EDUCATOR INSTRUCTIONAL DECISIONS AND MAXIMIZE STUDENT LEARNING.

USE THE ENTIRE ASSESSMENT IN COMBINATION WITH OTHER INDICATORS

Items in an interim assessment vary in format, content, target skill, and difficulty level. While it may be possible to make some inferences about what students know and can do based on their performance on a single test item, students' performance on the entire test is a better indicator of students' knowledge and skills.

All test results include some degree of error. Therefore, it is critical to use results from a test in combination with other information about student learning in a balanced manner. This can encompass student work on classroom assignments, quizzes, observations, and other forms of evidence.

Educators may use assessment results as one part of an “academic wellness check” for a student. The test results, when analyzed alongside additional information about the student, can strengthen conclusions about where the student is doing well and where the student might benefit from additional instruction and support.

VALIDITY OF RESULTS DEPENDS ON APPROPRIATE INTERPRETATION AND USE

The Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments were designed to be used by educators to evaluate student performance against grade-level standards. When used as designed, results from the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments can provide useful information to help educators improve teaching and learning for their students. However, any inferences made from the test results may not be valid if the test is used for purposes for which it was not designed and validated.

MANNER OF ADMINISTRATION IMPACTS THE USE OF RESULTS

Teachers may use the Smarter Balanced Interim Assessments in several ways to gain information about what their students know and can do. The examiner must first determine if the test will be administered in a standardized or non-standardized manner of administration. Non-standardized is the default setting.

When combined with other forms of evidence, results from standardized administrations can be reasonably used to gauge student knowledge and growth over time after a period of instruction because those results represent individual student knowledge. Standardized administration of the IABs can be used both as an assessment OF learning and an assessment FOR learning.

Non-standardized administration of the interim assessments is done primarily for learning. Results from a non-standardized administration should be used with caution when evaluating an individual student. Individual student scores may be produced, but if a student is working with other students, the individual student scores are not reflective of the individual student's ability. However, non-standardized administrations may yield information that cannot be collected during a standardized administration, such as hearing students' thought process as they discuss a problem aloud. The goal of a non-standardized administration is to learn where students are succeeding and where they might need more support during instruction.




MORE THAN ONE MEASURE OF STUDENT PROGRESS AND PERFORMANCE SHOULD ALWAYS BE USED TO MAKE EDUCATIONAL DECISIONS.

THE IAB DASHBOARD: A QUICK VIEW OF OVERALL GROUP-LEVEL RESULTS

The Smarter Reporting System IAB Dashboard provides educators with a quick view of overall results for the IABs administered to a group of students. A teacher can view the score distribution for each interim to see the percentage of students who performed in each reporting category (Above, Near, and Below Standard) as shown in Figure 7 below. The teacher can also see which IABs were completed by all students in the group.

Figure 7. IAB Dashboard



The teacher can see from the IAB Dashboard that not all 32 students in the class completed each IAB. The score distributions for each interim show overall group performance so the teacher can quickly see on which IABs students did well and where they did not do well. The teacher can see more detailed information about student performance.

EXAMPLE OF AN IAB IMPLEMENTATION: END-OF-UNIT ASSESSMENT


In this section, we provide an example of how an educator might use one of the IABs to improve teaching and learning in her classroom. Included in this example are screenshots from the Smarter Reporting System that illustrate the different views available to educators to analyze the data and interpret it within their local context.

Results will be analyzed at the group level, individual student level, and item level. At each level, highlights of appropriate use and cautions will be provided.

GROUP-LEVEL ANALYSIS

As shown in Figure 8 below, Ms. Garcia's classes had an average scale score of 2342 on the Grade 3 ELA – Read Informational Texts IAB. She can also see the error band (Standard Error of the Mean) of +/- 63 points. This means that if a test of parallel design were given to these students on another day without further instruction, their average scale score would likely fall between 2279 (2342 minus 63 points) and 2403 (2342 plus 63 points).

Figure 8. Group-Level View of IAB Results



Ms. Garcia can see from the Student Score Distribution section that 27% of her students scored within the Above Standard reporting category, 27% of the students scored within the At/Near Standard reporting category, and 46% scored within the Below Standard category.

From the group results page, Ms. Garcia can access links to supports through the “Instructional Resources” button. The link leads to interim Connections Playlist for that specific IAB - each IAB has an associated Tools for Teachers Connections Playlist. Connections Playlists are developed by teachers for teachers. Each playlist shows a Performance Progression that identifies the attributes of Below/Near/Above performance and links to Tools for Teachers lessons that support the skills covered in the associated interim assessment. In addition to the Smarter Balanced Connections Playlists, districts and schools have the option to upload links to local district or school resources within the Reporting System.

By selecting the “Instructional Resources” button, Ms. Garcia can access resources for all reporting categories. Ms. Garcia can find:

- instruction designed to enrich and expand their skills; and
- instruction based on student needs.

See the [Tools for Teachers](#) section for more information.

GROUP ITEM-LEVEL ANALYSIS

For each item in the IAB, Ms. Garcia can see the claim, target, item difficulty, the relevant standard assessed, and the proportion of students who received full credit, as well as the proportion of students at each score point.

For example, as shown in Figure 9, item #2 is noted as “Difficult”. Ms. Garcia sees that 45% of her students received full credit on Item #2. Continuing in the same row, she can also see that 55% of her students did not receive any points and 45% received the maximum of one point. This information indicates a need for additional support.

Figure 9. Item-Level View of IAB Results: Group Scores

Select a results view

Results By Item ▾

Instructional Resources

Export

Item #	Claim/Target	Item Difficulty	Standard	Full Credit	0	1	2
1	Reading Literary Text / Target 1	Easy	3.RL.1	73%	27%	73%	
2	Reading Literary Text / Target 3	Difficult	3.RL.4	45%	55%	45%	
3	Reading Literary Text / Target 4	Difficult	3.RL.3	73%	27%	73%	
4	Reading Literary Text / Target 1	Moderate	3.RL.1	73%	27%	73%	
5	Reading Literary Text / Target 4	Moderate	3.RL.3	73%	27%	0%	73%

Select a results view

Results By Item ▾

Instructional Resources

Export

Item #	Claim/Target	Item Difficulty	Standard	Full Credit	0	1
1	Reading - Informational Text / Target 13	Difficult	3.RI.5	50%	50%	50%
2	Reading - Informational Text / Target 11	Difficult		60%	40%	60%
3	Reading - Informational Text / Target 8	Difficult	3.RI.1	50%	50%	50%
4	Reading - Informational Text / Target 12	Moderate		65%	35%	65%
5	Reading - Informational Text / Target 10	Difficult	3.RI.4	40%	60%	40%

Ms. Garcia can also sort on the Full Credit column to quickly identify test items that students performed well on and items where students struggled.

STUDENT-LEVEL ANALYSIS

To learn more about her students' individual needs, Ms. Garcia can view "Results by Student" as shown in Figure 10 below. The "Reporting Category" column is sortable, so Ms. Garcia can easily identify the students who performed Above, Near, or Below Standard. She can use that information during small-group time in her classroom.

Using the test results for students, combined with her knowledge of student performance on classroom assignments, homework, and other observations, Ms. Garcia makes inferences about her students' ability to read and comprehend informational text. She is confident that students who scored in the Above Standard category have mastered the skills and knowledge taught in the classroom and are in no need of additional support on that content. For those students, she uses an idea from the Interim Connections Playlist (ICP) to offer an extra challenge along with some additional independent reading time.

Next, Ms. Garcia considers how to support the students who scored in the Below Standard category, suspecting that they might need additional instruction. Ms. Garcia remembers that the IAB is only one measure, and it should always be used in combination with other information about her students. She knows that a student who has never had difficulty comprehending informational text may have been having a bad day when the interim was administered. With that caveat in mind, Ms. Garcia reviews the reporting categories and chooses an instructional resource from the ICP to support the students who scored Below Standard in a collaborative learning group.

Figure 10. Results by Student View of IAB Results

Select a results view

Results By Student ▾

Instructional Resources

Student	Date	Session	Enrolled Grade	School	Status	Reporting Category	Scale Score / Error Band
Akbar, Aiko	Feb 1, 2021	JON-9bb9	G3	Sample School	Nonstandardized	Below Standard	2154 ± 101
Bragg, Tanner	Jan 31, 2021	WIL-5d11	G3	Sample School	Nonstandardized	Near Standard	2418 ± 114
Cooper, Jeff	Feb 1, 2021	BRO-53de	G3	Sample School	Nonstandardized	Above Standard	2576 ± 59
Jeff's Responses	021	AND-5c86	G3	Sample School	Nonstandardized	Above Standard	2577 ± 83
Jeff's Test History	021	WIL-5d11	G3	Sample School	Nonstandardized	Near Standard	2165 ± 182
Print Jeff's Full IAB Report	021	SMI-9964	G3	Sample School	Nonstandardized	Below Standard	2179 ± 45

As shown in Figure 10, Ms. Garcia can select an individual student from the group list (by selecting the blue box with the student's name) to examine the student's performance on items within the IAB. When an individual student is selected, Ms. Garcia can select the option to view the student's responses and a screen showing each item in the IAB is displayed as shown in Figure 11 below.

Figure 11. Individual Student Item-Level View of IAB Information

Donalson, Jillian 8000027611

Student's Responses

G3 Grade 3 ELA - Read Informational Texts (IAB) Dec 27, 2022

Item #	Claim/Target	Item Difficulty	Standard	Student Points	Max Points	Correctness
1	Reading Literary Text / Target 1	Easy	3.RL.1	0	1	0.00
2	Reading Literary Text / Target 3	Difficult	3.RL.4	0	1	0.00
3	Reading Literary Text / Target 4	Difficult	3.RL.3	1	1	1.00
4	Reading Literary Text / Target 1	Moderate	3.RL.1	1	1	1.00
5	Reading Literary Text / Target 4	Moderate	3.RL.3	2	2	1.00

Ms. Garcia selects item number 1, and the following three tabs appear Item Viewer, Rubric and Exemplar, and Item Information as shown in Figure 12 below.

Figure 12. Item-Level Tabs

Item Viewer Rubric and Exemplar Item Information

Key: D

This is the view of the item as seen while taking the assessment, including the student's response.

Zoom Out Zoom In

Read the passage and answer the questions.

Treasure in the Field
by Marilyn Bolchunos

Once there was a man who lived with his two young sons on a farm in Vietnam. Since the man had to tend the field, the boys took care of the house. That is, they were supposed to take care of the house.

Often the father returned home to find that nothing had been done—he even had to cook dinner.

"What have you been doing all day, Ta?" he would ask his older son.

1

Which detail from the passage **best** explains why the father must stop working in the field?

(A) The father needs to return home to cook the dinner.

(B) The father asks the neighbor to do the work in the fields for him.

(C) The father's sons depend on him to stay home and care for them.

(D) The father's age makes it too difficult to do farm work any longer.

By examining student responses in the Item Viewer tab, Ms. Garcia can identify patterns in student responses that might reveal common misconceptions or misunderstandings. If several students chose the same incorrect response, for example, Ms. Garcia can isolate areas to revisit with her class.

As shown in Figure 13 below, the Rubric and Exemplar tab shows the exemplar (i.e., correct response), any other possible correct responses to the item, and a rubric that defines the point values associated with specific responses. For multiple-choice questions, the key or correct response is provided.

Figure 13. Rubric and Exemplar Tab

G3 Grade 3 ELA - Read Informational Texts (IAB) Dec 27, 2022

Item #	Claim/Target	Item Difficulty	Standard	Student Points	Max Points	Correctness
1	Reading Literary Text / Target 1	Easy	3.RL.1	0	1	0.00

Item Viewer Rubric and Exemplar Item Information

Key: D

As shown in Figure 14 below, the Item Information tab describes the claim, assessment target, domain, and standard that the item assesses. This tab also provides the Depth of Knowledge, the item difficulty, and links to other supporting documentation.

Figure 14. Item Information Tab

G3 Grade 3 ELA - Read Informational Texts (IAB) Dec 27, 2022

Item #	Claim/Target	Item Difficulty	Standard	Student Points	Max Points	Correctness
1	Reading Literary Text / Target 1	Easy	3.RL.1	0	1	0.00

Item Viewer Rubric and Exemplar Item Information

Claim: Read Analytically: Literary Text - Students can read closely and analytically to comprehend a range of increasingly complex literary and informational texts.

Target 1: KEY DETAILS: Given an inference or conclusion, use explicit details and implicit information from the text to support the inference or conclusion provided.

Depth of Knowledge: Basic Skills and Concepts [View reference](#)

Item Difficulty: Easy

Common Core Standard:

3.RL.1 Ask and answer questions to demonstrate understanding of a text, referring explicitly to the text as the basis for the answers.

Supporting Documentation: [Interpretive Guide](#)

CLAIMS, TARGETS, DOMAIN, AND STANDARDS

Claims and targets are a way of classifying test content. The claim is the major topic area. For example, in English language arts, reading is a claim. Within each claim, there are targets that describe the knowledge and skills that the test measures. Each target may encompass one or more standards from the CCSS. Within the Reading claim, for example, one of the targets is concerned with finding the central idea in a text. Domains are large groups of related standards in the Mathematics CCSS (e.g., Geometry, Statistics and Probability, Ratios and Proportional Relationships). More information about the claims, targets, and standards can be found on the Development and Design page of the Smarter Balanced website <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/development/>.

DEPTH OF KNOWLEDGE

Depth of Knowledge (DOK) levels, developed by Webb (1997), reflect the complexity of the cognitive process demanded by curricular activities and assessment tasks (Table 2). Higher DOK levels are associated with activities and tasks that have high cognitive demands. The DOK level describes the kind of thinking a task requires, not if the task is difficult in and of itself.

Table 2. Depth of Knowledge Levels

DOK Level	Title of Level
1	Recall
2	Skills and Concepts
3	Strategic Thinking
4	Extended Thinking

ITEM DIFFICULTY

Each Smarter Balanced test item is assigned a difficulty level based on the proportion of students in the field-test sample who responded to that item correctly. The students who responded to the item are referred to as the reference population. The reference population determines the difficulty level of a test item. (Note: The reference population for an item consists of all the students who took the test the year the item was field-tested. Depending on when the item was field tested, the reference population may refer to students who took the spring 2014 Field Test or a subsequent summative assessment that included embedded field-tested items.”)

Test items are classified as easy, moderate, or difficult based on the average proportion of correct responses of the reference population, also referred to as the average proportion-correct score (Table 3). The average proportion-correct score can range from 0.00 (no correct answers meaning the item is difficult) to 1.00 (all correct answers meaning the item is easy).

Table 3. Item Difficulty Categories

Difficulty Category	Range of Average Proportion Correct (p-value) Score (minimum – maximum)
Easy	0.67 – 1.00
Moderate	0.34 – 0.66
Difficult	0.00 – 0.33

For items worth more than 1 point, the average proportion correct score is the item’s average score among students in the reference population divided by the maximum possible score on the item. For example, if the average score for a 2-point item is 1, its average proportion correct score is 1 divided by 2, or 0.50. In this example, that test item would be rated as moderate on the item difficulty scale.

Easy items are answered correctly by at least 67% of the students in the reference population.

Moderate items are answered correctly by 34-66% of the reference population.

Difficult items are answered correctly by 33% or fewer of the reference population.

As previously shown in Figure 14, item #1 is aligned to Standard 3.RL.5 (Use text features and search tools (e.g., key words, sidebars, hyperlinks) to locate information relevant to a given topic efficiently) and assesses Reading claim, Target 13 (TEXT STRUCTURES/ FEATURES: Relate knowledge of text structures or text features (e.g., graphics, bold text, headings) to obtain, interpret, or explain information). This information tells Ms. Garcia what concepts and skills the item assesses.


Ms. Garcia can also see from this tab that Item #1 is classified as difficult. Ms. Garcia can include item difficulty in her inferences about student performance because item classification provides her with additional context when reviewing test results and considering instructional implications.

Student scores on more difficult items should be treated differently from the scores on less difficult items. For example, if half of the students get an item wrong, Ms. Garcia should avoid making generalized inferences about student needs. Instead, Ms. Garcia can account for the item difficulty when drawing conclusions from test results to determine what students know and can do. If the item is rated difficult, Ms. Garcia’s conclusions about her students may differ from conclusions based on an item rated easy. If half of the students answer an easy item incorrectly, she may decide to re-teach the concepts addressed in that item. On the other hand, if half of her students got a difficult item incorrect, she may choose to address that result by encouraging additional practice on this type of item.

KEY AND DISTRACTOR ANALYSIS

For selected response items, a teacher can see whether a large number of students selected a particular incorrect response, which may signal a common misconception. This report is available by selecting Key/Distractor Analysis from the dropdown in the “Select a results view” as shown in Figure 15 below.

Figure 15. Select to View Key/Distractor Analysis



As shown in Figure 16 below, the Key and Distractor Analysis view displays information for multiple-choice and multi-select items. The teacher can see the claim, target, item difficulty, and related standard(s) for each item, the percentage of students who earned full credit for each item, and the percentage of students who selected each answer option. (For multi-select items that have more than one correct answer, these percentages may not add up to 100 percent.) The teacher can sort the list by the percentage of students who earned full credit to see those items on which students had the greatest difficulty and then determine whether there were incorrect answers that many students selected. (The correct answers are shaded.)

Figure 16. Key and Distractor Analysis View

Select a results view

Key / Distractor Analysis ▾

Instructional Resources

Export

The shaded responses below indicate the correct answer for each item.

Item #	Claim/Target	Item Difficulty	Standard	Full Credit	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Reading Informational Text / Target 10	Moderate	3.RI.4	70%	9%	4%	4%	70%		
2	Reading Informational Text / Target 14	Moderate	3.L.5	78%	78%	4%	0%	13%		
3	Reading Informational Text / Target 12	Moderate	3.RI.3	70%	17%	70%	4%	0%		
4	Reading Informational Text / Target 13	Moderate	3.RI.5	70%	9%	70%	17%	4%		
8	Reading Informational Text / Target 10	Moderate	3.RI.4	87%	87%	9%	0%	4%		
9	Reading Informational Text / Target 13	Moderate	3.RI.5	57%	17%	57%	4%	9%		

Ms. Garcia identifies Item 9 as one on which 17% of the students selected the same incorrect answer, A. To learn more about this item, the teacher can select the item number and see four tabs, Student Scores and Responses, Item Viewer, Rubric and Exemplar, and Item information as shown in Figure 17 below. From the Student Scores and Responses tab, the teacher can sort on the Response column to see which students incorrectly selected option A. By selecting the Item Viewer tab, Ms. Garcia can see all the response options and, using other information about the students based on classroom discussion and assignments, begin to form hypotheses about why those students may have chosen the incorrect response option. She may decide to post that item and have the students discuss their reasoning aloud.


Figure 17. Key and Distractor Analysis Item Details Tabs

9	Reading Informational Text / Target 13	Moderate	3.RI.5	57%	17%	57%	4%	9%	
<div>Student Points and Responses</div> <div>Item Viewer</div> <div>Rubric and Exemplar</div> <div>Item Information</div>									
Expand each student row to view their response to this item.									
Student	Date	Session	Enrolled Grade	School	Response	Student Points	Max Points	Correctness	
Akbar, Aiko	Feb 1, 2021	JON-9bb9	G3	Sample School	B	1	1	1.00	
Bragg, Tanner	Jan 31, 2021	WIL-5d11	G3	Sample School	A	0	1	0.00	
Cooper, Jeff	Feb 1, 2021	BRO-53de	G3	Sample School	B	1	1	1.00	
Corchado, Jasmine	Feb 1, 2021	AND-5c86	G3	Sample School	B	1	1	1.00	
Finney, Donny	Feb 1, 2021	WIL-5d11	G3	Sample School	A	0	1	0.00	

WRITING TRAIT SCORE REPORT

Each Performance Task on the ELA Interim Comprehensive Assessment (ICA) and selected ELA IABs includes a full write or essay question. For these tests, a Writing Trait Score is provided, as shown in Figure 18 below, that allows teachers to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of student writing based on student performance on the essay question.

Figure 18. Group Report on the Essay Question



This Performance Task report provides the information found on other group summary reports (average scale score and error band, student score distribution and item information). In addition, it indicates the writing purpose of the essay question. The purpose may be argumentative, explanatory, informational, narrative, or opinion depending on the grade level of the assessment.

The report provides the average points earned by the group of students and maximum number of points for each writing trait. The three writing traits describe the following proficiencies in the writing process.

- Organization/Purpose: Organizing ideas consistent with purpose and audience
- Evidence/Elaboration: Providing supporting evidence, details, and elaboration consistent with focus/thesis/claim, source text or texts, purpose and audience
- Conventions: Applying the conventions of standard written English; editing for grammar usage and mechanics to clarify the message

There is a maximum of four points for organization/purpose, four points for evidence/elaboration, and two points maximum for conventions.

The report also displays the Transformed Points value that is calculated by adding the Conventions score to the average of the Organization/Purpose and Evidence/Elaboration scores. These two values represent two dimensions that are used to compute the student's overall scale score and the Claim 2 – Writing reporting category for the ELA ICA.

A student's score is computed as follows:

Organization/purpose: 4 points earned

Evidence/elaboration: 1 points earned

Conventions: 2 points earned

Average = $(4+1)/2 = 2.5$, which is rounded up to 3 points, $3 + 2 = 5$ Transformed Points

The report also provides the percentage distribution of students by the number of points they earned for each writing trait and the percentage of students who earned each possible number of Transformed Points.

Training guides for hand scoring are available in the Interim Assessment Hand Scoring System. The guides include the rubrics and annotated scored student responses that are used to determine student scores.

The Performance Task Writing Rubrics are also available in the links below:

- [Argumentative \(PDF\)](#)
- [Explanatory \(PDF\)](#)
- [Informational \(PDF\)](#)
- [Narrative \(PDF\)Opinion \(PDF\)](#)

As shown in Figure 19 below, Ms. Garcia can view the writing trait scores for individual students by selecting the standard in the blue box for item 3. This displays a report on individual student performance by writing trait and Transformed Points earned. The teacher can sort by Transformed Points to quickly identify students who performed well and those who need additional support. The Student Scores and Responses tab allows the teacher to read each student's essay after selecting the blue box with the student's name. The Item Viewer displays the essay question as it appeared on the test. The Rubric and Exemplar tab provides the writing rubrics, and the Item Information tab provides information about the claim, target, standard, item difficulty, and Depth of Knowledge.

Figure 19. Individual Student Report on the Essay Question

Select a results view

Writing Trait Scores ▾

Instructional Resources Export

Item #	Claim/Target	Writing Purpose	Item Difficulty	Standard	Full Credit
3	Writing / Target 4	Informational	Difficult	3.W.2.D	3%

Student Points and Responses Item Viewer Rubric and Exemplar Item Information

Expand each student row to view their response to this item.

Student	Date	Session	Enrolled Grade	School	Evidence / Elaboration	Organization / Purpose	Conventions	Transformed Points
Aho, Sally	Dec 7, 2021	JON-6050	G3	Sample Elementary School	0	0	1	1
Allen, Taina	Dec 7, 2021	SMI-e322	G3	Sample Elementary School	1	1	0	1
Allen, William	Dec 7, 2021	SMI-e322	G3	Sample Elementary School	0	1	0	1
Ames, Donna	Dec 7, 2021	SMI-e322	G3	Sample Elementary School	0	0	0	0
Anderson, Patricia	Dec 7, 2021	SMI-e10c	G3	Sample Elementary School	1	0	0	1

As Ms. Garcia reviews these results, she bears in mind all the same caveats about weighing student scores in the context of other evidence she has collected on her students, factoring in the difficulty of the test item and manner of test administration and recognizing that no test or single test question should be used as the sole indicator of student performance. Ms. Garcia considers the report and the rubric along with other writing assignments students have turned in that year. She plans additional support for writing in class and shares practice ideas with her students and their families as well.

USING INTERIM RESULTS TO INFORM NEXT STEPS FOR INSTRUCTION

Interim assessment results can provide information about:

- student knowledge, by individual or group, after completing a unit of study
- student or group response patterns on each item
- students who have a strong grasp of the material and need enrichment activities to support expansion of their skills
- how to group students by knowledge/skill level for differentiated instruction
- areas to emphasize during classroom instruction

To further help educators use results to inform instruction, the Smarter Reporting System links directly to the Smarter Balanced Tools for Teachers.

SMARTER BALANCED TOOLS FOR TEACHERS

Smarter Balanced Tools for Teachers is an online collection of instructional and professional learning resources created by educators for educators. All resources are aligned to the CCSS, Smarter Balanced assessment targets, and one or more formative assessment attributes. The resources are designed to help educators implement the formative assessment process to improve teaching and learning. The resources can support instruction by:

- providing guidance on differentiated instruction for diverse learners;
- increasing educator’s assessment literacy;
- engaging students in their own learning;
- designing professional development opportunities; and
- providing materials for Professional Learning Communities.

Tools for Teachers can be accessed at <https://smartertoolsforteachers.org/>.

Tools for Teachers Interim Connections Playlists (ICPs)

Created by expert educators in collaboration with Smarter Balanced, Tools for Teachers Interim Connections Playlists (ICPs) link student interim reports to instructional resources in Tools for Teachers. ICPs can be easily accessed through the Instructional Resources button in the Smarter Reporting System. Each IAB and FIAB has an associated Tools for Teachers Interim Connections Playlist. Educators can use ICPs to find relevant and useful instructional supports that are aligned to students’ assessed needs.

The Tools for Teachers Interim Connections Playlists are not meant to replace curriculum or define an instructional sequence. The resources can be implemented as offered or adapted to suit unique classroom and individual student needs. By considering interim results along with other classroom assessment results and professional judgment, educators can decide how to use Tools for Teachers resources to support their instruction.

All of the Instructional Resources attached to the ICPs have been created and reviewed by educators after they have analyzed the items in the associated interim and offered their own best practices for differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and accessibility.

Figure 20. Smarter Balanced Interim Connections Playlist for Grade 4 Geometry

INTERIM CONNECTIONS PLAYLIST

Geometry

Smarter Balanced Educators

Updated Nov 12, 2020

STUDENT PERFORMANCE PROGRESSIONS ⓘ

Topic Resource	Below	Near	Above
Symmetry Searching for Symmetry →	Recognize all lines of symmetry in unfamiliar two-dimensional figures.	Know and draw line(s) including vertical, horizontal, diagonal of symmetry for regular and irregular two-dimensional polygons.	Identify if a shape has line(s) of symmetry and explain why.
Property of Angles Angles Around Us →	Know a right triangle has a 90 degree (right) angle, visually determine angles $<$, $>$ 90 degrees, and able to define and labeling conventions of angles (acute, right, obtuse)	Recognize right triangles as a category.	Know how to find and rotate a right triangle.
Creating a Geometric Map Creating a Geometric Map →	Identify points, lines, line segments, rays, angles (right, acute, obtuse), and perpendicular and parallel lines in two-dimensional figures.	Classify two-dimensional figures based on parallel or perpendicular lines or angles of specified lines.	Know how to rotate a right triangle.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Term	Definition
ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL	A category of performance based on students' scaled scores on the ICA and summative assessment. The four achievement levels indicate progress toward meeting the expectation of content mastery and college and career readiness: Level 4: Standard Exceeded; Level 3: Standard Met; Level 2: Standard Nearly Met; Level 1: Standard Not Met.
ADJUSTED FORM SUMMATIVE BLUEPRINT	A version of the Smarter Balanced summative assessments that has been offered since the 2020-21 school year. The test assesses the same content in math and English language arts/literacy as the previous years, but with fewer questions on the computer adaptive segment of the test. There are no changes to the performance tasks. Results will help provide school and state leaders with key information to advance learning and support equitable outcomes for students. Due to fewer items included on the adjusted form, Smarter Balanced advises that claim data for individual students should not be reported.
AVERAGE SCALE SCORE	Information about the average performance of students in a defined group for the tested grade and subject.
CLAIM	A summary statement about the knowledge and skills students are expected to demonstrate on the assessment related to a particular aspect of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment for ELA includes claims in reading, listening, and speaking, writing, and research/inquiry and for mathematics includes concepts and procedures, problem solving and modeling & data analysis, and communicating reasoning.
COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS (CCSS)	A set of standards created by a national council of state education leaders and adopted by most states in 2010. The standards describe what students should know and be able to do in mathematics and ELA in each grade K–12.
CONFIDENCE INTERVAL	A calculated range around the student's scale score on the IAB, equal to 1.5 times the standard error of measurement.
CORRECTNESS	Value arrived at by dividing the maximum score possible for an item by the student's score.
DEPTH OF KNOWLEDGE (DOK)	A four-level framework developed to describe the conceptual complexity of curricular activities and assessment tasks (not to be confused with difficulty).
DIFFICULTY (ITEM DIFFICULTY)	The rating of an item as easy, moderate, or difficult is based on the proportion of students in a field-test reference group who answered the item correctly. See page 18 for the definitions of the item difficulty categories.

Term	Definition
DOMAIN	Larger groups of related standards in the mathematics CCSS (e.g., Numbers and Operations—Fractions).
ERROR BAND	A student’s test score can vary if the test is taken several times. The error band is the level of uncertainty around a student score. The error band represents a score range that the student’s score would likely fall within if the student took the test multiple times before any additional instruction or learning occurs.
EXEMPLAR	An example of a response that would earn full credit.
IAB	An Interim Assessment Block measures a portion of the material taught at each grade level, such as fractions. A Focused IAB (FIAB) measures a more limited portion of material taught at grade level, such as add and subtract with equivalent fractions.
ICA	Interim Comprehensive Assessments measure the same content as the summative assessments.
KEY AND DISTRACTOR ANALYSIS	An item analysis that displays the percentage of students who selected the correct response option(s) (Key) and incorrect response options (Distractors).
PERFORMANCE STANDARD	A reference point to know how students are performing in relationship to a standard. Meeting the standard means meeting the expectation of the content area. Performance standards are categorized by scale score. The scale score cuts associated with the performance level are publicly available in the Technical Manual.
REFERENCE POPULATION	The reference population is a group of students. In this context, the reference population for an item consists of all the students who took the test the year the item was field-tested. Depending on when the item was field tested, the reference population may be students who took the Spring 2014 Field Test or a subsequent summative assessment that included embedded field-tested items. These students’ responses to test items were used to classify each item into one of three difficulty categories—easy, moderate, or difficult.
REPORTING CATEGORY	A category of performance based on students’ scaled scores on the IABs. The three reporting categories are: Above Standard, Near Standard, and Below Standard.
RUBRIC	A scoring guide for evaluating the quality of student responses, which describes the performance expectations for each test item.
SCALE SCORE/STUDENT SCORE	The score, ranging from 2000 to 3000, based on student results on a Smarter Balanced assessment. Smarter Balanced uses a single vertical scale across all tested grades.

Term	Definition
STANDARD ERROR OF MEASUREMENT	Acknowledges the difference between an estimated scale score and a student's true scale score. The statistical uncertainty around a student's true scale score, which may be affected by several factors, such as the sample of questions included on the test, a student's mental or emotional state during testing, or the conditions under which the student took the test.
STANDARD ERROR OF THE MEAN	The standard error is a statistical term that measures the accuracy with which a sample distribution represents a population by using standard deviation. In statistics, a sample mean deviates from the actual mean of a population—this deviation is the standard error of the mean.
STATUS	An indication of how the IAB was administered, including whether the test was a standardized or non-standardized administration, and whether the test was completed or partially complete.
TARGET	Describes the expectations of what will be assessed by the items and tasks within each claim. Also known as an assessment target.
WRITING TRAIT SCORES	Measures of the following writing proficiencies: Purpose/Organization: Organizing, Evidence/Elaboration, and Conventions

APPENDIX A: RESOURCES TO SUPPORT THE USE OF INTERIM ASSESSMENTS

These sources can be used to improve assessment literacy and to create a system of formative assessment that links interim data to instruction.

- The content specifications provide information about the claims and targets assessed on the interim and summative assessments.
- The item and task specifications provide guidance on how to translate the Smarter Balanced Content Specifications into actual assessment items.
- The interim assessment test blueprints provide information about the claims and targets assessed on each IAB, the number of items, and the Depth of Knowledge for the items.
- The summative assessment test blueprints provide information about the claims and targets assessed on each ICA and the Depth of Knowledge (for the items. However, because the ICAs are fixed-form tests, the number of items on an ICA is not a range as noted on the summative blueprints.
- Tools for Teachers Interim Connections Playlists provide instructional resources that can be accessed through a link on the interim reports or directly through the Tools for Teachers website.
- Tools for Teachers includes instructional and professional learning resources created and vetted by educators for educators to save teachers' time.

TEST BLUEPRINTS

Interim Assessment Block (IAB) blueprints are available for both ELA and mathematics. The IAB blueprints contain information that will help educators understand the content of each IAB. Each blueprint includes:

- The IABs available for each grade level
- The number of items included in each IAB
- The focus of each IAB, including information about the:
 - Claim(s)
 - Assessment target(s) and the emphasis of each target relative to other targets in the block
 - DOK level(s) addressed by items
 - The number of items by type (for ELA only - e.g., short text, machine scored)

The Interim Assessment Overview provides information about how IABs might be effectively integrated within classroom instruction. The Interim Assessment Overview and Blueprints for IABs in mathematics and ELA can be found in the Development and Design page of the <https://contentexplorer.smarterbalanced.org/>

Interim Comprehensive Assessment (ICA) blueprints are available for both ELA and mathematics. The ICA blueprints contain information that will help educators understand the content of each ICA. The blueprint includes:

- The ICAs available for each grade level
- The number of items included in each ICA
- The assessed content in each ICA, including information about the:
 - Claims
 - Assessment targets and the emphasis of each target relative to the other targets
 - DOK levels addressed by items
 - The number of items by type (for ELA only - e.g., hand scored, machine scored)

The ICAs measure similar content to the summative assessment and may be helpful for determining the knowledge and skills of students who are new to the district or the state. ICAs can also provide information about students' knowledge and skills after a significant period of instruction.

The Interim Assessment Overview and Blueprints for ICAs in mathematics and ELA can be found in the Development and Design page of the [Smarter Content Explorer](#).

Full-form and adjusted-form summative assessment blueprints are available for both ELA and mathematics. The summative assessment blueprints contain information that will help educators understand the content of each summative assessment.

Each summative assessment blueprint includes information about the:

- Claims
- Assessment targets and the emphasis of each target relative to the other targets
- DOK levels addressed by items
- The types of items (for ELA only - e.g., short text, machine scored)

The full-form and adjusted-form Summative Assessment Blueprints for mathematics and ELA can be found in the Development and Design page of the [Smarter Content Explorer](#).

Sample Use of the IAB Blueprints

A Grade 5 teacher wishes to determine the writing expectations for students who will take the ELA IABs. After reading the blueprints, the teacher understands that the Revision IAB is composed of fifteen machined-scored items and that students are expected to revise narrative, informational, and opinion texts as shown in Figure A1 below.

Figure A1. Grade 5 Block 4 IAB: Revision

Block 4: Revision					
Claim	Assessment Target	DOK	Items		Total Items
			Machine Scored	Short Answer	
Writing	1b. Revise Brief Texts (Narrative)	2	5	0	5
	3b. Revise Brief Texts (Informational)	2	5	0	5
	6b. Revise Brief Texts (Opinion)	2	5	0	5
TOTAL ITEMS					15

Looking further, the teacher sees another IAB on brief writes composed of six Short Answer items across the same three writing purposes, each requiring hand scoring as shown in Figure A2 below.

Figure A2. Grade 5 Block 3 IAB: Brief Writes

Block 3: Brief Writes					
Claim	Assessment Target	DOK	Items		Total Items
			Machine Scored	Short Answer ³⁶	
Writing	1a. Write Brief Texts (Narrative)	3	0	2	2
	3a. Write Brief Texts (Informational)	3	0	2	2
	6a. Write Brief Texts (Opinion)	3	0	2	2
TOTAL ITEMS					6

³⁶ These items are designed for hand scoring and may be AI scored with an application that yields comparable results by meeting or exceeding reliability and validity criteria for hand scoring.

The teacher also finds a performance task that deals solely with research and narrative writing. It includes 1 machine scored and 3 human scored items as shown in Figure A3 below.

Figure A3. Grade 5 Block 8 IAB: Performance Task

Block 8: Narrative Performance Task					
Claim	Assessment Target	DOK	Items		Total Items
			Machine Scored	Human Scored	
Writing	2. Compose Full Texts (Narrative)	4	0	1	1 ³⁹
Research	2. Interpret & Integrate Information (2)	3	1	2	3
	3. Analyze Information/Sources (0)	3			
	4. Use Evidence (1)	3			
TOTAL ITEMS					4

³⁹ The Writing PT score is derived from a single student response scored on three distinct traits.
There are also two or three Research items in each PT, for a total of three or four items per task.

Given the differences in class time required to administer each IAB and the amount of time needed to score them, the teacher decides which IAB best meets the instructional needs of the class.

APPENDIX B: A PARENT AND STUDENT GUIDE TO UNDERSTANDING THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORTS

This guide explains the Individual Student Reports for Interim Assessment Blocks (IABs) and Focused Interim Assessment Blocks (FIABs), Interim Comprehensive Assessments (ICAs), and Summative Assessments, and provides additional resources to help you understand what a student knows and can do.

WHAT ARE THE INTERIM ASSESSMENT BLOCKS (IABs AND FIABs)?

Interim Assessment Blocks are computer-based assessments teachers can use throughout the school year to concentrate on sets of concepts in ELA and mathematics. Most Interim Assessment Blocks can be administered in a single class period. They provide teachers, parents/guardians, and students with information about what concepts students have already mastered and where they might need additional help. For more information about Interim Assessment Blocks visit the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Web site at:

<https://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/>

WHAT DO THE INTERIM ASSESSMENT BLOCK SCORES MEAN?

A student's score is a number between 2,000 and 3,000 that falls into one of three reporting categories: Below Standard, Near Standard, or Above Standard. The score provides information about what a student knows and can do based on the assessed content. A student's teacher will use the score, along with other information, such as classroom assignments and quizzes, to decide what additional support is needed to help the student master the material covered in class.

WHAT ARE THE INTERIM COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENTS (ICAs)?

Interim Comprehensive Assessments are computer-based assessments teachers can use during the school year that measure the same content as the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment. There is one Interim Comprehensive Assessment for each grade level in ELA and mathematics and each assessment includes a performance task. The Interim Comprehensive Assessments provide information about overall student performance in English and mathematics. For more information, visit the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Web site at: <https://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/>

WHAT DO THE INTERIM COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SCORES MEAN?

A student's score is a number between 2,000 and 3,000 that falls into one of four achievement levels (Level 4: Standard Exceeded; Level 3: Standard Met; Level 2: Standard Nearly Met; Level 1: Standard Not Met). The score provides information about what a student knows and can do based on the assessed content. Claim scores provide information about the knowledge and skills students are expected to demonstrate on the assessment related to a particular aspect of the learning standards. For example, a claim within the English Assessment is reading. Claim scores are reported in one of three reporting categories: Above Standard, Near Standard, or Below Standard. A student's teacher will use these results, along with other information, such as classroom assignments and quizzes, to decide what additional support is needed to help the student master the material covered in class.

WHAT ARE THE SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS?

The summative assessments are administered by states, as an accountability measure, at the end of the year to

determine students' grade-level performance and progress toward college and career readiness in ELA and mathematics. The Smarter Balanced summative assessments are available in ELA and mathematics to students in grades 3–8 and high school. Each content area of the online test consists of a computer adaptive test (CAT) as well as a performance task (PT). For more information, visit the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Web site at: <https://www.smarterbalanced.org/assessments/>

SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Similar to the Interim Comprehensive Assessment scores, a student's score is a number between 2,000 and 3,000 that falls into one of four achievement levels (Level 4: Standard Exceeded; Level 3: Standard Met; Level 2: Standard Nearly Met; Level 1: Standard Not Met). The score provides information about what a student knows and can do based on the assessed content. Claim scores provide information about the knowledge and skills students are expected to demonstrate on the assessment related to a particular aspect of the learning standards. For example, a claim within the English Assessment is reading. Claim scores are reported in one of three reporting categories: Above Standard, Near Standard, or Below Standard.

HOW ACCURATE ARE THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS?

All tests include error, meaning that test results are not perfect measures of what a student knows. On an IAB report, there is an error band that is reported as a +/- number. The error band is located next to the student's score. The error band accounts for the fact that several factors may affect a student's test score, such as the sample of test questions, the student's mental or emotional state during testing, or the conditions under which he or she took the test. For example, being tired, hungry, or under stress and classroom factors such as noise or temperature, or technical issues with the computer might all affect a student's test performance.

ONE MEASURE OF A STUDENT'S SUCCESS

Assessment results are only one measure of a student's academic performance. They should be considered along with other available information, such as classroom tests, assignments, grades, and feedback from the teacher, in deciding what additional support a student needs to succeed in his or her learning.



ASSESSMENT RESULTS PROVIDE ONE MEASURE OF A STUDENT'S STRENGTHS AND AREAS WHERE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT MIGHT BE NEEDED.

Sample IAB Individual Student Report

1 Smarter REPORTING

Interim Assessment Blocks Report

Justice, Lena


Grade: 11

School: Sample High School

District: Sample District

State: WA

2 IAB Math High School Interim Assessment Blocks 2022-23



Error Band A student's test score can vary if the test is taken several times. If this student was tested again, it is likely that the scale score would fall within this range.

4 HS High School Math Performance Task (IAB)

Current Results

Previous Results



6

HS High School Math - Algebra and Functions I and II (IAB)



7 Frequently Asked Questions

Where can I find more information about the Smarter Balanced Assessment System? Information about Smarter Balanced Assessment System is available at www.smarterbalanced.org

8 View Sample Items

Gain familiarity with the types of questions and tools for students by viewing sample items: sampleitems.smarterbalanced.org

These results represent only one indicator of a student's performance. These results should be used along with other information, such as classwork and other tests when making educational decisions. Specific questions about individual student results should be directed to the student's teacher.

Important Information About Interim Assessments


Interim assessments may be scored by local teachers. This scoring is not subject to the rigorous controls used in summative assessment and local results may show some variations.

Exposure to, and familiarity with test questions may affect student performance and the accuracy of interim results.

© 2023 The Regents of the University of California

1. Student information: name, grade, school, district, and state
2. Name of report
3. Definition of Error Band
4. Name of the assessment
5. Student's scale score and error band information (If this student took the test again without further instruction, the student's scale score would likely fall within this range.)
6. Date of the assessment and student's reporting category
7. Frequently Asked Questions
8. Useful information and additional resources about interim assessments

SAMPLE ICP INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT*



*Note: The Summative Assessment report includes the same reporting elements for achievement levels and claims.

1. Name of report, type of assessment, subject, and year
2. Student information: name, grade, school, district, and state
3. Student's scale score and error band and a description of the student's achievement level
4. Information about the student's achievement: scale score, achievement level, error band, and other possible achievement levels with maximum and minimum scores for each level
5. Student's achievement for each of the tested claims
6. Additional information

Revision Log

Updates to the Interim Assessments Interpretive Guide after September 15, 2017, are noted below.

Page	Description of Change	Revision Date
Various	Updated screen shots for Figures 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10	3/16/2018
Various	Added new screen shots, Figures 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15	3/16/2108
16	Moved the original “Item-Level Analysis” section up to “Group Item Level Analysis”	3/16/2108
23-25	Added new section for Key and Distractor Analysis	3/16/2108
25-27	Added new section for Writing Trait Scores	3/16/2018
15	Added new section for IAB Dashboard with new Figure 4. Renumbered existing figures accordingly.	6/25/2018
Various	Updated screen shots and associated text for Figures 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17	6/25/2018
38-40	Updated screen shots and associated text for the Sample IAB and ICA Individual Student Reports	6/25/2018
4-5	Updated the language about interim assessments being considered “non-secure/non-public” to match the current description “student- and teacher-facing” to align with the Interim Assessments Overview document posted on the Smarter Balanced website	2/21/2019
5	Added an example to clarify Providing interim assessment resources other than those approved in the Usability, Accessibility and Accommodations Guidelines	2/21/2019
7	In Table 1, clarified Example 1 under Non-standardized	2/21/2019
13	Changed the example under Test Results are Not Perfect Measures of Student Performance to ICA results and added Figure 4 to illustrate the example. All subsequent figures re-numbered accordingly.	2/21/2019
25	Updated screen shot for new Figure 16: Group Report on the Essay Question	2/21/2019

Page	Description of Change	Revision Date
26	Replaced text about “total points” with “Transformed Points” to clarify how the writing trait scores are used to calculate a student’s overall score and Claim 2 – Writing reporting category for ELA ICAs and summative assessments	2/21/2019
27	Updated new Figure 17. Individual Student Report on the Essay Question	2/21/2019
40	Updated screen shot of Sample Interim Comprehensive Assessment Individual Student Report	2/21/2019
Cover page	Changed the title from “Interim Assessments Interpretive Guide” to Interpretive Guide for ELA and Mathematics Assessments”	10/29/2019
List of Tables and Figures	Removed this page	10/29/2019
5	<p>Revised the first paragraph to include information about interpreting results for summative assessments.</p> <p>Moved the section about interpreting student results for IABs and ICAs to the Interim section.</p> <p>Replaced the section titled “Smarter Balanced Assessment System” with a new section, “Overview of the Smarter Balanced Assessment System” with language and screen shots from the Smarter Balanced website.</p>	10/29/2019
6	Under Two Types of Interim Assessments, added the complete names for IABs and ICAs in the first sentence	10/29/2019

Page	Description of Change	Revision Date
7	<p>Changed the name of the section from “Assessment Content” to Interim Assessment Content.</p> <p>Removed “and the same standards” in, “The ICAs measure the same content and the same standards as the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment.”</p> <p>Added information about Focused IABs.</p> <p>Added new Figure 1. Interim Assessments at a Glance and renumbered subsequent figures accordingly.</p>	10/29/2019
8	Under Administration of the Interim Assessments, removed a reference to manner of administration (standardized/non-standardized) being available on printed student reports	10/29/2019
9	Updated Table 1 to match the examples of standardized and non-standardized uses of the interim assessments to match the Interim Assessment Guide for Administration	10/29/2019
10	<p>Under Understanding Smarter Balanced Assessment Results, changed references to the “Interim Assessment Reporting System” to the Smarter Reporting System” and added information about summative assessments.</p> <p>Under Group-Level Results, changed “a classroom of students” to “A teacher’s classes,” removed “a grade level of students” and clarified the definition of a group of students.</p> <p>Under Student-Level Results, added information about the roster of students that provides information about individual students.</p> <p>Under Item-Level Results, clarified that these are available for interim assessments only, and added a description of item information that is provided for each item (claim, target, item difficulty, standard, maximum score, and the student’s score for the item).</p>	10/29/2019

Page	Description of Change	Revision Date
11	Under Scale Scores and Error Band, added a reference to summative assessment results including scale scores and an error band.	10/29/2019
12	<p>Added a section titled Group-Level information that includes information about average scales scores, the Student Score Distribution, and Error of the Mean.</p> <p>Changed the title of the section from “Reporting Overall Performance on Interim Assessments” to “Reporting Overall Performance on Smarter Balanced Assessments”</p> <p>Under Interim Assessment Blocks, clarified the description of the IAB reporting categories in the 3rd paragraph.</p> <p>In the description about Figure 3, replaced “achievement level” with “scale score” in the last sentence.</p>	10/29/2019
13	<p>In the second paragraph under Figure 3, changed “performance levels” to “reporting categories” for IABs and added “achievement levels on” the ICA or summative test in the last paragraph. Also added a reference to the Smarter Balanced website for the location of the Scoring Specifications.</p> <p>Changed the section title from “Interim Comprehensive Assessments” to “Summative Assessments and Interim Comprehensive Assessments.”</p> <p>Added information about summative assessments including a description of the Achievement Level Setting process.</p> <p>Added information about approved cut scores for grades 9 and 10 and the release of Grade 9 and Grade 10 ICAs beginning in 2019-20.</p>	10/29/2019

Page	Description of Change	Revision Date
14	<p>In Figure 4, added the scale score ranges for grades 9 and 10 Mathematics and grades 9 and 10 ELA</p> <p>Under Claim Scores, clarified that the reporting system displays claim scores and added the names of the Claims for ELA and Mathematics.</p>	10/29/2019
15	Added a section about Target Reports for summative assessments, including information about how target performance is reported (relative to the entire test and relative to Level 3 (Met the standard)).	10/29/2019
16	Added new Figure 5: Sample Target Report for Summative Assessment and renumbered subsequent figures accordingly	10/29/2019
17	<p>Replaced the screen shot in Figure 6: Student’s Scale Score and Error Band with an updated report and changed the accompanying text accordingly.</p> <p>Under Use the Entire Assessment in Combination with Other Indicators, replaced “assessment form” with “interim assessment” and “IAB” with “test” in the first paragraph.</p>	10/29/2019
19	Under The IAB Dashboard: A Quick View of Overall Group-level Results, added “Smarter Reporting System” before “IAB Dashboard” in the first paragraph.	10/29/2019
20	Replaced the screen shot in Figure 8 with an updated report and changed the descriptive text accordingly.	10/29/2019
25	Under Claims, Targets, Domain, and Standard, updated the location of more information about claims, targets, and standards on the Smarter Balanced website.	10/29/2019
27	<p>Replaced references to “Ms. Garcia” with “the teacher” since this is not part of an example of Classroom use of an IAB.</p> <p>Replaced screen shots in Figure 15 with updated reports and changed the accompanying text accordingly.</p>	10/29/2019
28	Replaced the screen shots in Figures 16 and 17 with updated reports and changed the accompanying text accordingly.	10/29/2019

Page	Description of Change	Revision Date
29	<p>In the Writing Trait Score Report section, removed references to “Ms. Garcia” and replaced with “the teacher.”</p> <p>Replaced the screen shot in Figure 18 with an updated report and changed the accompanying text accordingly.</p>	10/29/2019
35	Added Standard Error of the Mean to the Glossary of Terms	10/29/2019
37	<p>Replaced screen shot in Figure A1 with updated blueprint (“Short Text” changed to “Short Answer.”)</p> <p>Replaced screen shot in Figure A2 with updated blueprint (“Short Text” changed to “Short Answer”) with footnote explaining that these items require hand scoring. Added reference to Short Answer items in the accompanying text.</p>	10/29/2019
38	Replaced screen shot in Figure A3 with updated blueprint (Narrative Performance Task) and changed the accompanying text accordingly.	10/29/2019
39	<p>Changed the title of Appendix B from “A Parent and Student Guide to Understanding the Interim Assessment Reports” to “A Parent and Student Guide to Understanding the Individual Student Reports.”</p> <p>Added “and Summative assessments to the first paragraph.</p>	10/29/2019
40	<p>Added two new sections, “What Are the Summative Assessments?” and “Summative Assessment Results.”</p> <p>Changed the title of the next section from, “How Accurate are the Interim Assessments?” to “How Accurate Are the Assessment Results?”</p>	10/29/2019
41	<p>Replaced the screen shot of the Sample Interim Assessment Block Individual Student Report with an updated report and changed the accompanying text accordingly.</p> <p>Added new #3 “Definition of Error Band” and renumbered the next elements accordingly.</p>	10/29/2019

Page	Description of Change	Revision Date
42	<p>Replaced the screen shot of the Sample Interim Comprehensive Assessment Individual Student Report with an updated report and changed the accompanying text accordingly.</p> <p>Added “Student’s scale score and error band to #3 and “*Note: The Summative Assessment report includes the same reporting elements for achievement levels and claims.”</p>	10/29/2019
Various	Updated the template to adhere to the new Smarter Balanced style guidelines	4/13/2021
Various	Updated references to Digital Library with Tools for Teachers equivalents in text and figures.	4/13/2021
Various	Ensured consistency in the use of acronyms (e.g., ELA, ICAs, etc.)	4/13/2021
Various	Added information on the new Smarter Balanced adjusted form summative blueprint.	4/13/2021
3-6	Modified the Interim Assessments section to better incorporate the new Focused Interim Assessment Blocks and provide updated information to the sections on standardized and non-standardized use.	4/13/2021
Various	Updated references and links with the Smarter Content Explorer.	4/13/2021
Various	Updated screenshots of the Smarter Reporting System to reflect informational and style updates.	4/13/2021
Various	Updated to new Smarter Balanced template and completed accessibility review and remediation.	4/13/2021
Various	Updated some language for clarity.	11/07/2023
Various	Updated to reflect access to Tools for Teachers within membership.	11/07/2023
Various	Added vetting for accessibility, diversity, inclusion, equity.	11/07/2023
Various	Updated information about the adjusted blueprint.	11/07/2023
Various	Updated to add Focused Interim Assessment Blocks (FIABs).	11/07/2023
Various	Included more information about the Interim Connections Playlists.	11/07/2023
Various	Clarified how interim reports could be used to impact instruction	11/07/2023

Page	Description of Change	Revision Date
Various	Adjusted glossary definitions to explain assessment terms.	11/07/2023
Various	Replaced old screenshots of Smarter Balanced Reporting System	11/07/2023