DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 470 TM 023 841

TITLE	Bibliography of Assessment Alternatives: Science. Innovative Assessment.
INSTITUTION	Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, OR. Test Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	94
CONTRACT	RP91002001
NOTE	66p.
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Techniques; *Educational Assessment; Educational Innovation; *Elementary Secondary Education; Portfolios (Background Materials); *Science Education; *Student Evaluation; *Test Construction; Test Use
IDENTIFIERS	*Alternative Assessment; *Performance Based Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Entries in this bibliography represent current holdings of the Test Center of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in the area of alternative assessment ideas for science. Alternative refers to holdings on topics other than standardized, norm-referenced tests. The list emphasizes performance assessments, portfolios, and technological innovations. Some of the assessments described are intended for informal classroom use. A total of 108 resources are annotated. (SLD)

ED 386 470

Innovative Assessment

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ASSESSMENT ALTERNATIVES:

SCIENCE

Fall, 1994 Edition

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

THE TEST CENTER

Sponsored by OERI Office of Educational Research and Improvement U.S. Department of Education

Innovative Assessment

Bibliography of Assessment Alternatives: SCIENCE

Fall, 1994 Edition

The Test Center
Evaluation and Assessment Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly, or in part, by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Department of Education, under Contract Number RP91002001. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

Northwest
Regional
Educational
Laboratory

THE TEST CENTER
101 SW Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204-3297
(503) 275-9582

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ASSESSMENT ALTERNATIVES: SCIENCE

August 1994

Our goal is to assure that our citizens know enough about science so that they:

- can tell the difference between sense and nonsense, between science and pseudoscience
- can distinguish the possible from the impossible, the probable from the improbable
- can understand both the powers and limits of science and technology
- are not at the mercy of experts--or worse, of charlatans posing as experts
- can be participants, not victims, in our increasingly and irreversible technological society.

(David Saxon, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, February 17, 1991)

The following entries represent current Test Center holdings in the area of alternative assessment ideas for science. "Alternative," for this purpose, means "other than standardized, norm-referenced." The list emphasizes performance assessments, portfolios, technological innovations, etc. Some of the entries may be intended for informal, classroom use. For more information, contact Matthew Whitaker, Test Center Clerk, at (503) 275-9582, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 SW Main Street, Suite 500, Portland, Oregon 97204, e-mail: testcenter@nwrel.org. To purchase a copy of this bibliography, please call NWREL's Document Reproduction Service at (503) 275-9519.

In this bibliography, terms are used in the following way: *open-response* = tasks with only one right answer; *open-ended* = having more than one right answer; *holistic rubric* = one score based on overall impression; *analytical trait rubric* = performance judged along several dimensions; *task specific rubric* = rubric tailored for a specific task; and *generalized rubric* = rubric used across tasks.

Abraham, Michael R., Eileen Bross Grzybowski, John W. Renner, et al. ***Understandings and Misunderstandings of Eighth Graders of Five Chemistry Concepts Found in Textbooks.*** **Located in: Journal of Research in Science Teaching 29, 1992, pp. 105-120.**

The study reported in this paper looked at how well grade eight students understand five concepts in chemistry: chemical change, dissolution, conservation of atoms, periodicity, and phase-change. There are five problems, one associated with each concept. Each problem describes (and/or shows) a problem situation and asks one to three questions. Some questions require short answers and some require explanations of answers. Each response is scored on a six-point scale of conceptual understanding from "no response" to "sound understanding" of the concept. The paper gave some examples of misunderstandings shown by the students.

The authors found that very few students really understood the concepts. They speculate that this may either be due to the nature of instruction (mostly textbook driven and little hands-on) or because students are not developmentally ready for the formal logic found in these concepts. The paper also reports some information on student status and the relationship between scores on this test and another measure of formal logical thinking.

A related study using the same five tasks is *A Cross-Age Study of the Understanding of Five Chemistry Concepts* by Michael R. Abraham, Vickie M. Williamson, and Susan Westbrook (TC#600.3CROAGS). Available from: The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Oklahoma, 620 Parrington Oval., Norman, OK 73019.

(TC#650.3UNDMIE)

Alberta Education. ***Diploma Examinations Program--Chemistry 30, Physics 30, Biology 30,*** **1991. Available from: Learning Resources Distributing Centre, 12360 - 142 St., Edmonton, AB T5L 4X9, Canada, (403) 427-2767, fax (403) 422-9750.**

Alberta Education develops high school diploma examinations in several course areas. These, combined with school-awarded "marks" are used to assign credit for the courses. We have received the 1991 versions of the exams for Chemistry 30, Physics 30, and Biology 30 There are three types of questions: multiple-choice, "numerical response" (students "bubble" their answers onto the scan sheet), and written response. All three tests have multiple-choice. The other two formats differ between tests.

All tests appear to focus on subject area knowledge. (Rather than problem solving, communication, reasoning, science process skills, etc.) Examinations are given locally under controlled conditions. Papers are scored centrally. Scoring appears to be based on the correctness of the answer.

(TC# 600.3DIPEXP)

Alberta Education. *Evaluating Students' Learning and Communication Processes*, January 1993-January 1994. Available from: The Learning Resources Distributing Centre, 12360 - 142 St., Edmonton, AB T5L 4X9, Canada, (403) 427-2767, fax (403) 422-9750.

The goals of the *Evaluating Students' Learning and Communication Processes* program are to: (1) evaluate progress of secondary students (grades 7-10) in six learning and communication processes; (2) integrate the six processes across classes in language arts, social studies, and science; and (3) empower students to take control of learning by making them conscious of the six process skills and how they, themselves, use them. It is based on the premise that students' achievement is directly related to the extent to which they have conscious, independent control over essential learning and communication processes. The six learning and communication processes are: exploring, narrating, imagining, empathizing (understanding the perspectives of others), abstracting (create, support, apply and evaluate generalizations), and monitoring. The materials provide generalized performance criteria (indicators) that serve both to define each process skill and to provide a mechanism for judging the quality of student use of the skill, regardless of the area in which they are working.

There is a general handbook for all subject areas that covers evaluation (performance criteria and recording information) and instruction (how to implement the program, instructional activities for students, help with student self-reflection, help with teacher collaboration, and how to report student progress). There is a separate handbook for each subject area that contains sample teaching units designed to show teachers how to incorporate diagnostic evaluation of students' learning and communication processes into regular instruction. In science the diagnostic teaching units are in the areas of structures/design for grade 7 and acids/bases for grade 10.

The documents give a good rationale for the importance of the six process skills and the importance of student self-monitoring of the processes. They also give extremely good advice on how to design instructional tasks that require students to use the six process skills, how to use instructional tasks as a context for student self-monitoring of process skills, and how to evaluate progress on these skills. The documents are also very useful because they have attempted to define process skills and apply them across subject matter areas. No technical information is provided. Some sample student work is provided.

(TC# 600.3EVASTL)

Appalachia Educational Laboratory. *Alternative Assessments in Math and Science: Moving Toward a Moving Target*, 1992. Available from: Appalachia Educational Laboratory, PO Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325, (304) 347-0400.

This document reports on a two-year study by the Virginia Education Association and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory. In the study, 11 pairs of K-12 science and math teachers designed and implemented new methods of evaluating student competence and application of knowledge

Teachers who participated in the study found that the changes in assessment methods led to changes in their teaching methods, improvements in student learning and better student attitudes. Instruction became more integrated across subjects and shifted from being teacher-driven to being student-driven. Teachers acted more as facilitators of learning rather than dispensers of information.

Included in the report is a list of recommendations for implementing alternative assessments, a list of criteria for effective assessment, and 22 sample activities (with objectives, tasks, and scoring guidelines) for elementary, middle, and high school students, all designed and tested by the teachers in the study. Most activities have performance criteria that are holistic and task specific. No technical information or sample student work is included.

(TC#600.3ALTASM)

Arter, Judith A. ***Integrating Assessment and Instruction*****, 1994. Available from: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 SW Main St., Suite 500, Portland, OR 97204, (503) 275-9582, fax: (503) 275-9489.**

Although not strictly about science assessment, this paper is included because of its discussion of how, if designed properly, performance assessments can be used as tools for learning in the classroom as well as tools for monitoring student progress.

(TC# 150.6INTASI)

Arter, Judith A. ***Performance Criteria: The Heart of the Matter*****, 1994. Available from: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 SW Main St., Suite 500, Portland, OR 97204, (503) 275-9582, fax: (503) 275-9489.**

Although not directly related to science assessment, this paper discusses an important issue that pertains to performance assessment in general--the need for clear and well thought out scoring mechanisms. The paper discusses what performance criteria are, the importance of good quality performance criteria, how to develop performance criteria, and keys to success. The author argues for generalized, analytical trait performance criteria that cover all important aspects of a performance and are descriptive.

(TC# 150.6PERCRH)

Aurora Public Schools. ***Performance Assessments in Science and Mathematics*****, 1994. Available from: Strategic Plan Facilitator, Aurora Public Schools, Department of Instructional Services, 15751 E. 1st Ave., Suite 220, Aurora, CO 80011, (303) 340-0861, fax: (303) 340-0865.**

The author has provided three examples of the types of assessments being developed by teachers in Aurora Public Schools developing an analogy for the major anatomical and physiological components of a typical eukaryotic cell, recommending a decision concerning the future use of medical technology in human biology, and collecting and analyzing a data set These examples, for secondary students, include a description of the task, prerequisite student experiences, and criteria for judging student performance on the task. Students work in groups of two to four. The assessments are mostly for classroom use.

Performances are evaluated along several dimensions including content, complex thinking, and collaborative working. Most of the rubrics are task specific and emphasize relative quality. For example, a "4" score for complex thinking on the medical technology task is: "The student clearly and completely identified the criteria by which the alternatives were assessed. The criteria were presented in detail and reflected an unusually thorough understanding and concern for the repercussions of the decision." The collaborative worker rubric is generic and more descriptive, a "4" is "The student expressed ideas clearly and effectively; listened actively to the ideas of others; made a consistent effort to ensure that ideas were clearly and commonly understood; accurately analyzed verbal and non-verbal communications; solicited and showed respect for the opinions of others."

No technical information nor sample student responses are included.

(TC# 000.3SCIMAP)

Badger, Elizabeth and Brenda Thomas. *On Their Own: Student Response to Open-Ended Tasks in Mathematics*, 1989-91. Available from: The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, 1385 Hancock St., Quincy, MA 02169, (617) 770-7334.

The materials we received contain assessment materials for grades 4, 8 and 12 from three years (1988-1990) in four subject areas: science, math, social studies and reading. This entry describes the science portion of the materials

In the 1988 and 1990 materials, students were given a written problem in which they had to apply concepts of experimental design, or use concepts in life or physical sciences, to explain a phenomenon. In 1988, three problems were given to fourth graders, six problems to eighth graders, and seven problems to twelfth graders. In 1990, three problems were given to fourth graders, and four were given to eighth and twelfth graders. Some of these were repeated across grade levels. All problems are included in this document. Responses were analyzed for the ability to note important aspects of designing an experiment or the amount of understanding of concepts they displayed. No specific performance criteria or scoring procedures are provided. However, there is extensive discussion of what students did, illustrated by sample responses. Because some of the information was also presented in multiple-choice format, the state was able to conclude that "although students appear to know and recognize the rules and principles of scientific inquiry when presented as sta' 'options, unstructured situations that demand an application of these principles seem to baffle them."

In 1989, a sample of 2,000 students was assigned one of seven performance tasks (the three in science required lab equipment and/or manipulatives) to do in pairs. Each pair was individually watched by an evaluator. Each evaluator could observe between six and ten pairs each day. It took 65 evaluators five days to observe the 2,000 performances. Evaluators were to both check off those things that students did correctly (e.g., measured temperature correctly), and record observations of students' conversations and strategies. Again, detailed scoring procedures are not provided. There is, again, much discussion of observations illustrated by samples of student responses.

Some information about results for all the assessments is provided: percentages of students getting correct answers, using various strategies, using efficient methods, giving good explanations, etc., depending on the task. No technical information about the tests themselves is provided.

(TC#600.3ONTHOS)

Baker, Eva L., Pamela R. Aschbacher, David Niemi, et al. ***CRESST Performance Assessment Models: Assessing Content Area Explanations,*** **April 1992. Available from: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 145 Moore Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90024, (310) 206-1532, fax (310) 825-3883.**

The authors provide two detailed examples of performance assessments for high school students--history and chemistry. In addition to these two specific examples, the document includes help on duplicating the technique with other subject matter areas, including rater training, scoring techniques, and methods for reporting results. The general procedures include: a Prior Knowledge Measure which assesses (and activates) students' general and topic-relevant knowledge; provision of primary-source/written-background materials; a writing task in which students integrate prior and new knowledge to explain subject matter issues in responses to prompts; and a scoring rubric.

The prior knowledge portion of the chemistry example consists of 20 chemistry terms for which students "write down what comes to mind drawing upon [their] knowledge of chemistry." The "written materials" consist of a description of how a chemistry teacher tests samples of soda pop to determine which contained sugar and which contained an artificial sweetener. The writing task involves assisting a student who has been absent to prepare for an exam.

Scoring is done on a scale of 0-5 for each of: overall impression, prior knowledge, number of principles or concepts cited, quality of argumentation, amount of text-based detail, and number of misconceptions. (The scoring scheme is elaborated upon for the history example, but not for the chemistry example.) Scoring on several of the five-point scales is based on the number of instances of a response rather than their quality. For example, conceptual misunderstanding is scored by counting the number of misunderstandings. Only the "argumentation" scale calls for a strictly quality judgment.

No technical information is included. Sample student responses are provided for the history example but not the chemistry example.

(TC# 000.3CREPEA)

Barnes, Lehman W., and Marianne B. Barnes. ***Assessment, Practically Speaking.*** **Located in: Science and Children, March 1991, pp. 14- 15.**

The authors describe the rationale for performance assessment in science. Traditional tests (vocabulary, labeling, matching, multiple-choice, short-answer, puzzle, questions, essay) accurately assess student mastery of the verbal aspects of science, but they do not allow students to demonstrate what they know.

(TC#600.6ASSPRS)

Baron, Joan B. ***Performance Assessment: Blurring the Edges Among Assessment, Curriculum, and Instruction*****, 1990. Located in: Champagne, Lovitts and Calinger (Eds.), Assessment in the Service of Instruction, 1990, pp. 127-148. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005, [AAAS Books: (301) 645-5643]. Also in: G. Kulm & S. Malcom (Eds.), Science Assessment in the Service of Reform, 1991, pp. 247-266, AAAS.**

After a brief discussion of the rationale for doing performance assessments in science, this article describes work being done in Connecticut as of 1991. The tasks for these assessments have three parts that involve a blend of individual work at the beginning and end, and group work in the middle:

1. At the beginning, each student provides information about his or her prior knowledge and understandings of the scientific concepts and processes relevant to the task. The student also provides a preliminary solution to the task. This serves to encourage preliminary thinking, brings diversity to the thinking of the group, makes more obvious what each student brings to the task, has instructional value, and provides a baseline for students to refer to later.

2. Students then work as a team to produce a group product. Throughout this process individual students report their views/summaries/insights of the work of the group.

3. After the group work, a transfer task is completed individually by each student.

The paper then spends some time discussing how to structure the tasks used in such assessments, and also the learning theory and collaborative learning research that underpin the approach.

The paper concludes with a discussion of current issues in performance assessment in science including

- They take a lot of time.
- The concepts assessed are harder to teach and harder for students to grasp
- Teachers are concerned about covering the material that is required in course guides
- It requires a great deal of expertise on the part of the teacher.

(TC#600.6PERASB)

Bennett, Dorothy. ***Assessment & Technology Videotape*****, 1992. Available from: The Center for Technology in Education, Bank Street College of Education, 610 W. 112th St., New York, NY 10025, (212) 875-4550.**

The Center for Technology in Education (CTE) has been conducting research on how best to use technology in assessment. It supports the use of video to capture aspects of students' performance that cannot be assessed with paper and pencil.

This document consists of a video and handbook that focus on the assessment of thinking skills, communication skills and interpersonal skills. Its context is a group project which requires applying physics to the design of motorized devices, and producing at least two simultaneous motions in different directions to accomplish an action or set of actions

The first part of the video describes an alternative assessment system that uses students' personal journals, group logs, projects, and presentations. Personal journals document students' personal experiences with technology outside the classroom and their observations about how things work. Group logs document group problem-solving and dynamics. The group projects and presentations are the major part of the assessment. Presentations are videotaped and scored by a panel of experts and other students.

The second part of the video contains four examples of students' presentations (car wash, tank, garbage truck, oscillating fan) which can be used to practice scoring using the criteria set forth in the handbook. Performances are scored using generalized criteria for thinking skills, communication/presentation skills, and work management/interpersonal skills, by looking at the relative numbers of positive and negative instances of each behavior

Brief descriptions of the above criteria are contained in the handbook. The procedure is a prototype. Feedback by those attempting to use the criteria is requested

(TC#600.3ASSTEVh and 600.3ASSTEVv)

California Assessment Program (CAP). *New Directions in CAP Science Assessment*, **1990. Available from: California Department of Education, PO Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244, (916) 445-1260, fax (916) 657-5101.**

The new California science curriculum identifies six themes (energy, evolution, patterns of change, scale/structure, stability and systems/interactions) that cut across three content areas (earth sciences, physical sciences, and life sciences.) CAP is developing multiple-choice, open-ended, and performance items to match this curriculum.

CAP administered open-ended science questions to 8,000 sixth graders in the spring of 1989. The questions required students to create hypotheses, design investigations, and write about social and ethical issues in science. Each task took 10 to 15 minutes.

CAP also field tested five performance assessment tasks with about 50,000 sixth graders in spring, 1990 Tasks were administered at five stations and took about 10 minutes each. The tasks were:

1. Building a circuit, and then predicting, testing, and recording the conductivity of various materials

2. Creating a classification system for a collection of leaves, and explaining the adjustments necessary when a "mystery leaf" is introduced into the group

3. Performing a number of tests on a collection of rocks, and then recording and classifying the results

4. Estimating and measuring water volumes

5. Performing chemical tests on samples of lake water

This document includes instructions for administering one of the performance tasks (electricity), seven letters written by students commenting on the assessment, and two open-ended questions with sample student responses.

(TC#600.3NEWDII)

California Department of Education. ***Science--New Directions in Assessment, California Learning Assessment System*****, 1993. Available from: California Department of Education, PO Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244, (916) 657-2451, fax: (916) 657-5101**

This document contains the following: five performance tasks (1991 pilot performance tasks for grades 8, and 11, and 1992 performance tasks for grades 5, 8, and 10); a newsletter describing current status of the science portfolio for grades 5, 8, and 10; and an overview of the California Learning Assessment System (CLAS) for 1990-1992. (The CLAS also has an enhanced multiple-choice section that is described, but not illustrated, in this document.)

The tasks require some individual and some group work, have multiple questions focusing on a common theme (e.g., recycling or fossils), and require several class periods to complete. Scoring on the tasks in grades 5 and 8 is task specific (on a scale of 0-4 or 0-6); scoring on the grade 10 and 11 tasks uses a general 1-4 point scoring guide that emphasizes understanding, detailed observations, good quality data, good experimental design, organized presentation of data, supported conclusions, and reasonable explanations.

Neither technical information nor sample student responses are included.

(TC#600.3SCINED)

California Department of Education. ***Science Portfolios--The Watershed*****, October 1992. Available from: California Assessment Program, California Dept. of Education, PO Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244, (916) 657-3747, fax: (916) 657-5101.**

This copy of the newsletter, *The Watershed*, contains an article on writing in science, ideas on science portfolios, and a nice statement of assessment as an instructional tool.

(TC#600.6SCIPOW)

California Department of Education. ***Golden State Examination Biology and Chemistry, Draft*****, 1992. Available from: California Department of Education, PO Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244, (916) 657-2451, fax: (916) 657-5101**

The purpose of the Golden State Examination is to identify and recognize students with outstanding achievement in biology, algebra, geometry, US history, chemistry, and economics. This document describes the 1993 assessments.

There are two required sections taking 45 minutes each. The first section is multiple-choice, justified multiple-choice, and short answer. The second section is a laboratory task, performed individually by using materials that have been set-up at testing stations. The purpose is to assess student ability to use laboratory equipment, make observations, conduct experiments, interpret results, and analyze data. (A third, optional, section is the science portfolio, described in another entry on this bibliography, TC# 600.3 GOLSTE.)

Results are scored using a generic 1-6 point scale tailored to specific tasks. The generic scoring guide emphasizes knowledge of biological concepts, creative use of principles, relevant alternative explanations, sound analysis of data, and clear communication.

Sample tasks and student responses are included. No technical information is included.

(TC#600.3GOLSTB)

California Department of Education. ***Golden State Examination Science Portfolio -- A Guide for Teachers*** **and** ***A Guide for Students*****, 1994. Available from: California Department of Education, PO Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244, (916) 657-2451, fax: (916) 657-5101**

The Golden State Examination (GSE) portfolio is a collection of student work produced during a year of high school biology, chemistry, or second-year coordinated science. It allows students to present for evaluation a broader representation of performance, exhibiting depth of conceptual and procedural knowledge. This is an optional component for the GSE. Scores are combined with the multiple-choice, short-answer, open-ended, and laboratory-performance portions of the GSE only if it would serve to improve the student's overall score.

Students must include three entries in the portfolio to demonstrate: problem-solving, creative expression, and growth through writing. Each entry is accompanied by a self-reflection sheet. There are both teacher and student guides which explain in detail what types of things should go in the portfolio and criteria for success. Examples of student work are included. No technical information is provided.

(TC#600.3GOLSTE)

Center for Talent Development. ***Elementary School Pre-Post Survey*** **and** ***Middle/High School Pre-Post Survey*****, 1993. Available from: Evaluation Coordinator, Center for Talent Development, Northwestern University, Andersen Hall, 2003 Sheridan Rd., Evanston, IL 60208, (708) 491-4979.**

This document contains surveys of student attitudes toward mathematics and science. There are two levels--elementary and middle/high school. It was designed for use with Access 2000 participants who are primarily African-American and Hispanic students in an inner-city public school system and enrolled in a math/science/engineering enrichment program.

(TC# 220.3QUEELM)

Champagne, Audrey, B. Lovitts, and B. Calinger. ***Assessment in the Service of Instruction*****, 1990. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005 [AAAS Books: (301) 645-5643].**

This book is a compilation of eleven papers that address the issue of making assessment a tool for meaningful reform of school science. The book contains papers that cover: an overview of good assessment, national and state assessment initiatives, traditional assessments, innovative assessments (performance, group, portfolio, and dynamic), and experiences in England and Wales.

The introductory article by two of the editors *(Assessment and Instruction: Two Sides of the Same Coin)* covers the following topics:

1. Reasons for assessing, including instruction, conveying expectations, monitoring achievement, accountability and program improvement.

2. What should be assessed, and the inability of multiple-choice tests to assess the most important aspects of scientific competence: generating and testing hypotheses, designing and conducting experiments, solving multi-step problems, recording observations, structuring arguments, and communicating results; or scientific attitudes: comfort with ambiguity and acceptance of the tentative nature of science.

3. A definition of "authentic" assessment: "An assessment is authentic only if it asks students to demonstrate knowledge and skills characteristic of a practicing scientist or of the scientifically literate citizen." Simply matching the curriculum is not enough, because the curriculum may be lacking.

Other articles from this book that are particularly relevant to this bibliography are described separately.

(TC#600.6ASSINT)

Chi, M.T., P.J. Feltovich, and R. Glaser. ***Categorization and Representation of Physics Problems by Experts and Novices.*** **Located in: <u>Cognitive Science</u> 5, 1981, pp. 121-152.**

The authors report on a series of studies to determine the differences between expert and novice problem solvers in physics. Although this paper is not about assessment per se, the observations in the paper might help users to define what good physics problem solving looks like, which in turn can serve as the basis for forming performance criteria to be used with performance assessments.

Expert problem solvers begin with a brief analysis of the problem statement to categorize the problem (i.e., determine which schema to activate). Once activated, the schema itself specifies further tests for its appropriateness. When the expert has decided that a particular principle is, indeed, appropriate, then the knowledge contained in the schema provides the general form that specific equations, to be used for solution, will take. This is contrasted to novice problem solvers which use superficial characteristics to categorize problems and lack procedural connections.

Several samples of expert and novice thinking are provided.

(TC#660.6CATREP)

16

Coalition of Essential Schools. Various articles on exhibitions of mastery and setting standards, 1982-1992. Available from: Coalition of Essential Schools, Brown University, Box 1969, One Davol Sq., Providence, RI 02912, (401) 863-3384.

Although not strictly about science, this series of articles discusses performance assessment topics and goals for students that are of relevance to science. The articles are: *Rethinking Standards*; *Performances and Exhibitions: The Demonstration of Mastery*; *Exhibitions: Facing Outward, Pointing Inward*; *Steps in Planning Backwards*; *Anatomy of an Exhibition*; and *The Process of Planning Backwards*

These articles touch on the following topics: good assessment tasks to give students, the need for good performance criteria, the need to have clear targets for students that are then translated into instruction and assessment, definition and examples of performance assessments, brief descriptions of some cross-disciplinary tasks, the value in planning performance assessments, and the notion of planning backwards (creating a vision for a high school graduate, taking stock of current efforts to fulfill this vision, and then planning backward throughout K-12 to make sure that we are getting students ready from the start).

(TC#150.6VARARD)

Colison, J. *Connecticut's Common Core of Learning*, 1990. Available from: Performance Assessment Project, Connecticut Department of Education, Box 2219, Hartford, CT 06145, (203) 566-4001.

The Connecticut Department of Education is developing a series of performance assessments in science and math. Each task has three parts: individual work to activate previous knowledge; group work to plan and carry out the task; and individual work to check for application of learning. This document provides:

1. A lengthy description of one of the ninth-grade science tasks: "speeders"

2. Short descriptions of 24 performance tasks in science (8 each in chemistry, physics, and earth sciences), and 18 in math

3. A group discussion self-evaluation form to be used by students

No technical information or general scoring guides are included in this document.

(TC#600.3CONSCI)

Collins, Angelo. ***Portfolios for Assessing Student Learning in Science: A New Name for a Familiar Idea?*****, 1990. Located in: Champagne, Lovitts and Calinger (Eds.), Assessment in the Service of Instruction, 1990, pp. 157-166. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005 [AAAS Books: (301) 645-5643]. Also in: G. Kulm and S. Malcom (Eds.), Science Assessment in the Service of Reform, 1991, pp. 291-300, AAAS.**

This paper presents the rationale for using portfolios in science, defines and provides the characteristics of such portfolios, and discusses what should go in them. There is no one "right" way to do a portfolio. They will differ due to three factors--purpose, context and design.

Purpose includes what is to be shown with the portfolio--mastery of content? understanding of and use of the processes by which this knowledge is constructed? student attitudes toward science? student comfort with ambiguity and the tentative nature of science? Purpose also includes how the portfolio will be used--student self-reflection? accountability? instruction?

Context includes such things as the age of the students and student interests and needs. Design covers such considerations as what will count as evidence, how much evidence is needed, how the evidence will be organized, who will decide what evidence to include, and evaluation criteria.

This article focuses mostly on considerations when designing a portfolio system in science, but a few, brief examples are given.

(TC#600.6PORFOA)

Collins, Angelo. ***Portfolios: Questions for Design*****. Located in: Science Scope 15, March 1992, pp. 25-27.**

This repeats a lot of the information on this topic presented by the author on other entries on this bibliography. This is a nice, short summary. The author appears to use the term "purpose" (as in "determine the purpose for the portfolio") to mean "target" (what do we want to show about the student).

(TC#600.3PORQUD)

Collins, Angelo. ***Portfolios for Science Education: Issues in Purpose, Structure, and Authenticity*****. Located in Science Education 76, 1992, pp. 451-463.**

The author teaches preservice science teachers. This paper discusses design considerations for portfolios in science and applies these considerations to portfolios for student science teachers, practicing science teachers, and elementary students. The design considerations the author suggests are:

1. Determine what the portfolio should be evidence of, i.e., what will the portfolio be used to show?

2. Determine what types of displays should go in the portfolio to provide evidence of #1. The author suggests and describes several types: artifacts (actual work produced), reproductions of events (e.g., photos, videotapes), attestations (documents about the work of the person prepared by someone else), and productions (documents prepared especially for the portfolio such as self-reflections).

3. View the portfolio as a "collection of evidence" that is used to build the case for what is to be shown. Those developing the portfolio should determine the story to be told (based on all the evidence available) and then lay this out in the portfolio so that it is clear that the story told is the correct one.

(TC#600.6PORSCE)

Collins, Allan, Jan Hawkins, and John R. Frederiksen. *Three Different Views of Students: The Role of Technology in Assessing Student Performance, Technical Report No. 12*, April 1991. Available from: Center for Technology in Education, Bank Street College of Education, 610 W. 112th St., New York, NY 10025, (212) 875-4550, fax: (212) 316-7026. Also available from ERIC: ED 337 150.

This paper begins by discussing why assessment in science needs to change: if tests continue to emphasize facts and limited applications of facts the curriculum will be narrowed to these goals. The paper then gives several good examples of how high-stakes uses of tests have negative, unintended side effects on curriculum and instruction.

The authors use the term "systemically valid" to refer to assessments that are designed to foster (create) the learning they also assess. The authors discuss four criteria for "systemically valid" tests, i.e., the test directly measures the attribute of interest, all relevant attributes are assessed, there is high reliability, and those being assessed understand the criteria. They also discuss criteria for quality tasks, examples of alternative assessment ideas, cost, cheating, and privacy.

(TC#600.6THRDIV)

Connecticut State Department of Education. *Connecticut Common Core of Learning Assessment*, 1989-1992. Available from: Connecticut State Department of Education, Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment, 165 Capitol Ave., Room 340, Hartford, CT 06106, (203) 566-4001.

This package contains a variety of documents produced between 1989 and 1992. Included is information about: rationale for the assessment, Connecticut's Common Core of Learning (student learning objectives), development process, several sample tasks and scoring mechanisms, student and teacher feedback forms, summaries of student and teacher feedback on the assessments using these forms, a process for developing performance tasks, a survey for student attitudes about science and mathematics, and an example of concept mapping as an assessment tool.

There appear to be two kinds of tasks: complex group projects and shorter on-demand tasks covering individual skills. The projects attempt to get at application and extension of knowledge and concepts. They require some individual and some group work and extend over several days. The on-demand portion covers knowledge and its application in limited situations. Performances are scored for group collaboration, process skills, and communication skills. Some of the rubrics are task specific and some are general; some are based on quantity (the number of possible solutions listed, for example) and some are more quality based.

(TC#000.3CONCOC)

CTB McGraw-Hill. ***CAT/5 Performance Assessment Supplement*, 1990. Available from: CTB/McGraw-Hill, PO Box 150, Monterey, CA 93942, (800) 538-9547, fax (800) 282-0266.**

The "CTB Performance Assessments" are designed to either be stand-alone or integrated with the CAT/5 or CTBS/4. There are five levels for grades 2-11. The total battery includes reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. There are 12-25 short-response questions for each subtest. The math and science subtests take 30-40 minutes. The entire battery takes two to three hours. (For the CAT/5 there is a checklist of skills that can be used at grades K and 1.)

Some questions are grouped around a common theme. Many resemble multiple-choice questions with the choices taken off. For example, questions on one level include: "What are two ways that recycling paper products helps the environment?" "This table shows the air temperatures recorded every two hours from noon to midnight...At what time did the temperature shown on the thermometer most likely occur?" and "These pictures show some of the instruments that are used in science...List two physical properties of the water in the jar below that can be measured with the instruments shown in the pictures. Next to each property, write the name of the instrument or instruments used to measure the property."

Some of the answers are scored right/wrong and some are scored holistically. The materials we received contained no examples of the holistic scoring so we are unable to describe it. Scoring can be done either locally or by the publisher. When the Performance Assessments are given with the CAT/5 or CTBS/4, results can be integrated to provide normative information and scores in six areas. There are only three, however that use the math and science subtests: demonstrating content and concept knowledge, demonstrating knowledge of processes/skills/procedures, and using applications/problem solving strategies. When the Performance Assessments are given by themselves only skill scores are available.

The materials we received contain sample administration and test booklets only. No technical information or scoring guides are included.

(TC# 060.3CAT5PA)

Curriculum Corporation. *Science--A Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools* and *Using the Science Profile*, 1994. Available from: Curriculum Corporation, St. Nicholas Pl., 141 Rathdowne St., Carlton, Victoria, 3053, Australia, (03) 639-0699, fax (03) 639-1616.

These documents represent the science portion of a series of publications designed to reconfigure instruction and assessment in Australian schools. The project, begun in 1989, was a joint effort by the States, Territories, and the Commonwealth of Australia, initiated by the Australian Education Council.

The profiles are not performance assessments, per se, in which students are given predeveloped tasks. Rather, the emphasis has been on conceptualizing major student outcomes in each area and articulating student development toward these goals using a series of developmental continuums These continuums are then used to track progress and are overlaid on whatever tasks and work individual teachers give to students.

The science profiles cover the strands of earth and beyond, energy and change, life and living, natural and processes materials, and working scientifically. Each strand is divided into subareas called "organizers." For example, the organizers for the strand of "working scientifically" are: planning investigations, conducting investigations, processing data, evaluating findings, using science, and acting responsibly. Each organizer is tracked through eight levels of development. For example, the organizer of "processing data" has "talks about observations and suggests possible interpretations" at Level 1, and "demonstrates rigour in handling of data" at Level 8.

There are lots of support materials that describe what each strand means, how to organize instruction, types of activities to use with students, and how to use the profiles to track progress. Some samples of student work are included to illustrate development. The documents say that the levels have been "validated," but this information is not included in the materials we received.

(TC# 600.3SCICUA)

Curriculum Corporation. *Technology--A Curriculum Profile for Australian Schools*, 1994. Available from: Curriculum Corporation, St. Nicholas Pl., 141 Rathdowne St., Carlton, Victoria, 3053, Australia, (03) 639-0699, fax (03) 639-1616.

This document represents the technology portion of a series of publications designed to reconfigure instruction and assessment in Australian schools. The project, begun in 1989, was a joint effort by the States, Territories, and the Commonwealth of Australia, initiated by the Australian Education Council.

The profiles are not performance assessments, per se, in which students are given predeveloped tasks. Rather, the emphasis has been on conceptualizing major student outcomes in each area and articulating student development toward these goals using a series of developmental continuums. These continuums are then used to track progress and are overlaid on whatever tasks and work individual teachers give to students.

The technology profiles cover the major strands of: designing, making and appraising, information, materials, and systems. Each strand is broken down into subareas called "organizers." For example, the organizers for "designing, making and appraising" are investigating, devising, producing, and evaluating. Each organizer is tracked through eight levels of development. For example, "evaluating" goes from "describes feelings about own design ideas, products, and processes" at Level 1 to "analyzes own products and processes to evaluate the effectiveness of methodologies used and the short and longer-term impact on particular environments and cultures" at Level 8.

There are lots of support materials that describe what each strand means, how to organize instruction, types of activities to use with students, and how to use the profiles to track progress. Samples of student work are included to illustrate development. The document says that the levels have been "validated," but this information is not included in the materials we received.

(TC# 600.3TECCUA)

Dana, Thomas M., Anthony W. Lorsbach, Karl Hook, and Carol Briscoe. *Students Showing What They Know: A Look at Alternative Assessments*, 1991. Located in: G. Kulm and S. Malcolm (Eds.), Science Assessment in the Service of Reform, 1991, pp. 331-337. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005 [AAAS Books: (301) 645-5643].

The authors present short descriptions of assessment activities they have developed and used with students at the Florida State University School for grades 6-12 in physical science, biology, and chemistry. The assessments are based on the theory that students construct knowledge for themselves as they participate in educational activities. The authors briefly mention the following techniques: concept mapping, journals, scrap books, and oral interviews. The examples include mostly descriptions of tasks; there is mention, but not elaboration, of the criteria for judging responses. The techniques emphasize student self-evaluation.

(TC#600.3STUSHW)

Darling-Hammond, Linda, Lynne Einbender, Frederick Frelow, and Janine Ley-King. ***Authentic Assessment in Practice: A Collection of Portfolios, Performance Tasks, Exhibitions, and Documentation*, October 1993. Available from: National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST), Box 110 Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.**

This book contains sample performance assessments for grades 1-12 in science, math, social studies, writing and drama from a number of sources. Formats include exhibitions, projects, on demand performance assessments and portfolios. The authors have included reprints of papers that discuss characteristics of "authentic" assessment, performance task design, and portfolios. Not all assessment information for each example is reproduced; the authors have usually excerpted or summarized information. Performance tasks are more thoroughly covered than performance criteria. In most cases no technical information or sample student responses are provided.

There are five science samples that cover grades 5-12. Tasks include designing a carton, explaining springs, floatation, insulation, and explaining the motion of a maple seed.

(TC# 000.3AUTASP)

Doran, Rodney, Joan Boorman, Fred Chan, et al. ***Assessment of Laboratory Skills in High School Science*, 1991. Available from: Graduate School of Education, University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260, (716) 645-2455.**

This document consists of four manuals (*Science Laboratory Test in: Biology, General Science, Chemistry, and Physics*), and two overview presentations (*Alternative Assessment of High School Laboratory Skills* and *Assessment of Laboratory Skills in High School Science*). These describe a series of on-demand activities to assess high school student laboratory skills in science, and a study examining test reliability, inter-rater agreement, and correlations between different parts of the tests.

Six hands-on tasks are presented in each content area manual (biology, chemistry, physics). Each task has two parts. In Part A, students are given a problem to solve and are directed to state an appropriate hypothesis, develop a procedure for gathering relevant observations or data and propose a method for organizing the information collected. After 30 minutes their plans are collected. Plans are scored on three experimental design traits: statement of hypothesis, procedure for investigation, and plan for recording and organizing observations/data. In Part B students are given a predeveloped plan to collect information on the same questions as in Part A. They have 50 minutes to carry out the plan and compose a written conclusion. Performance on Part B is scored for quality of the observations/data, graph, calculations, and conclusion. This procedure ensures that success on Part B is not dependent on Part A. Scoring is designed to be generic: the same criteria are used across tasks Individual tasks also have specific additional criteria.

The *General Science* test has six tasks set up in stations. Students spend ten minutes at each station. Students answer specific questions that are classified as planning, performing, or reasoning. Scoring is not generalized; points are awarded for specific answers.

All manuals include complete instructions for administering and scoring the tests. Only a few sample student responses are provided. Results from a study done with 32 high schools in Ohio showed that rater agreement was good, it was a very time-consuming process, and teacher reactions varied widely.

(TC#600.3ASSLAS)

Gayford, Christopher. Group problem solving in biology and the environment, 1989-93. Available from: Department of Science and Technology, University of Reading, Reading, Berkshire RG6 1HY, England, UK, (073) 431-8867.

This document consists of three journal articles: *A Contribution to a Methodology for Teaching and Assessment of Group Problem Solving in Biology Among 15-Year Old Pupils.* Located in Journal of Biological Education 23, 1989, pp. 193-198. *Patterns of Group Behavior in Open-Ended Problem Solving in Science Classes of 15-Year-Old Students in England.* Located in: International Journal of Science Education 14, 1992, pp. 41-49. *Discussion-Based Group Work Related to Environmental Issues in Science Classes with 15-Year-Old Pupils in England.* Located in: International Journal of Science Education 15, 1993, pp. 521-529.

The author reports on a series of related studies in which secondary students engaging in group work are assessed on a variety of skills such as group process, problem solving, attitudes, and science process. The purposes of the studies were to: (1) explore the use of group discussion as a way to develop and exercise skills such as communication, problem solving, and numeracy; (2) discover how students approach problem solving tasks; and (3) describe the group dynamics of students engaging in group problem solving tasks. The papers are included in this database because of the assessment devices developed by the author to examine student problem solving and process skills.

The specific tasks in which students were engaged in these studies were discussions of controversial issues about the environment and practical investigations in which students were to determine the best source of a substance or the amount of water needed by various plants. Students worked in groups. Each task took from 60-90 minutes. Performance was assessed using a variety of scoring guides, the most detailed of which was a generalized rubric assessing ability to state the problem, ability to work cooperatively as a team, quality of reasons for choice of design, ability to modify the design as a result of experience, and ability to evaluate success. Performance was rated on a three-point scale.

The papers include a good enough description of the tasks and scoring procedures that they could be reproduced by the reader. The paper also includes information about student performance on the tasks. No other technical information nor sample student responses are included

Permission to reproduce materials has been granted by the author.

(TC# 600.3CONTOM)

Green, Barbara. ***Developing Performance-Based Assessments and Scoring Rubrics for Science.*** **Available from: Texas Education Agency, Instructional Outcomes Assessment, 1701 N. Congress Ave., Austin, TX 78701, (512) 463-9734.**

Paper presented at Texas Science Supervisors Association Cast Conference, Austin, TX, November 3, 1993.

The Texas Education Agency is field-testing performance tasks to assess grade 4 and 8 science process skills. Actual tasks are secure; sample tasks not used in the assessment are available. The two we received require students to design an insulating container for ice cubes (grade 4) and determine the absorbency of paper towels (grade 8). These illustrate the two basic kinds of tasks--design and inquiry. Students plan and carry out their designs or inquiries at stations having a standard set of disposable and nondisposable materials. Students respond in writing (showing pictures, diagrams, and data displays when appropriate) to printed directions. For example, the grade 4 task asks students to plan the design (draw a picture and write a description), construct the design and test it, improve the design, and write a report (written analysis and conclusion).

Scoring uses a different holistic four-point scale for each of the two types of tasks: designs and investigations. For example, a "4" on design tasks means:

> The overall response is consistent with a sound scientific approach to design. The response indicates that the student has a clear understanding of the problem. The response may, in some cases, define additional aspects of the problem or include extensions beyond the requires of the task. Some inconsistencies may be present, but they are overwhelmed by the superior quality of the response. A score point '4' response is characterized by most of the following...

The package of materials we received has descriptions of the two tasks, a sample student response for each (unscored), and the scoring guide for each. No technical information is included. The contact person has given permission for educators to reproduce, for their own students, the materials submitted.

(TC# 600.3PERBAA)

Hall, Greg. ***Performance Assessment in Science - STS Connections*****, 1993. Available from: Alberta Education, Box 43, 11160-Jasper Ave., Edmonton, AB T5K 0L2, Canada, (403) 427-0010, fax (403) 422-4200.**

The "Grade 9 Science Performance-Based Assessment" consists of six stations set up in a circuit at which students perform a variety of investigations. The six in the 1993 assessment include: seed dispersal, calibrating a hydrometer and using it to measure the density of a sugar solution, determining which of several choices is the best insulator, building a robot arm, testing for contaminates, and examining an environmental issue. Three circuits, accommodating a total of 15 students, is recommended. Each group requires two hours Students respond in writing to a series of questions.

Responses for the Grade 9 assessment were scored on two dimensions problem solving/inquiry skills and communication. The scoring guide is generalized (the same one is used across all tasks) and uses a four-point (0-3) scale. A "3" for Inquiry is "Analyzed and readily understood the task, developed an efficient and vorkable strategy, strategy implemented effectively, strategy supports a qualified solution, and appropriate application of critical knowledge." A "3" for Communication is: "Appropriate, organized, and effective system for display of information or data; display of information or data is precise, accurate, and complete; and interpretations and explanations logical and communicated effectively"

The documents we have contain: a general overview of the procedures, complete activity descriptions, an administration script and the scoring guide. Student booklets for the 9th grade assessment, technical information and sample student responses are not included

(TC# 600.3PERAST)

Halpern, Diane (Ed.). ***Enhancing Thinking Skills in the Sciences and Mathematics*****, 1992. Available from: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 365 Broadway, Hillsdale, NJ 07642, (800) 926-6579.**

This book is not strictly about assessment. Rather, it discusses the related topics of "What should we teach students to do?" and "How do we do it?" The seven authors "criticize the conventional approach to teaching science and math, which emphasizes the transmission of factual information and rote procedures applied to inappropriate problems, allows little opportunity for students to engage in scientific or mathematical thinking, and produces inert knowledge and thinking skills limited to a narrow range of academic problems." (p. 118) In general, they recommend that teachers focus on the knowledge structures that students should know, use real tasks, and set up instruction that requires active intellectual engagement

The authors give various suggestions on how to bring this about: instructional methods, videodiscs, group work, and a host more. The final chapter analyzes the various positions and raises theoretical issues.

(TC#500.6ENHTHS)

Hardy, Roy. ***Options for Scoring Performance Assessment Tasks.*** **Available from: Educational Testing Service, 1979 Lakeside Parkway, Suite 400, Tucker, GA 30084**

A presentation to the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, California, April 23, 1992.

Four assessment tasks were developed to explore the feasibility of performance assessment as part of a statewide assessment program. Tasks were: shades of color (grades 1-2), discovering shadows (grades 3-4), identifying minerals (grades 5-6), and designing a carton (grades 7-8). The tasks are described in the paper, but all of the relevant materials are not included Each task was designed to take one hour. Most tasks are completed individually, but one (cartons) is a group task.

Response modes were varied (multiple-choice, figural, short narratives, products), in part to see which are feasible, and in part to see how different kinds of scores relate to each other. Most scoring was right/wrong or holistic on degree of "correctness" of answer. Cartons was scored holistically on problem solving. The scoring procedures are described but not presented in detail. The paper also describes the process used to develop scoring rubrics, to train scorers at the state level, and to analyze the data. No sample student responses are included in this document, but were used in training.

The tasks were completed by 1,128 students from 66 classes in 10 school districts. Teachers completed a survey (questions are included in the paper). Results showed that it took from 1/2 to three minutes to score the performances, interrater agreement ranged from .76 to the high .90's, relationships between scoring procedures varied, and teachers liked the procedures. In all, the author concluded that it is feasible to use performance tasks in statewide assessment.

(TC#600.3OPTSCP)

Harlen, Wynne. ***Performance Testing and Science Education in England and Wales*, 1991. Located in: Gerald Kulm and Shirley M. Malcom (Eds.), <u>Science Assessment in the Service of Reform</u>. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005 [AAAS Books: (301) 645-5643].**

This is a good summary of the approach to science education and assessment currently under way in England and Wales. (For related information, see the entries under Chris Whetton.) It discusses the history of the project, provides three hands-on test questions as examples, and describes the issues and problems which have arisen thus far--for example, comparability of tasks, amount of reading required by students, and trying to accomplish too many purposes with a single assessment.

From the examples provided, it appears that the performance tasks are a series of open-response questions which address a single science process skill, e.g., interpreting information, planning an investigation, or observing. Students provide short-answers which are evaluated according to degrees of con ›teness or right/wrong. Criteria differ by task.

(TC#600.6PERTES)

Heard, Virgil Gale. ***A Comparison of Science I and Science II with Traditional Curriculum,*** **July 25, 1992. Available from: Program Director for Science, Fort Worth Independent School District, University Plaza, Suite SE216, 100 N. University Dr., Fort Worth, TX 76107, (817) 871-2531.**

The state of Texas recently provided school districts with the option of replacing traditional subject area courses with thematic, coordinated courses that integrate the life sciences, earth sciences, and physical sciences. A prototype Science II Pre/Post Test was developed to compare effects on student learning of implementing this approach (Science I and II) to a more traditional subject area approach to teaching science It was administered to about 500 eighth graders in four pilot and three control schools.

The paper-and-pencil test consists of 40-50 multiple choice questions. However, students are required to manipulate equipment at 8-9 laboratory stations in order to determine the "correct" responses to 18 of these test questions. Test are scored electronically.

The following are included in this document: (1) a report of the test results, and (2) a copy of the Pre/Post Test. No answer key is provided.

(TC# 600.3SCIIIP)

Helgeson, Stanley. ***Assessment of Science Teaching and Learning Outcomes,*** **1993. Available from: The National Center for Science Teaching and Learning, 104 Research Center, 1314 Kinnear Rd., Columbus, OH 43212, (614) 292-3339.**

The author provides a nice summary of the following topics: purposes of student assessment in science, results of national and international assessments, the effects of high stakes assessment on instruction, assessment of attitudes in science, computer applications, and reasons for alternative assessment.

(TC#600.6ASSSCT)

Helgeson, Stanley L., and David D. Kumar. ***A Review of Educational Technology in Science Assessment,*** **1993. Available from: The National Center for Science Teaching and Learning, 1929 Kenny Rd., Columbus, OH 43210, (614) 292-3339.**

The authors found that most current use of technology consists mainly of computerized administration of multiple-choice tests drawn from item banks. However, they also describe some more innovative applications such as computer generated test questions, laboratory simulations, and computer scoring of more open-ended tasks. However, most of these appear to be based on assessing content and procedural knowledge rather than thinking skills.

(TC# 600.6REVEDT)

Hibbard, K. Michael. ***Region 15 - Together for Students - A Community of Learners*****, 1993. Available from: Region 15 School District, PO Box 395, Middlebury, CT 06762, (203) 758-8250.**

This document contains handouts used in a training session that appears to be an overview of the Pomperaug Regional School District 15 student assessment system. In addition to a general overview and philosophy statement, the hando' ts include sample assessment materials in science, social studies, math, and writing for grades 1-12.

The science information focuses mostly on checklists for assessing writing in science.

No technical information nor samples of student work are included.

(TC# 000.6TOGSTC)

Hibbard, K. Michael. ***What's Happening?*****, 1991. Available from: Region 15 School District, PO Box 395, Middlebury, CT 06762, (203) 758-8250.**

This document is a series of performance tasks in which assessment is integrated with instruction. The tasks include: chemical reaction, consumer action research, plant growth, physiological responses of the human body, survival in the winter, science fiction movie development, and food webs. Each task includes assessment rating forms and checklists, some of which are designed for student self-assessment. For example, the *survival in winter* exercise includes a rating scale that assesses 12 features of the project on a scale of 1-5, and a rating scale for an oral presentation. Other tasks include performance criteria for group work and self-rating on perseverance. The performance criteria are a mixed bag. Some directly refer to specific features of the task (e.g., "detailed descriptions were given of each plants' growth"). Others are general features that could be applied to many tasks (e.g., "shows persistence"). However, there is no standard of criteria across tasks; there is a different number of criteria and a different mix of specific and general criteria depending on task.

The assessments were developed for classroom use and do not include detailed definitions of traits to be rated, nor sample anchor performances. No technical information is included.

(TC#600.3WHAHAP)

Horn, Kermit, and Marilyn Olson. ***1992-1993 Lane County Fourth Annual Project Fair - Official Guidelines, Criteria & Registration Forms for Grades K-12.*** **Available from: Kermit Horn or Marilyn Olson, Project Fair Coordinators, Instructional Services Division, Lane Education Service District, PO Box 2680, Eugene, OR 97402, (503) 689-6500.**

This document is the handbook given to students in grades K-12 interested in registering for the Lane County project fair. It contains information on registration, criteria by which projects will be judged, and help with getting started.

The document also gives some excellent ideas on interdisciplinary projects.

Some journal entries from past submissions are included to show students what to do. No samples are included that illustrate score points on criteria. The criteria, although an excellent start, are still a little sketchy.

(TC# 000.3LANCOP)

Johnson, David W. and Roger T. Johnson. ***Group Assessment as an Aid to Science Instruction*****, 1990. Located in: Champagne, Lovitts and Calinger (Eds.), Assessment in the Service of Instruction, 1990, pp. 267-282. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005 [AAAS Books: (301) 645-5643]. Also located in: G. Kulm & S. Malcom (Eds.), Science Assessment in the Service of Reform, 1991, pp. 103-126, AAAS.**

The authors favor cooperative learning in science because of research that shows positive effects on student learning and attitudes. Their suggestions for group assessment build on this same philosophy--group assessment involves having students complete a lesson, project, or test in small groups while a teacher measures their level of performance. If done well, this format allows assessment of outcomes that are difficult to assess in other ways, such as reasoning processes, problem solving, metacognitive thinking, and group interactions. The authors also maintain that it increases the learning it is designed to measure, promotes positive attitudes toward science, parallels instruction, and reinforces the value of cooperation. The article describes how to structure performance tasks in a cooperative framework.

The authors then describe, in general, different ways to record the information from the task--observational records, interviews, individual and group tests, etc. This is a general overview of the possibilities, however, and provides no specific rubrics, forms, questions, etc.

(TC#600.6GROASA)

Jones, Lee R., Ina V.S. Mullis, Senta A. Raizen, et al. ***The 1990 Science Report Card - NAEP's Assessment of Fourth, Eighth, and Twelfth Graders.*** **Available from: Education Information Branch, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Dept. of Education, 555 New Jersey Ave NW, Washington, DC 20208, (800) 424-1616.**

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is a congressionally mandated project of the National Center for Education Statistics, part of the US Department of Education. This document includes the results of the 1990 Science Assessment from NAEP. It includes sample exercises, some of which are multiple-choice and others are open-ended.

(TC# 600.6SCIREC2)

Jones, M. Gail. ***Performance-based Assessment in Middle School Science.*** **Located in: Middle School Journal 25, March 1994, pp. 35-38.**

The author presents some ideas on how to do performance-based classroom assessments of science process skills. She recommends reviewing units of study to analyze the process skills being emphasized, identifying the observable aspects of each skill, and designing tasks that allow you to observe the skills. The author illustrates this process in various ways--both by giving an extended example on coastal ecology, and by listing science process skills, some observable behaviors, and related examples of tasks students could be given to elicit the behavior. The discussion of how to score responses is not as complete. No technical information is provided.

(TC#600.6PERBAS)

Jungwirth, Ehud, and Amos Dreyfus. ***Analysis of Scientific Passages Test,*** **1988. Available from: Educational Testing Service, Tests in Microfiche, TC922019, Set R. Also referenced in: "Science Teachers' Spontaneous, Latent or Non-attendance to the Validity of Conclusions in Reported Situations," Research in Science and Technological Education 8, 1990, pp. 103-115.**

The authors have developed a measure of science teacher critical thinking. Teachers are asked to identify the similarities between two passages in which the same invalid conclusion is reached. Passages illustrate "post hoc" thinking; attributing causality to an antecedent event; drawing conclusions about a population from a non-representative sample; and acceptance of tautologies as explanations. Teachers respond in writing. There are four forms. No technical information, except performance of one group of 76 teachers, is available.

(TC#600.4ANASCP)

Kamen, Michael. *Use of Creative Drama to Evaluate Elementary School Students' Understanding of Science Concepts*, 1991. Located in: G. Kulm and S. Malcom (Eds.), Science Assessment in the Service of Reform, 1991, pp. 338-341. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005 [AAAS Books: (301) 645-5643].

This article emphasizes kinesthetic learning--reinforcing and assessing knowledge of scientific concepts through acting them out. For example, students can demonstrate their knowledge of waves by forming a line and creating waves with different wave length and amplitude. Other examples are given for air pressure, solar energy, and land snails. The assessment appears to occur by seeing the extent to which students can illustrate the concept properly. No other performance criteria are discussed. Tasks were designed for students in grades K-6.

(TC#600.6USECRD)

Kanis, I. B. *Ninth Grade Lab Skills*. Located in: The Science Teacher, January 1991, pp. 29-33.

This paper provides a summary description of the six performance tasks given to ninth grade students as part of the 1985-86 Second International Science Study to assess laboratory skills. A brief description, a picture of the lab layout, and a list of scoring dimensions are provided for each task. It appears that scoring is essentially right/wrong and task-specific. Students were scored on ability to manipulate material, collect information, and interpret results. A brief discussion of some results of the assessment are provided. There is enough information here to try out the tasks, but not enough to use the performance criteria. No sample student performances are included. The paper also discusses problems with many current lab activities (too cookbook) and how to redesign lab exercises to promote higher-order thinking skills.

(TC#6?? 3NINGRL)

Kentucky Department of Education. *Kentucky Instructional Results Information System*, 1991-92. Available from: Advanced Systems in Measurement & Evaluation, Inc., PO Box 1217, 171 Watson Rd., Dover, NH 03820, (603) 749-9102. Also available from: Kentucky Department of Education, Capitol Plaza Tower, 500 Mero St., Frankfurt, KY 40601, (502) 564-4394.

This document contains the released sets of exercises and related scoring guides from Kentucky's 1991-92 grade 4, 8, and 12 open-response tests in reading, math, science, and social studies. It does not contain any support materials such as: rationale, history, technical information, etc.

There are three to five tasks/exercises at each grade level in each subject. Most are open-response (only one right answer), but some are open-ended (more than one right answer). Examples in math are: write a word problem that requires certain computations, determine how many cubes are needed for a given figure, follow instructions, explain an answer, arrange a room, explain a graph. Examples in science are: experimental design for spot remover, graph and interpret results of a study on siblings, and predict the weather from a weather map. Each exercise has it's own set of scoring criteria. It appears that the scoring emphasizes the correctness of the response and not the process by which the response was obtained.

(TC#060.3KENINR)

Kentucky Department of Education. *Performance Events, 1992-93, Grade 8.* Available from: Kentucky Department of Education, Capital Plaza Tower, 500 Mero St., Frankfort, KY 40601, (502) 564-4394.

This document includes three performance tasks and related scoring guides from the 1993 grade 8 assessment. The tasks relate to mapping the ocean floor, identifying bones, and water pollution. There is both group and individual work using a variety of manipulatives. Each task consists of a a series of related questions, some of which have only one right answer and some of which are more open-ended. Scoring employs task-specific scoring guides developed from a generic guide that addresses completion of the task, understanding, efficiency/ sophistication, and insight. Scored student responses are included. No technical information is included.

(TC#600.3PEREVG)

Koballa, T.R. *Goals of Science Education*, 1989. Located in: D. Holdzkom and P. Lutz (Eds.), Research Within Reach: Science Education, pp. 25-40. Available from: National Science Teachers Association, Special Publications Department, 1742 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20009, (202) 328-5800.

Assessment should be designed to cover important student processes and outcomes. This article is included because it discusses what our goals for students should be. Specifically, the author maintains that most science curricula are oriented toward those students that want to pursue science academically and professionally. We should also, however, be looking at science education as a means of promoting other important goals for students such as: longing to know and understand, respect for logic, and helping students to acquire capacities to cope with change.

(TC#600.5GOASCE)

Kober, Nancy. *What We Know About Science Teaching and Learning*, 1993. Available from: Council for Educational Development and Research (CEDaR), 2000 L Street, NW, Suite 601, Washington DC 20036, (202) 223-1593.

This booklet provides a very nice summary and overview of the changes in science instruction and assessment and the reasons for the changes. It includes short sections on such topics as:

why science is important for all citizens, why science instruction needs to change, instructional ideas, implications for policy, curriculum standards, how to send the message that science is important, equity issues, instructional methods, staff development needs of teachers, and the role of parents and the community.

(TC#600.6WHAKNS)

Kulm, Gerald, Shirley M. Malcom. ***Science Assessment in the Service of Reform*, 1991. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005 [AAAS Books: (301) 645-5643].**

This book contains articles from various authors who discuss: current issues surrounding science assessment, the rationale for considering alternatives, curriculum issues and trends, and alternative assessment initiatives in various states and countries. There are good summaries of what is occurring with the *National Assessment of Educational Progress*, with test publishers in England and Wales, and with various states. An appendix presents brief descriptions of alternative assessments under development by various organizations. The individual articles that appeared to be of most interest for the purpose of this bibliography are entered separately.

(TC#600.6SCIASI)

Lawrence, Barbara. ***Utah Core Curriculum Performance Assessment Program: Science*, 1993. Available from: Profiles Corporation, 507 Highland Ave., Iowa City, IA 52240.**

The Utah State Office of Education has developed 90 constructed response items in mathematics, science and social studies (five in each of grades 1-6 for each subject) to complement multiple-choice tests already in place. Assessments are designed to match the Utah Core Curriculum. Although districts must assess student status with respect to core-curriculum goals, use of the state-developed assessments is optional.

The science assessments are designed to measure four general process skills: identify/describe, explain, infer, organize, and create. Each task has several questions relating to the same theme. For example, one grade 3 task takes students through a simulated walk in the woods. A series of activities asks students to do such things as: "Color an animal and its surroundings in a way that shows how the animal uses camouflage...;" and "Next to each animal paste the picture of an animal or animals likely to use that shelter." Most student responses are short (some are multiple-choice); the longest are no more than a paragraph.

Scoring is task-specific and based either on getting the correct answer (e.g., the score for pasting animals next to shelters is 0-3 depending on how many are done correctly) or quality of the response (e.g., the score for camouflage is 0-2, where 2 is "student colors one of the animals in a way that enhances its camouflage" and 1 is "student partially addresses the task."). Points are totaled for each task, and between tasks for each of the four process skills assessed. Four levels of proficiency on each skill are identified: advanced, proficient, basic and below basic. Cut scores for each level are based on percent correct (approximately 90%=advanced, 70%=proficient, 40%=basic, below 40%=below basic) and behavioral descriptions of performance at each level.

Assessment activities are bound in books for each grade level/subject. Each task includes teacher directions, student test-taking materials, and scoring guides. The Office of Education has collected information on teacher reaction to the assessments from the field test. No other technical information is available at this time. An introductory training video is available which helps teachers use the assessment program (but does not deal specifically with science.)

(TC# 600.3UTACOC and 000.6INTUTCv--*video*)

Lawrence Hall of Science. *Full Option Science System--Water Module*, 1992. Available from: Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corporation, 310 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL 60604, (800) 554-9862. Also available from: Lawrence Hall of Science, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, (510) 642-8941.

The *Full Option Science System* is a series of hands-on instructional modules with associated assessments. The module reported here is on water. There are three parts to the assessment, all of which are described in detail in the document. The first part is a series of hands-on tasks set up in stations. Examples are: "Put three drops of mystery liquids on wax paper and observe what happens." and "What do your observations tell you about the mystery liquids?" Two different testing configurations are outlined (8 students and 24 students). Each group takes about 30 minutes. The second part of the assessment is an open-response paper and pencil test that takes about 15 minutes. The third part of the assessment is an application of concepts in paper and pencil format that takes about 20 minutes. All answers are scored for degree of correctness.

Administration and scoring information is provided, but no technical information on the tests nor information about typical performance is given.

(TC#600.3FOSSWM)

Lee, Elaine P. *Discovering the Problem of Solid Waste: Performance Assessments*, 1991. Available from: Lake County Educational Service Center, 19525 W. Washington St., Grayslake, IL 60030, (708) 223-3400.

In this booklet, 17 performance tasks are presented for students in grades 3-6. The tasks are based on an instructional manual used to teach the topic of solid waste, assess knowledge of the topic, and measure the ability to apply that knowledge in hands-on activities. Not all the tasks are appropriate for each of the grades.

Each performance task contains information about grade level, concepts being assessed (e.g., types of solid waste or recognizing changes in materials in a landfill), process skills needed to complete the task (e.g., classifying, measuring, observing, or ordering), and the objects/items needed for the task, directions, and questions to answer. Many of the tasks are completed at home or at a work station in the classroom.

Scoring emphasizes the correctness of the response; the scoring guides are different for each task. The guide provides information on the maximum points to assign for each question and for the entire task.

No information on staff training or technical information is provided.

(TC#620.3DISPRS)

Liftig, Inez Fugate, Bob Liftig, and Karen Eaker. ***Making Assessment Work: What Teachers Should Know Before They Try It.*** **Located In: Science Scope 15, March 1992, pp. 4-8.**

The authors contend that students have trouble taking alternative assessments because they have no practice doing do. For example, they don't know the higher-order thinking skills vocabulary that is often used in performance tasks, so they don't know what to do. They also don't know what it takes to do well. The authors recommend that students learn vocabulary, practice oral and written communication, and are careful not to leave anything out because they figure that the teacher already knows the student knows it. A list of vocabulary is included.

(TC#600.6MAKASW)

Lock, Roger. ***Gender and Practical Skill Performance in Science.*** **Located in: Journal of Research in Science Teaching 29, 1992, pp. 227-241.**

This paper is not included here because of the results of the study of student gender differences in high school students. Rather, it is included because of its brief descriptions of the performance tasks used, procedures, and method of scoring student performances. The four tasks were: measuring the rate of movement of blow fly larvae in dry and damp atmospheres, finding out how the size of the container with which a burning candle is covered affects the length of time for which the candle burns, determining the mass supported by a drinking straw, and identifying an unknown solution. Only one of these (straws) is described in enough detail to replicate. There are separate performance criteria for each task. Student performance is assessed live by listening to what the student says while he or she does the task, by watching what the student does, and by looking at what the student writes down. The criteria for the unknown solution task are given.

Because of the nature of the research reported, some technical information is included on the tasks. An attempt to obtain more information from the author was unsuccessful.

(TC#600.6GENPRS)

Lunetta, Vincent N., and Pinchas Tamir. ***Matching Lab Activities.*** **Located in: The Science Teacher 46, May 1979, pp. 23-25.**

The authors list 24 skills and behaviors related to the scientific process, recommend using these skills to analyze the tasks given to students to make sure that students are being required to apply/use all the skills of importance, and report on a study in which they analyzed several tasks using the list. They discovered that most lab activities do not require students to use many of the skills on the list.

(TC#600.6MATLAA)

Macdonald Educational. ***Learning Through Science*, 1989. Available from: Macdonald Educational, Wolsey House, Wolsey Road, Hemel Hempstead HP2 4SS, England, UK. Also available from: Teachers' Laboratory, Inc., PO Box 6480, Brattleboro, VT 05301, (802) 254-3457.**

This is one of a series of publications developed to promote instructional reform in science in the United Kingdom. The reform movement emphasizes active learning and concept development. (An overview of this curriculum reform movement is included in TC# 600.6SCIASI--Wynne Harlen, *Performance Testing and Science Education in England and Wales.*)

In addition to sections covering such topics as "why do science" and how to organize instruction, one chapter covers record keeping. This chapter proposes keeping track of student development toward mastery of broad scientific concepts and habits of thought rather than keeping track of activities completed. The chapter provides a brief description of a rating procedure (presented in more detail in another publication) for 24 attributes such as: curiosity, perseverance, observing, problem solving, exploring, classifying, area, and time. A sample five-point rating scale for one of the attributes, curiosity, is given.

An appendix to the book also provides developmental continua for: attitudes, exploring observations, logical thinking, devising experiments, acquiring knowledge, communicating, appreciating relationships, and critical interpretation of findings. These could be adapted for use in keeping track of student progress in a developmental fashion.

(TC#600.6LEATHS)

Macdonald Educational. ***With Objectives in Mind*, 1984. Available from: Macdonald Educational, Wolsey House, Wolsey Road, Hemel Hempstead HP2 4SS, England, UK. Also available from: Teachers' Laboratory, Inc., PO Box 6480, Brattleboro, VT 05301, (802) 254-3457.**

This is one of a series of publications developed to promote instructional reform in science in the United Kingdom. This instructional reform emphasizes active learning and concept development. (An overview of this curriculum reform movement is included in 600.6SCIASI--Wynne Harlen, *Performance Testing and Science Education in England and Wales.*)

This document covers such topics as the contribution of science to early education, objectives for children learning science, and how to use the various instructional units that have also been produced as part of this series. There is a good discussion of how student understanding in science develops, which includes many samples of student behavior as illustrations of the various stages. This discussion could be adapted to constructing developmental continua for tracking student progress to be used for performance assessment.

(TC#600.6WITOBM)

Marshall, G. *Evaluation of Student Progress*, 1989. Located in: D. Holdzkom and P. Lutz (Eds.), Research Within Reach: Science Education, pp. 59-78. Available from: National Science Teachers Association, Special Publications Department, 1742 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20009, (202) 328-5800.

This paper presents a general overview of assessment development targeted at classroom teachers. The author emphasizes the need to clearly define outcomes for students and then match the outcome to the proper assessment technique--multiple-choice, essay, projects, practical tests and lab reports. Examples of each item type (using science content) are provided.

(TC#600.6EVASTP)

Martinello, Marian L. *Martinello Open-ended Science Test (MOST)*, 1993. Available from: University of Texas at San Antonio, Division of Education, San Antonio, TX 78249, (210) 691-5403, fax: (210) 691-5848.

This assessment is designed to be administered as a pretest and posttest of scientific observation, inference, and supporting evidence skills for children in grades 2-5. A child is given an unknown object to examine (e.g., a crinoid, sweet gum seedpod, oak gall) and is asked to respond to three specific questions: (1) What do you see? (2) What do you think it is? (3) Why do you think so?

The test may be administered to individual children by soliciting oral responses or to class groups of children by soliciting written responses. All responses are open-ended. Responses are scored by assigning points for each reasonable observation made, inference made or piece of supporting evidence given by the student.

The document includes a description of the general procedure and scored examples of student responses to "oakgalls" and "seed pods." Technical information is available from the author. Also, samples of student written responses are available.

(TC# 600.3MAROPS)

Martinez, M. ***Figural Response in Science and Technology Testing*, 1991. Located in: G. Kulm and S. Malcom (Eds.), Science Assessment in the Service of Reform, 1991, pp. 384-390. Available from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005 [AAAS Books: (301) 645-5643].**

This paper briefly describes two field tests of "figural response" items. In figural response items students draw graphs, label diagrams, etc. They can be computer scored because the computer looks for the placement of key features in certain places on the answer sheet. For example, did the graphing extend up to the point expected?

The first experiment involved field testing 25 items to determine their feasibility for the *National Assessment of Educational Progress*. The second experiment involved computer-delivered items in which features could be moved around on the screen.

Several examples of items are provided.

(TC#600.6FIGRES)

McColskey, Wendy, and Rita O'Sullivan. ***How to Assess Student Performance in Science: Going Beyond Multiple-Choice Tests*, June 1993. Available from: SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE), PO Box 5367 Greensboro, NC 27435, (800) 755-3277.**

This publication presents a nice, relatively short, summary of assessment possibilities and steps for developing assessments in science. There are sections that cover: deciding on student outcomes, matching outcomes to assessment type, developing performance criteria, and reflecting on grading practices.

(TC#600.6HOWASS)

Medrich, Elliott A., and Jeanne E. Griffith. ***International Mathematics and Science Assessments: What Have We Learned?*, 1992. Available from: National Technical Information Service, US Dept. of Commerce, 5282 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161, (703) 487-4650.**

This report provides a description of international assessments of math and science (First International Mathematics and Science Studies, 1960's; Second International Mathematics and Science Studies, 1980's; and First International Assessment of Educational Progress, 1988), some of their findings, and the issues surrounding the collection and analysis of these data. It also offers suggestions about ways in which new data collection standards could improve the quality of the surveys and the utility of future reports.

(TC# 000.6INTMAS)

Meinhard, Richard. ***A Developmental Baseline Profile of 12 Key Elementary Science Concepts/Processes*, 1990. Available from: The Institute for Developmental Sciences, 3957 E. Burnside, Portland, OR 97214, (503) 234-4600.**

The Oregon Cadre for Assistance to Teachers of Science, (OCATS) Developmental Assessment Project is designed to encourage concept/process-based science education in order to promote long range student growth in science. One part of this project was to gather information on how science concepts develop in students from kindergarten through grade five. The concepts were:

Logical-mathematical organization of objects--simple classification, multiple classification. seriation, and whole number operations.

2. Geometrical and spatial relationships of objects--perimeter, area, and multiplicative projective relationships.

3. Physical properties of objects--quantity, weight, and volume.

4. Experimental reasoning--controlling variables.

5. Causal explanation--proportional reasoning.

One performance task was given to the students for each concept area. Performance was rated using a holistic developmental scale with four stages: sensory-motor (student engages in the activity without representational thought of the activity), preoperational (intuitive, no real understanding), operational (conceptual understanding under some circumstances), and formal (concept used as a variable in a more complex system of explanatory reasoning). Each stage has two substages; a final scale has eight points.

After discussing the results for the sample of 40 K-5 students in this study, the authors point out that the advantages of assessing students in this fashion are in knowing:

1. The readiness of students to handle instruction of certain types

2. How to teach concepts to students in ways they can understand

3. What needs to be done to move the student to higher developmental levels

Neither the performance tasks nor the scoring techniques are described in detail in this paper No technical information, except distribution of performance, is included.

(TC#6^0.6DEVBAP)

Mergendoller, J.R., V.A. Marchman, A.L. Mitman, and M.J. Packer. *Task Demands and Accountability in Middle-Grade Science Classes*, 1987. Located in: <u>Elementary School Journal</u> 88, pp. 251-265.

The authors maintain that the types of thinking students engage in and the quality of learning that occurs are largely influenced by the nature of the tasks students complete. After analyzing a large number of instructional and assessment tasks given to eighth graders, the authors conclude that, in general, the tasks given students present minimal cognitive demands. The article also provides suggestions about analyzing and modifying curriculum tasks.

Although not strictly about assessment, the article is included here to reinforce the notion that, as in instruction, the task given to students in a performance assessment can affect how well one can draw conclusions about student ability to think--if students are not given performance tasks that require thinking, it would be difficult to analyze responses for thinking ability.

(TC#600.6TASDEA)

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP--1987). *Learning by Doing: A Manual for Teaching and Assessing Higher-Order Thinking in Science and Mathematics. Report No. 17-HOS-80*, 1987. Available from: Educational Testing Service, CN 6710, Princeton, NJ 08541, (800) 223-0267.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress was established in 1969 to monitor student achievement status and trends. Samples of students aged 9, 13 and 17 are tested periodically, with science assessments having occurred in 1970, 1973, 1982, 1986, and 1990.

Learning by Doing is an overview of a pilot test of "higher-order thinking skills" that was added to the 1986 assessment. This pilot consisted of 30 tasks/items in the areas of sorting/classifying, observing/formulating hypotheses, interpreting data, and designing/conducting an experiment. The tasks included open-ended paper and pencil items, use of equipment at stations, and complete experiments. *Learning by Doing* briefly describes 11 of the exercises presented to students. Scoring is not described in detail. (The full report is available from NAEP at the above address.)

Lisa Hudson in chapter 4 of *Assessment in the Service of Instruction* (TC#600.6ASSINT) discusses some issues with respect to this pilot test and the 1990 science assessment. These include whether the time and cost of giving the performance items really provides that much extra information; how the ability to read, listen, and write might affect scores; and whether this type of task would differentially encourage inquiry-based instruction. (These are questions that relate to all performance assessments and not just the NAEP pilot.)

(TC#050.6LEARYD)

National Center for Improving Science Education. *Getting Started in Science: A Blueprint for Elementary School Science Education*, 1989. Available from: National Center for Improving Science Education, 2000 L St. NW, Suite 602, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 467-0652. Also available from ERIC: ED 314 238.

This report covers such topics as the rationale for science instruction, how children learn science, teacher development and support, and assessment. The chapter on assessment promotes the idea of assessment in the service of instruction--measuring the full range of knowledge and skills required for science, alignment with instruction, and a range of assessment approaches.

The authors outline the characteristics of a good assessment system, including characteristics of tests, measuring affective as well as cognitive dimensions, and assessing instruction and curriculum.

(TC#600.6GETSTS)

National Research Council. ***National Science Education Standards - Discussion Standards*****, May 1994. Available from: National Committee on Science Education Standards and Assessment (NCSESA), 2101 Constitution Ave., NW, HA 486, Washington, DC 20418, (202) 334-1399, fax (202) 334-3159, e-mail: scistnd@nas.edu.**

The National Science Education Standards are organized into five categories: program, teaching, content, assessment, and system. These describe what students should learn and how they should be taught and assessed. They are broken down by grade ranges (K-4, 5-8, 9-12). Each range covers learning/teaching/assessing science and content standards: science as inquiry; physical science; life science; earth/space science; science and technology; science and societal challenges; and, lastly, history and nature of science. A final set of standards for K-12 relate to unifying concepts and processes.

This is a discussion draft.

(TC# 600.5NATSCE)

National Science Teachers Association. ***Scope, Sequence and Coordination of Secondary School Science, Volume 1: The Content Core, A Guide for Curriculum Designers*****, 1992. Available from: The National Science Teachers Association, Special Publications Dept., 1742 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20009, (202) 328-5800.**

This book outlines curriculum standards for secondary science (grades 6-12). The document emphasizes the need to do more than have students memorize facts, the philosophy that students need to be involved in the practical applications of science, the approach that the various subject areas need to be coordinated, the theory that all students need to be scientifically literate, and the belief that students learn best when they construct their own meaning. However, the scope, itself, concentrates mainly on the knowledge part of the curriculum.

(TC#600.5SCOSEC)

New York Department of Education. ***New York State Program Evaluation Test in Science, Grade 4*****, 1991. Available from: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Albany, NY 12234.**

This entry includes two documents from the New York Department of Education. The one listed in the title provides an overview of the 1991 Grade 4 science test and complete descriptions of the performance tasks (materials needed, set-up and administration). There are five stations--Measuring Objects, Water on Objects, Grouping Objects, Electrical Testing, and Mystery Box. It takes students about an hour to circulate to all five stations. Scoring information is in another document that we do not have, therefore there is no indication of what skills these activities are attempting to measure. There is also no technical information nor sample student work. *Mystery Box* is cataloged as a separate document--see number below.

The second document, *Guide To Program Evaluation K-4*, describes a model for evaluating K-4 science programs. The components include: objective test, manipulative test, student science attitudes survey, analysis of instructional activities, and science program environment surveys. This document describes the system, the rationale for the system, and provides worksheets for reporting and using information. The actual surveys are included in another document we do not have.

(TC#600.3NEWYOS AND 600.3MYSBOX) IN-HOUSE USE ONLY

O'Rafferty, Maureen Helen. ***A Descriptive Analysis of Grade 9 Pupils in the United States on Practical Science Tasks*****, 1991. Available from: University Microfilms International Dissertation Services, 300 N. Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106, (800) 521-0600, microfilm #913 5126.**

This dissertation was a re-analysis of some of the information from the Second International Science Assessment (SISS)(1986), but it also includes a good description of the performance portion of the SISS and three of the six performance tasks. (The SISS also contained a multiple-choice portion and several surveys.)

The three tasks included in this document (Form B) were: determining the density of a sinker, chromatography observation and description, and identifying starch and sugar. The other three tasks (Form A) in the SISS, not included in the document, are: using a circuit tester, identifying solutions by ph, and identifying a solution containing starch. Each task has a series of questions for the student to answer using the equipment provided. (10-11 total). The questions asked students to observe, calculate, plan and carry out a simple experiment, explain, and determine results. Each subquestion was classified as being one of three types of process skills: performing, reasoning, or investigating. The six tasks were set up at 12 alternating stations A, B, A, B, ...). Twelve students could be tested every 45 minutes.

One to two points were given for each answer. The basis for assigning points was not clear, but appears to be based on a judgment of the correctness of the response.

The dissertation includes a number of student responses to the tasks, overall performance of the US population, and several reinterpretations of the results. For example, student performance on questions classified as measuring the same skill were widely different. The author speculates that this is either because the definitions of the skills are imprecise, or because such unitary skills don't exist.

The author also examined student responses for patterns of errors, and discussed the implications of this for instruction.

(TC#600.3DESANP)

Ostlund, Karen. ***Sizing Up Social Skills.*** **Located in: Science Scope 15, March 1992, pp. 31-33.**

The author presents a taxonomy of social skills important for the science classroom, provides a few ideas for how to teach them, and offers a couple of ideas on student and teacher monitoring techniques.

(TC#223.6SIZUPS)

Padian, Kevin. ***Improving Science Teaching: The Textbook Problem.*** **Located in: Skeptical Inquirer 17, Summer 1993, pp. 388-393.**

Although not strictly about assessment, this article is included because it discusses the nature of the tasks and activities that we give students to do. One of the major points of the article is that giving students "hands-on" activities doesn't ensure "good" activities. If we don't craft our tasks to get at the heart of what we want to accomplish with students, the tasks will be worthless both as instruction and assessment tools.

(TC#600.6IMPSCT)

Pine, Jerry, Gail Baxter, and Richard J. Shavelson. ***Assessments for Hands-On Elementary Science Curricula*****, 1991. Available from: Physics Department, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, (818) 356-6811.**

The authors present the case that science curriculum should enable students to learn how to pursue an experimental inquiry, and should give them the ability to construct new knowledge from their observations. Assessment should match this but the authors question whether it is always necessary to have hands-on assessment tasks. The authors designed a study that compared observer rating of fifth- and sixth-grade student performance of hands-on tasks with five other surrogates: ratings of student lab notebooks that covered the same hands-on tasks, a computer simulation of the tasks, free-response paper and pencil questions, multiple-choice items, and California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) scores. The surrogates (with the exception of the CTBS) were designed to parallel the hands-on tasks as closely as possible.

This paper reports on the relationship of observer ratings, notebook ratings, simulations, and CTBS scores. Results showed:

1. It was possible to get consistent ratings of student performance on hands-on tasks with trained observers

2. Ratings of lab notebooks were a promising surrogate for observations, but they have to be designed carefully

3. Computer simulations, open-ended questions, and multiple-choice questions were not good surrogates

4. CTBS scores were moderately related to hands-on performance, but appeared to mainly reflect general verbal and numerical skills

5. In order to assess inquiry instruction rather than general natural ability, hands-on tasks need to be carefully designed

The paper briefly describes all the tasks used in the study, but does not present them in enough detail to replicate. A companion paper, *New Technologies for Large-Scale Science Assessments: Instruments of Educational Reform* (TC#600.3NEWTEF), describes the tasks in more detail.

(TC#600.3ASSFOH)

Pomeroy, Deborah. ***Implications of Teachers' Beliefs About the Nature of Science: Comparison of the Beliefs of Scientists, Secondary Science Teachers, and Elementary Science Teachers.*** **Located in: Science Education 77, June 1993, pp. 261-278.**

The author reports on a study that asked the question: "Are there differences between how scientists and teachers view the nature of science, scientific methodology, and related aspects of science education?" She developed a 50-item survey which covered: (1) the nature of scientific inquiry--is the only valid way of gaining scientific knowledge through inductive methods using controlled experimentation, or is there a role, as more contemporary views have it, for dreaming, intuition, play, and inexplicable leaps? (2) what K-12 science education should be like, and (3) background information on respondents.

The complete survey and discussion of the results are included in the article.

(TC#600.4TEABEA)

Psychological Corporation. ***Integrated Assessment System--Science Performance Assessment*****, 1992. Available from: Psychological Corporation, Order Service Center, PO Box 839954, San Antonio, TX 78283, (800) 228-0752.**

This is a series of seven tasks designed to be used with students in grades 2-8 (one task per grade level). The tasks involve designing and conducting an experiment based on a problem situation presented in the test. Students are provided various materials with which to work. Students may work individually or in teams, but all submitted products must be individually generated. Students generate a hypothesis they wish to test, write down (or show using pictures) the procedures used in the experiment, record data, and draw conclusions. At the end, students are asked to reflect on what they did and answer questions such as: "What problem did you try to solve?" "Tell why you think things worked the way they did," and "What have you seen or done that reminds you of what you have learned in the experiment?" The final question in the booklet asks students how they view science. This question is not scored but can be used to gain insight into students' performances.

Only the written product in the answer booklet is actually scored. (However, the publisher recommends that teachers watch the students as they conduct the experiment to obtain information about process. A checklist of things to watch for is provided.) Responses can be scored either holistically or analytically using criteria which have been generalized so that they can be used with any task. The holistic scale (0-6) focuses on an overall judgment of the performance based on quality of work, conceptual understanding, logical reasoning, and ability to communicate what was done.

The four analytical traits are experimenting (ability to state a clear problem, and then design and carry out a good experiment), collecting data (precise and relevant observations), drawing conclusions (good conclusions supported by data), and communicating (use of appropriate scientific terms, and an understandable presentation of what was done.). Traits are scored on a scale of 1-4.

There is a scoring guide that describes the procedure. However, in the materials we obtained, there are no student performances provided to illustrate the scoring. No technical information about the assessment is included.

(TC#600.3INTASS)

Psychological Corporation. ***GOALS: A Performance-Based Measure of Achievement--Science*, 1992. Available from: Psychological Corporation, Order Service Center, PO Box 839954, San Antonio, TX 78283, (800) 228-0752.**

GOALS is a series of open-response questions (only one right answer) that can be used alone or in conjunction with the MAT-7 and SAT-8. Three forms are available for 11 levels of the test covering grades 1-12 for each of science, math, social studies, language and reading. Each test (except language) has ten items. On the science test, tasks cover content from the biological, physical, and earth/space sciences. Each task seems to address the ability to use a discrete science process skill (e.g., draw a conclusion, record data) or use a piece of scientific information. The tasks require students to answer a question and then (usually) provide an explanation

Responses are scored on a four-point holistic scale (0-3) which emphasizes the degree of correctness or plausibility of the response and the clarity of the explanation. A generalized scoring guide is applied to specific questions by illustrating what a 3, 2, 1 and 0 response look like.

Both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced (how students look on specific concepts) score reports are available. Scoring can be done either by the publisher or locally. A full line of report types (individual, summary, etc.) are available.

The materials we obtained did not furnish any technical information about the test itself.

(TC#610.3GOALSS)

Raizen, Senta and J. Kaser. ***Assessing Science Learning in Elementary School: Why, What, and How?*** **Located in: Phi Delta Kappan, May 1989, pp. 718-722.**

This paper describes some of the limitations of current standardized, multiple-choice tests to assess science, discusses how this combines with inadequate teacher preparation and textbooks to create inferior science instruction, and provides a list of questions to ask about any test being considered for use. The list of questions includes such things as "Are problems with more than one correct solution included?" and "Are there assessment exercises that encourage students to estimate their answers and to check their results?"

(TC#600.6ASSSCL)

Raizen, Senta A., Joan B. Baron, Audrey B. Champagne, et al. ***Assessment in Elementary School Science Education*, 1989. Available from: The National Center for Improving Science Education, 2000 L St. NW, Suite 602, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 467-0652. Also available from: ERIC ED 314 236.**

The authors discuss the following topics: why assessment is important, issues in assessment, what to assess, how to assess, using assessment in instruction, and assessment of program features. The emphasis is on using assessment to enhance instruction not to undermine it. A lengthy appendix describes "fundamental organizing concepts in science that all students, by the time they finish sixth grade, should incorporate in the way they think about and engage their world." These include: orderliness, cause and effect, systems, scale, models, change, structure and function, variations, and diversity. There is a definition of each area and examples of K-6 instructional activities.

This appears to be a longer and more detailed version of TC# 600.6GETSTS, National Center for Improving Science Education.

(TC#600.6ASSELS)

Riggs, Iris M. and Larry G. Enochs. *Toward the Development of an Elementary Teacher's Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Instrument*, 1989. Available from: ERIC ED 308 068.

Paper presented at the 62nd Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, San Francisco, CA.

This publication reports on a study in which the Personal Science Teaching Efficacy Belief Scale and the Science Teaching Outcome Expectancy Scale were administered to measure teacher feelings of self-efficacy and outcome expectancy. The authors present evidence that the combined instrument is valid for studying elementary teacher's beliefs toward science teaching and learning. The instrument is included.

(TC#600.4TOWDEE)

Riverside Publishing Company, The. *Performance assessments for ITBS, TAP and ITED (various levels and subject areas)*, 1993. Available from: The Riverside Publishing Company, 8420 Bryn Mawr Ave., Chicago, IL 60631, (800) 323-9540.

Riverside is publishing a series of open-response items in the areas of social studies, science, mathematics, and language arts. Nine levels are available for grades 1-12. They supplement achievement test batteries available from the publisher: ITBS, TAP, and ITED. Each level uses a scenario to generate a series of related questions, some of which have only one right answer, and others of which are more open-ended and generative.

For example, the science assessments we received center around designing a biology display for a local museum (high school) and exploring the web of life (elementary). The biology assessment has students design and use classification systems for living things, draw a bar graph based on presented information, generalize about muscles, and show knowledge about the brain. Tests take $1^1/_2$ to 2 hours depending on grade level.

No information about scoring, sample student performances, nor technical information was included in the materials we received. However, the publishers' catalog indicates that scoring materials are available and that the tests are normed.

(TC# 060.3PERAST)--IN-HOUSE USE ONLY

Roth, Wolff-Michael. ***Dynamic Evaluation.*** **Located in: Science Scope 15, March 1992, pp. 37-40.**

The author describes a method by which students plan and report experiments: the Vee Map. The Vee Map requires students to list vocabulary related to the topic they are reporting, develop a concept map of these terms, describe the experimental design, desc. ibe the data collected, and present their conclusions One extended example in earth science is given. Performance criteria for assessing the Vee Map is sketchy. No technical information is included.

(TC#630.6DYNEVA)

Rutherford, F. James and Andrew Ahlgren. ***Science for All Americans--Science Literacy,*** **1990. Available from: Oxford University Press, Inc., 200 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016, (800) 334-4249.**

This book discusses science curriculum standards The premise is that, although not everyone will be a scientist, future success of humanity requires that everyone have a certain level of scientific literacy--knowledge, habits of mind, and the desire to be a critical thinker. The chapters cover the following kinds of goals we should have for students: the scientific endeavor as a human enterprise, basic knowledge about the world, major scientific themes, and habits of mind.

(TC#600.5SCIFOA)

Scottish Examination Board. ***Standard Grade - Amended Arrangements in Biology,*** **1992. Available from: Dr. David M. Elliot, Director of Assessment, Ironmills Rd., Dalkeith, Midlothian, Edinburgh, EH22 1LE, Scotland, UK, (031) 663-6601.**

The Scottish Examination Board prepares end-of-course tests for a variety of high school subjects to certify level of student competence. We have received tests for math, general science, and biology. The course syllabus for biology calls for coverage of: the biosphere, the world of plants, animal survival, investigating cells, the body in action, inheritance, and biotechnology. The goals of the course are: knowledge and understanding, problem solving, practical abilities, and attitudes. (Only the first three are assessed.) There are two main parts to the assessment for biology--written tests (developed by the Examination Board) and classroom embedded performance assessments (conducted by teachers according to specifications developed by the Examination Board). The two parts are combined to rate student competence. Each goal is rated on a scale of 1-5, overall performance is rated on a scale of 1-7 (1 being highest).

Written tests, developed each year, cover knowledge/understanding and problem solving in the content areas outlined in the syllabus. Two levels of the test are available: General and Credit. Students getting about 50 percent right on the General level obtain a rating of 4; about 80 percent right gives a rating of 3. Likewise a score of about 50 percent on the Credit test gives a rating of 2, while 80 percent gives a rating of 1. All questions are short answer or multiple-choice and are scored by degree of correctness of the answer.

The performance assessments cover techniques (students must demonstrate competence in ten areas such as "carrying out a test for starch") and investigations (students are scored for "generative skills," "experimentation skills," "evaluation skills," and "recording and reporting skills" on each of two investigations). Scoring entails assigning points for various specified features of performance, such as 2 points for "producing a table of results with suitable headings and units of measurement."

The package of materials we received included the course syllabus, specifications for the written and performance assessments, and copies of the written tests for 1993. It did not include technical information or sample student responses.

(TC# 640.3BIOSTG)

Scottish Examination Board. *Standard Grade - Amended Arrangements in Science*, 1992. Available from: Dr. David M. Elliot, Director of Assessment, Ironmills Rd., Dalkeith, Midlothian, Ediburgh, Scotland, EH22 1LE.

The Scottish Examination Board prepares end-of-course tests for a variety of high school subjects to certify level of student competence. We have received tests for math, general science, and biology. The course syllabus for general science calls for coverage of: healthy and safe living, an introduction to materials, energy and its uses, and a study of environments. Goals are knowledge, problem solving, practical abilities (science process skills), and attitudes. (Only the first three are assessed.) There are two main parts to the assessment for general science--written tests (developed by the Examination Board) and classroom embedded performance assessments (conducted by teachers according to specifications developed by the Examination Board). The two parts are combined to rate student competence on a scale of 1-7. (Separate ratings are given overall and for each of the three goals.)

Written tests, developed each year, cover knowledge/understanding and problem solving in the content areas outlined in the syllabus. Three levels of the test are available: Foundation, General, and Credit. Students getting about 50 percent right on the Foundation level obtain a rating of 6; about 80 percent right gives a rating of 5. Likewise, percent right on the General level give ratings of 4 or 3, and percent right on the Credit level give ratings of 2 or 1. ("1" is the highest rating.) All questions are short answer or multiple-choice and are scored for degree of correctness of the answer.

The performance assessments cover techniques (students must demonstrate competence in eight areas such as "measuring ph") and investigations (students are scored for "generative skills," "experimentation skills," "evaluation skills," and "recording and reporting skills" on each of two investigations). Scoring entails assigning points for various specified features of performance, such as 2 points for "clearly identifying the purpose of the investigation in terms of the relevant variables."

The package of materials we received included the course syllabus, specifications for the written and performance assessments, and copies of the written tests for 1993. It did not include technical information or sample student responses.

(TC# 610.3SCISTG)

Semple, Brian McLean. ***Performance Assessment: An International Experiment*, 1992. Available from: ETS, Scottish Office, Education Department, Rosedale Rd., Princeton, NJ 08541, (609) 734-5686.**

This report describes the Second International Assessment of Educational Progress on math and science conducted in 1991. Eight math and eight science tasks were given to a sample of thirteen-year-olds in five volunteer countries (Canada, England, Scotland, USSR, and Taiwan). This sample was drawn from the larger sample involved in the main assessment.

The 16 hands-on tasks are arranged in two 8-station circuits. Students spend about five minutes at each station performing a short task. Most tasks are "atomistic" in nature; they measure one small skill. For example, the 8 math tasks concentrate on measuring length, angles, and area, laying out a template on a piece of paper to maximize the number of shapes obtained, producing given figures from triangular cut-outs, etc. Some tasks require students to provide an explanation of what they did. All 16 tasks are included in this document, although some instructions are abbreviated and some diagrams are reduced in size.

Most scoring appears to be right/wrong. (However, it is not entirely clear how the explanations are scored. It consists of some kind of judgment of reasonableness of the explanation.) There must also have been some observation of how the students approached the tasks, because a detailed analysis of such strategies for one problem is given.

Student summary statistics on each task are included. There is a brief summary of teacher reactions, student reactions, the relationship between student performance on various tasks, and the relationship between performance on the multiple-choice and performance portions of the test

(TC#600.3PERASS)

Semple, Brian McLean. ***Science - Assessment of Achievement Programme*, 1992. Available from: Scottish Office Library, New St. Andrews House, Room 4/51a, Edinburgh, EH1 3SY, Scotland, UK, (031) 244-4388.**

The "Assessment of Achievement Programme (AAP)" was established by the Scottish Office of Education Department in 1981 to monitor the performance of pupils in grades 4, 7, and 9. This document reports on the 1990 science assessment. The assessment focused on science process skills: observing, measuring, handling information, using knowledge, using simple procedures, inferring, and investigating.

Assessment tasks used two formats: written (select the correct answer and provide a reason for the choice); and practical (use manipulatives to select the correct answer and provide a reason, or longer investigations such as observe an event and write down the observation). The practical portion was set up in (1) circuits of eight stations (four minutes at each station), or (2) longer investigations of 15-30 minutes. Schools in the assessment sample were also invited to comment on the types of skills assessed, and describe the science program at their schools.

Detailed scoring guides are not provided in the materials we have. Student responses were apparently scored for both the correctness of the answer and the adequacy of the explanation.

The document we have describes the background of the assessment program, provides sample written and practical tasks for each skill area assessed, and describes student performance on the tasks (by grade level and gender, and over time). Neither technical information nor sample student performances are included

(TC# 600.3SCAASA)

Shavelson, Richard J., Neil B. Carey, and Noreen M. Webb. ***Indicators of Science Achievement: Options for a Powerful Policy Instrument.* Located in: Phi Delta Kappan, May 1990, pp. 692-697.**

The authors review reasons for moving from multiple-choice tests of science achievement to more performance-based measures, and then discuss three examples: looking at how well students can move between different representation of a problem, mental models, and performance assessments/surrogates.

(TC#600.6INDOFS)

Shavelson, Richard J., Gail P. Baxter, Jerry Pine, and J. Yure. *New Technologies for Large-Scale Science Assessments: Instruments of Educational Reform*, 1991. Available from: University of California, 552 University Rd., Santa Barbara, CA 93106, (805) 893-8000.

This document is a series of papers that report in more detail on the studies of hands-on versus surrogate assessment tasks also described in *Assessments for Hands-On Elementary Science Curricula* (TC#600.3ASSFOH). This includes more detailed descriptions of the three hands-on tasks (paper towels, sow bugs, and electric mysteries) and computer simulations. Findings, in addition to those reported in the companion paper, include:

1. Although observers could be trained to be very consistent in their ratings, a major source of error is still in the tasks chosen. That is, the decision about the level of an individual's performance depends greatly on the particular task used.

2. Hands-on assessment provides different information than that provided by paper and pencil tests.

For additional information to those reported in this paper and its companion paper see the following references:

Baxter, Gail P., Richard J. Shavelson, Susan Goldman, and Jerry Pine. *Evaluation of Procedure-Based Scoring for Hands-on Science Assessment.* Journal of Educational Measurement, 1992, 29, pp. 1-17. (TC#600.3EVAPRB)

Shavelson, Richard J., and Gail P. Baxter. *What We've Learned About Assessing Hands-On Science.* Located in: Educational Leadership, Vol. 49, No. 8, May 1992, pp. 20-25. (TC#600.3WHAWEL)

Shavelson, Richard J., Gail P. Baxter, and Jerry Pine. *Performance Assessments--Political Rhetoric and Measurement Reality.* Located in: Educational Researcher, Vol. 21, No. 4, May 1992, pp 22-27. (TC#600.3PERASP)

Shavelson, Richard J., Maria Araceli Ruiz-Primo, Gail P. Baxter. *On the Stability of Performance Assessments.* Located in: Journal of Educational Measurement, Spring 1993, 30, pp 41-53. (TC#600.6ONSTAP)

(TC#600.3NEWTEF)

Small, Larry. *Science Process Evaluation Model*, 1992. Available from: Schaumburg Community Consolidated District #54, 524 E. Schaumburg Rd., Schaumburg, IL 60194, (708) 885-6700.

This document contains a paper presented at a national conference in 1988 which briefly describes Schaumburg's science assessment system, and a set of tests for students in grades 4-6. The tests have three parts: multiple-choice to measure content and some process skills, self-report survey to assess attitudes toward science, and hands-on tasks to assess science process skills.

The hands-on part attempts to measure 11 student science process skills: observing, communicating, classifying, using numbers, measuring, inferring, predicting, controlling variables, defining operationally, interpreting data, and experimenting. It consists of students using manipulatives to answer fixed questions such as "Which drop magnifies the most?" or "Which clay boat would hold the most weights and still float in the water?" Students respond by choosing an answer (multiple-choice), supplying a short answer, or, in a few cases, drawing a picture or graph. Complete tests for Grades 4, 5, and 6 are included.

No scoring procedures or technical information were included with the package. For additional information on this project see *Teamwork Testing* (Small--TC#650.3TEATES)

(TC#600.3SCIPRE)

Small, Larry, and Jane Petrek. *Teamwork Testing*. Located in: Science Scope 15, March 1992, pp. 29-30.

The authors describe a model for performance-based assessment in middle school chemistry which emphasizes group cooperation and the process of doing science. One task was described in detail. Performance criteria were hinted at, but not described.

For other information on this project see *Science Process Evaluation Model* (Small--TC#600.3SCIPRE).

(TC#650.3TEATES)

Stecher, Brian M. *Describing Secondary Curriculum in Mathematics and Science: Current Status and Future Indicators*, 1992. Available from: RAND, 1700 Main St., PO Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407.

The author describes what could go into an indicator system of the health of science and mathematics education. He concludes that current data sources for these indicators are inadequate.

(TC#000.6DESSEC)

Surber, John R.. Map Tests (various documents). Available from: John R. Surber, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI 53201, (414) 229-1122.

This is a collection of the following four documents.

Surber, John R. *Mapping as a Testing and Diagnostic Device*. Located in: C. D. Holley and D. F. Dansereau (Eds.), Spatial Learning Strategies, 1984, pp. 213-233. Available from: Academic Press, Inc., 1250 6th Ave., San Diego, CA 92101.

Surber, John R., Philip L. Smith. *Testing for Misunderstanding*. Located in Educational Psychologist 16, 1981, pp. 165-174.

Surber, John R., Philip L. Smith, and Frederika Harper. *Technical Report No. 1. Structural Maps of Text as a Learning Assessment Technique: Progress Report for Phase I* (undated).

Surber, John R., Philip L. Smith, and Frederika Harper. *Technical Report No. 6. The Relationship Between Map Tests and Multiple Choice Tests*, March 1982.

These reports describe the development of map tests as an assessment technique to identify conceptual misunderstandings that occur when students learn from text. In this testing technique, concepts and their interrelationships are represented graphically. These graphic representations are called text maps. A training manual for constructing text maps is included. The manual introduces the symbols to be used in the concept map to indicate: 1) definitions, 2) characteristics or properties, 3) examples, 4) temporal relations, 5) causal relations, 6) similarity, and 7) greater- or less-than comparisons.

The papers present four methods of using maps to assess the structure of student knowledge. All involve various levels of deleting information from a completed text map and providing clues on content and structure. Students complete the missing information--similar to a cloze test. Text maps and map tests can be constructed using any content area--science, social studies, etc. They can be used in study skills or reading classes. In these reports, the content of the training manual is drawn from chemistry and study skills.

(TC#150.6MAPTES)

Vargas, Elena Maldonado and Hector Joel Alvarez. *Mapping Out Students' Abilities*. Located in: Science Scope 15, March 1992, pp. 41-43.

The authors use concept maps to assess the knowledge structures students have on various concepts in science. They give some brief help on how to design a concept map, and more extensive help on how to score maps. Two examples are given: matter and photosynthesis. (See also John Surber, TC# 150.6MAPTES)

(TC#600.6MAPOUS)

Whetton, Chris, Marian Sainsbury, Steve Hopkins, et al. *National Assessment in England and Wales*, 1992. Available from: National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), The Mere, Upton Park, Slough, Berks, S11 2DQ, England, UK.

This document is a series of papers presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting in 1992. It updates the status of the science assessment described in other entries for Whetton: *Science for Seven-Year Olds* (TC#600.6SCIFOS), *The Pilot Study of Standard Assessment Tasks for Key Stage 1* (TC#070.3STAASTm--in-house use only), and *Standard Assessment Tasks for Key Stage 1* (TC#100.3STAAST--in-house use only). For additional information see Harlen (TC#600.6PERTES).

The papers review the history of the assessment, describe and present a few examples of the assessment tasks for seven-year-olds, discuss the support needed to assist teachers to administer this large a number of performance tasks, describe the changes that resulted for the 1992 assessment, and briefly describe plans for the 14-year-old assessment.

(TC#600.6NATASE)

Whetton, Chris. *Science for Seven-Year-Olds in England and Wales*, 1991. Available from: National Foundations for Educational Research, The Mere, Upton Park, Slough, Berks S11 2DQ, England, UK.

This paper reports on the development in England and Wales of performance assessments that are tied to their new national curriculum for the United Kingdom. In spring 1991, all seven-year-olds (600,000) were tested This paper discusses the pilot that was carried out in 1990 and the changes made for the 1991 assessment. Although this paper addresses all subject areas, the examples are selected from the science portion of the test.

Student performance was noted on over 200 "standards of achievement" observed during a series of specified performance tasks. In addition to these tasks, students also had a "science interview" to assess knowledge of specific facts.

Due to the pilot test, the full scale assessment for 1991 was modified so that:

1. Fewer attainment targets will be noted; 200 separate judgments were too many for teachers to make.

2. Not all attainment targets will be noted for each child; teachers will choose targets based on previous assessment results.

3. Certain "core" targets will be covered for all students. In addition, one extra target in science and math will be selected for each student.

4. Each task will focus on only one or two attainment targets

5. Science interviews have been abandoned.

A related document, *The Pilot Study of Standard Assessment Tasks for Key Stage 1* (TC#070 3STAASTm) contains a complete description and analysis of the pilot, and *Standard Assessment Tasks for Key Stage 1* (TC#600.3STAAST--in-house use only), contains the complete 1991 assessment package for all content areas. For additional information see other entries for Whetton and Harlen (TC#600.6PERTES).

(TC#600.6SCIFOS)

Whetton, Chris, G. Ruddock, Steve Hopkins, et al. *The Pilot Study of Standard Assessment Tasks for Key Stage 1*, 1991. Available from: National Foundations for Educational Research, The Mere, Upton Park, Slough, Berks S11 2DQ, England, UK.

This set of two reports describes the pilot test of the age-7 performance tests in England in more detail than that reported in *Science for Seven-Year-Olds in England and Wales* (TC#600.6SCIFOS). For other information see additional entries for Whetton and Harlen (TC#600.6PERTES).

(TC#070.3STAASTM--IN-HOUSE USE ONLY)

Whetton, Chris, G. Ruddock, Steve Hopkins, et al. *Standard Assessment Tasks for Key Stage 1*, 1991. Available from: National Foundations for Educational Research, The Mere, Upton Park, Slough, Berks S11 2DQ, England, UK.

This package contains all the materials used by teachers for the age 7 *Standard Assessment Tasks*--administration handbooks, detailed description of tasks and scoring procedures, information recording booklets, and student worksheets. For related information see other entries from Whetton and Harlen (TC#600.6PERTES.)

(TC#100.3STAAST--IN-HOUSE USE ONLY)

Wiggins, Grant. *The Futility of Trying to Teach Everything of Importance*. Located in: <u>Educational Leadership</u>, November 1989, pp. 44-48, 57-59.

Assessment has to reflect what we value. This article presents a philosophy for science instruction that has implications for assessment. Specifically, the author maintains that the goal of education should not be to teach every fact that we think students will need to know, because this will be impossible to do. Rather, we should concentrate on developing those habits of mind and high standards of craftsmanship that will enable students to be lifelong learners and critical thinkers The article briefly mentions some of the implications for assessment of this philosophy.

(TC#600.6FUTTRT)

Williams, Susan E., Hersholt Waxman, and Juanita Copley. ***Calculator Mathematics Curriculum Assessment*, undated. Available from: University of Houston, College of Education, Curriculum and Instruction Dept., Houston, TX 77204, (713) 743-9870.**

These observation checklists were designed to collect research data pertaining to the use of calculators in secondary mathematics classes. The instruments focus on the quality of calculator instruction. Student and teacher behaviors are recorded on a checklist about ten times per item per classroom period. General areas assessed include teacher/student interactions, environment, management of time and students, activities, materials, content, instructional strategies, and specific classroom applications of calculators. Assessment is administered by the researcher while observing teachers conducting mathematics lessons. Instruments are available for observing the use of fraction, scientific, and graphing calculators. At this time, the assessment instrument is in the exploratory stage, though it has been successfully piloted. This document includes only the observation forms; neither summarization and interpretation nor technical information is included.

(TC# 500.4CALMAC)

Yager, Robert E. and Alan J. McCormack. ***Assessing Teaching/Learning Successes in Multiple Domains of Science and Science Education*. Located in: Science Education 73, 1989, pp. 45-58.**

This article describes the authors' view of the proper targets for instruction in science (knowing and understanding, exploring and discovering, imagining and creating, feeling and valuing, and using and applying), goes on to describe the STS (Science-Technology-Society) approach to teaching science, and then lists some tests (mostly multiple-choice) that attempt to measure the targets. The paper is included on this bibliography mainly for the first two points.

(TC#600.5ASSTEL)

Yee, Gary, and Michael Kirst. ***Lessons from the New Science Curriculum of the 1950s and 1960s*. Located in: Education and Urban Society 26, February 1994, pp. 158-171.**

The title of this article says it all--what we need to do differently in the current round of content standards to avoid the problems of the past.

(TC# 600.5LESFRN)

Science Bibliography

Index Codes

A - Type

1 = Example
2 = Theory/how to assess/rationale for alternative assessment
3 = Content/what should be assessed
4 = Related: general assessment; program evaluation; results of studies; technology; attitudes

B - Purpose for the Assessment

1 = Large scale
2 = Classroom
3 = Research

C - Grade Levels

1 = Pre K-K
2 = 1-3
3 = 4-6
4 = 7-9
5 = 10-12
6 = Adult
7 = Special education
8 = All
9 = Other

D - Content Covered

1 = General science
2 = Biology
3 = Chemistry
4 = Physics
5 = Earth/Space Science
6 = Other
7 = All/Any

E - Type of Tasks

1 = Enhanced multiple choice
2 = Constructed response: short answers
3 = Long response/essay
4 = On-demand
5 = Project
6 = Portfolio
7 = Group
8 = Other than written
9 = Cognitive map

F - Skills Assessed

1 = Knowledge/conceptual understanding
2 = Application of concepts
3 = Persuasion
4 = Critical thinking/problem solving; reasoning/decision making
5 = Group process skills
6 = Quality of writing/communication
7 = Student self-reflection
8 = Process
9 = Comprehension

G - Type of Scoring

1 = Task specific
2 = General
3 = Holistic
4 = Analytical Trait

A1Abraham, Michael (TC#650.3UNDMIE)
A1Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
A1Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
A1Appalachia Ed. Lab. (TC#600.3ALTASM)
A1Aurora Public Schools (TC#000 3SCIMAP)
A1Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
A1Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
A1Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
A1CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600.3NEWDII)
A1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
A1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
A1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
A1Colison, J. (TC#600.3CONSCI)
A1CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
A1CTB/McGraw-Hill (TC#060.3CAT5PA)
A1Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
A1Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
A1Dana, Thomas (TC#600.3STUSHW)
A1Darling-Hammond, Linda (TC#000.3AUTASP)
A1Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
A1Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
A1Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
A1Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
A1Hardy, Roy (TC#600.3OPTSCP)
A1Heard, Virgil Gale (TC#600.3SCIHP)
A1Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
A1Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
A1Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
A1Kanis, I. B. (TC#600.3NINGRL)
A1KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
A1Lawrence, Barbara (TC#600 3UTACOC)
A1Lawrence, Barbara (TC#000.6INTUTCv)
A1Lawrence Hall of Science (TC#660.3FOSSWM)
A1Lee, Elaine (TC#620.3DISPRS)
A1Lock, Roger (TC#600.6GENPRS)
A1Macdonald Educational (TC#600 6LEATHS)
A1Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6WITOBM)
A1Martinello, Marian (TC#600.3MAROPS)
A1Martinez, M. (TC#600.6FIGRES)
A1Meinhard, Richard (TC#600.6DEVBAP)
A1NAEP (TC#050 6LEABYD)
A1NY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3NEWYOS)
A1O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
A1Pine, Jerry (TC#600.3ASSFOH)
A1Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
A1Psychological Corp (TC#510.3GOALSS)
A1Riverside Publishing Co. (TC#060 3PERAST)
A1Riverside Publishing Co (TC#500 3CALPRI)
A1Roth, Wolff-Michael (TC#630 6DYNEVA)
A1Scottish Examination Board (TC#610 3SCISTG)
A1Scottish Examination Board (TC#640 3BIOSTG)
A1Semple, Brian (TC#600 3SCAASA)
A1Semple, Brian (TC#600.3PERASS)
A1Shavelson, Richard (TC#600.3NEWTEF)
A1Small, Larry (TC#600.3SCIPRE)
A1Small, Larry (TC#650.3TEATES)
A1Surber, John (TC#150.6MAPTES)
A1Vargas, Elena (TC#600.6MAPOUS)
A1Whetton, Chris (TC#600 6NATASE)
A1Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6SCIFOS)
A1Whetton, Chris (TC#070.3STAAST)
A1Whetton, Chris (TC#100 3STAAST)
A2Arter, Judith A. (TC#150.6INTASI)
A2Arter, Judith A. (TC#150.6PERCRII)
A2Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORFOA)
A2Collins, Angelo (TC#600.3PORQUD)
A2Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORSCF)
A2Collins, Allan (TC#600.6THRDIV)
A2Darling-Hammond, Linda (TC#000 3AUTASP)
A2Harlen, Wynne (TC#600.6PERTES)
A2Helgeson, Stanley (TC#600 6ASSSCT)
A2Johnson, David (TC#600.6GROASA)
A2Jones, M. Gail (TC#500.6PERBAS)
A2Kober, Nancy (TC#600 6WHAKNS)
A2Kulm, Gerald (TC#600 6SCIASI)
A2Nat'l Center for Improving Sci. Ed
(TC#600.6GETSTS)
A2Nat'l Research Council (TC#600.5NATSCF)
A2Raizen, Senta (TC#600.6ASSSCI)
A2Raizen, Senta (TC#600 6ASSELS)
A2Shavelson, Richard (TC#600 6INDOES)
A3Halpern, Diane (TC#500.6ENHTHS)
A3Harlen, Wynne (TC#600.6PERTES)
A3Koballa, T. R. (TC#600 5GOASCF)
A3Kober, Nancy (TC#600.6WHAKNS)
A3Kulm, Gerald (TC#600.6SCIASI)
A3Nat'l Center for Improving Sci. Ed
(TC#600.6GETSTS)
A3Nat'l Science Teachers Assn (TC#600 5SCOSEC)
A3Nat'l Research Council (TC#600 5NATSCE)
A3Ostlund, Karen (TC#223.6SIZUPS)
A3Raizen, Senta (TC#600.6ASSELS)
A3Rutherford, F. James (TC#600.5SCIFOA)
A3Wiggins, Grant (TC#600 6FUTERT)
A3Yager, Robert (TC#600 5ASSTEE)
A3Yee, Gary (TC#600.5LESFRN)
A4Abraham, Michael (TC#650 3UNDMIE)
A4Appalachia Ed. Lab. (TC#600 3ALTASM)
A4Arter, Judith (TC#150 6INTASI)
A4Arter, Judith (TC#150.6PERCRII)
A4Barnes, Lehman (TC#600.6ASSPRS)
A4Baron, Joan (TC#600 6PERASB)
A4CA Dept of Ed. (TC#600 6SCIPOW)
A4Center for Talent Dev. (TC#220 3QUEELM)
A4Champagne, Audrey (TC#600 6ASSINT)
A4Chi, M T (TC#660 6CATREP)

A4Coalition of Essential Schools (TC#150.6VARARD)
A4Collins, Allan (TC#600.6THRDIV)
A4CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
A4Halpern, Diane (TC#500.6ENHTHS)
A4Harlen, Wynne (TC#600.6PERTES)
A4Helgeson, Stanley (TC#600.6ASSSCT)
A4Helgeson, Stanley (TC#600.6REVEDT)
A4Horn, Kermit (TC#000.3LANCOP)
A4Jungwirth, Ehud (TC#600.4ANASCP)
A4Kober, Nancy (TC#600.6WHAKNS)
A4Kulm, Gerald (TC#600.6SCIASH)
A4Liftig, Inez Fugate (TC#600.6MAKASW)
A4Lunetta, Vincent (TC#600.6MATLAA)
A4Marshall, G. (TC#600.6EVASTP)
A4McColskey, Wendy (TC#600.6HOWASS)
A4Medrich, Elliott (TC#000.6INTMAS)
A4Mergendoller, J. R. (TC#600.6TASDEA)
A4Nat'l Center for Improving Sci. Ed. (TC#600.6GFTSTS)
A4Ostlund, Karen (TC#223.6SIZUPS)
A4Padian, Kevin (TC#600.6IMPSCT)
A4Pine, Jerry (TC#600.3ASSFOH)
A4Pomeroy, Deborah (TC#600.4TEABEA)
A4Raizen, Senta (TC#600.6ASSSCL)
A4Raizen, Senta (TC#600.6ASSELS)
A4Riggs, Iris (TC#600.4TOWDEE)
A4Shavelson, Richard (TC#600.3NEWTEF)
A4Stecher, Brian M (TC#000.6DESSEC)
A4Williams, Susan (TC#500.4CALMAC)
A4Yee, Gary (TC#600.5LESFRN)
B1Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
B1Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
B1CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600.3NEWDIH)
B1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
B1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
B1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
B1Colison, J. (TC#600.3CONSCI)
B1CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
B1CTB/McGraw-Hill (TC#060.3CAT5PA)
B1Darling-Hammond, Linda (TC#000.3AUTASP)
B1Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
B1Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
B1Hardy, Roy (TC#600.3OPTSCP)
B1Heard, Virgil Gale (TC#600.3SCIHP)
B1Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
B1Kanis, I. B. (TC#600.3NINGRI)
B1KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PERFVG)
B1Lawrence, Barbara (TC#600.3UTACOC)
B1Lawrence, Barbara (TC#000.6INTUTCv)
B1Martinello, Marian (TC#600.3MAROPS)
B1Martinez, M. (TC#600.6FIGRES)
B1NAEP (TC#050.6LEABYD)
B1NY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3NEWYOS)
B1O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
B1Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
B1Psychological Corp. (TC#610.3GOALSS)
B1Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#060.3PERAST)
B1Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#500.3CALPRL)
B1Semple, Brian (TC#600.3SCAASA)
B1Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6NATASE)
B1Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6SCIFOS)
B1Whetton, Chris (TC#070.3STAAST)
B1Whetton, Chris (TC#100.3STAAST)
B2Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
B2Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
B2Appalachia Ed. Lab. (TC#600.3ALTASM)
B2Aurora Public Schools (TC#000.3SCIMAP)
B2Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORFOA)
B2Collins, Angelo (TC#600.3PORQUD)
B2Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORSCE)
B2Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
B2Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
B2Dana, Thomas (TC#600.3STUSHW)
B2Darling-Hammond, Linda (TC#000.3AUTASP)
B2Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
B2Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
B2Jones, M. Gail (TC#500.6PERBAS)
B2Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
B2Lawrence Hall of Science (TC#660.3FOSSWM)
B2Lee, Elaine (TC#620.3DISPRS)
B2Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6LEATHS)
B2Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6WITOBM)
B2Meinhard, Richard (TC#600.6DEVBAP)
B2Roth, Wolff-Michael (TC#630.6DYNEVA)
B2Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
B2Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
B2Semple, Brian (TC#600.3PERASS)
B2Small, Larry (TC#600.3SCIPRE)
B2Small, Larry (TC#650.3TEATES)
B2Surber, John (TC#150.6MAPTES)
B2Vargas, Elena (TC#600.6MAPOUS)
B3Abraham, Michael (TC#650.3UNDMIE)
B3Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
B3Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
B3Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
B3Lock, Roger (TC#600.6GENPRS)
B3Pine, Jerry (TC#600.3ASSFOH)
B3Shavelson, Richard (TC#600.3NEWTEF)
C1Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
C1Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6LEATHS)
C1Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6WITOBM)
C1Meinhard, Richard (TC#600.6DEVBAP)
C2Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
C2Lawrence, Barbara (TC#600.3UTACOC)
C2Lawrence, Barbara (TC#000.6INTUTCv)
C2Lee, Elaine (TC#620.3DISPRS)
C2Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6LEATHS)
C2Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6WITOBM)

C2Martinello, Marian (TC#600.3MAROPS)
C2Meinhard, Richard (TC#600.6DEVBAP)
C2Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
C2Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6NATASE)
C2Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6SCIFOS)
C2Whetton, Chris (TC#070.3STAAST)
C2Whetton, Chris (TC#100.3STAAST)
C3CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600.3NEWDII)
C3CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
C3Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
C3Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
C3Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
C3Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
C3Lawrence, Barbara (TC#600.3UTACOC)
C3Lawrence, Barbara (TC#000.6INTUTCv)
C3Lawrence Hall of Science (TC#660.3FOSSWM)
C3Lee, Elaine (TC#620.3DISPRS)
C3Martinello, Marian (TC#600.3MAROPS)
C3Meinhard, Richard (TC#600.6DEVBAP)
C3NY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3NEWYOS)
C3Pine, Jerry (TC#600.3ASSFOH)
C3Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
C3Semple, Brian (TC#600.3SCAASA)
C3Shavelson, Richard (TC#600.3NEWTEE)
C3Small, Larry (TC#600.3SCIPRE)
C4Abraham, Michael (TC#650.3UNDMIF)
C4Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
C4Aurora Public Schools (TC#000.3SCIMAP)
C4CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
C4Colison, J. (TC#600.3CONSCI)
C4CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
C4Dana, Thomas (TC#600.3STUSHW)
C4Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
C4Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
C4Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
C4Heard, Virgil Gale (TC#600.3SCIHIP)
C4Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
C4Jones, M. Gail (TC#500.6PERBAS)
C4Kanis, I. B. (TC#600 3NINGRL)
C4KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
C4O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
C4Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
C4Semple, Brian (TC#600.3SCAASA)
C4Semple, Brian (TC#600.3PERASS)
C5Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
C5Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
C5Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
C5Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
C5Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
C5CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
C5CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
C5CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600 3SCINED)
C5CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000 3CONCOC)
C5Dana, Thomas (TC#600 3STUSHW)
C5Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
C5Lock, Roger (TC#600.6GENPRS)
C5Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
C5Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
C8Appalachia Ed. Lab. (TC#600.3ALTASM)
C8Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORFOA)
C8Collins, Angelo (TC#600.3PORQUD)
C8Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORSCE)
C8CTB/McGraw-Hill (TC#060.3CAT5PA)
C8Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
C8Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
C8Darling-Hammond, Linda (TC#000.3AUTASP)
C8Hardy, Roy (TC#600.3OPTSCP)
C8Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
C8NAEP (TC#050.6LEABYD)
C8Psychological Corp. (TC#610.3GOALSS)
C8Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#060.3PERAST)
C8Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#500.3CALPRL)
C8Roth, Wolff-Michael (TC#630.6DYNEVA)
C8Surber, John (TC#150.6MAPTES)
C8Vargas, Elena (TC#600.6MAPOUS)
D1Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
D1Appalachia Ed. Lab. (TC#600.3ALTASM)
D1CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600.3NEWDII)
D1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
D1CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000 3CONCOC)
D1CTB/McGraw-Hill (TC#060 3CAT5PA)
D1Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
D1Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
D1Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
D1Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
D1Hardy, Roy (TC#600.3OPTSCP)
D1Heard, Virgil Gale (TC#600.3SCIHIP)
D1Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000 6TOGSTC)
D1Jones, Lee (TC#600 6SCIREC2)
D1Jones, M. Gail (TC#500 6PERBAS)
D1Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
D1Kanis, I. B. (TC#600 3NINGRL)
D1Lawrence, Barbara (TC#600 3UTACOC)
D1Lawrence, Barbara (TC#000.6INTUTCv)
D1Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6LEATHS)
D1Macdonald Educational (TC#600 6WITOBM)
D1Martinez, M. (TC#600 6FIGRES)
D1Meinhard, Richard (TC#600.6DEVBAP)
D1NY Dept of Ed. (TC#600.3NEWYOS)
D1Psychological Corp. (TC#600 3INTASS)
D1Psychological Corp. (TC#610.3GOALSS)
D1Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#500 3CALPRL)
D1Scottish Examination Board (TC#610 3SCISTG)
D1Semple, Brian (TC#600.3SCAASA)
D1Semple, Brian (TC#600 3PERASS)
D1Small, Larry (TC#600 3SCIPRE)
D1Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6NATASE)
D1Whetton, Chris (TC#600 6SCIFOS)

D1Whetton, Chris (TC#070.3STAAST)
D1Whetton, Chris (TC#100.3STAAST)
D2Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
D2Aurora Public Schools (TC#000.3SCIMAP)
D2CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600.3NEWDIH)
D2CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
D2CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
D2CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
D2Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
D2Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
D2Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
D2Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
D2KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
D2Lock, Roger (TC#600.6GENPRS)
D2Martinello, Marian (TC#600.3MAROPS)
D2Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#060.3PERAST)
D2Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
D3Abraham, Michael (TC#650.3UNDMIE)
D3Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
D3Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
D3Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
D3CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600.3NEWDIH)
D3CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
D3CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
D3Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
D3Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
D3Lock, Roger (TC#600.6GENPRS)
D3O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
D3Riverside Publishing Co (TC#500.3CALPRL)
D4Abraham, Michael (TC#650.3UNDMIE)
D4Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
D4Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
D4Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
D4CA Assess. Prog (TC#600.3NEWDIH)
D4Colison, J (TC#600.3CONSCI)
D4Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
D4Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
D4Lock, Roger (TC#600.6GENPRS)
D4O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
D5CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600.3NEWDIH)
D5CA Dept. of Ed (TC#600.3SCINED)
D5Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
D5KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
D5Lawrence Hall of Science (TC#660.3FOSSWM)
D5Lee, Elaine (TC#620.3DISPRS)
D5Small, Larry (TC#650.3TEATES)
D6Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
D6Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
D7CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTF)
D7Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORFOA)
D7Collins, Angelo (TC#600.3PORQUD)
D7Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORSCE)
D7Darling-Hammond, Linda (TC#000.3AUTASP)
D7NAEP (TC#050.6LEABYD)
D7Pine, Jerry (TC#600.3ASSFOH)
D7Shavelson, Richard (TC#600.3NEWTEF)
D7Surber, John (TC#150.6MAPTES)
D7Vargas, Elena (TC#600.6MAPOUS)
E1Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
E1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
E1Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
E1Semple, Brian (TC#600.3SCAASA)
E2Abraham, Michael (TC#650.3UNDMIE)
E2Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
E2CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
E2CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
E2CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
E2CTB/McGraw-Hill (TC#060.3CAT5PA)
E2Hardy, Roy (TC#600.3OPTSCP)
E2Heard, Virgil Gale (TC#600.3SCIHP)
E2Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
E2Kanis, I. B. (TC#600.3NINGRL)
E2KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
E2Lawrence, Barbara (TC#600.3UTACOC)
E2Lawrence, Barbara (TC#000.6INTUTCv)
E2Lawrence Hall of Science (TC#660.3FOSSWM)
E2Lee, Elaine (TC#620.3DISPRS)
E2Martinez, M. (TC#600.6FIGRES)
E2NAEP (TC#050.6LEABYD)
E2O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
E2Psychological Corp. (TC#610.3GOALSS)
E2Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#060.3PERAST)
E2Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#500.3CALPRL)
E2Semple, Brian (TC#600.3SCAASA)
E2Semple, Brian (TC#600.3PERASS)
E2Small, Larry (TC#600.3SCIPRE)
E2Small, Larry (TC#650.3TEATES)
E2Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6NATASE)
E2Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6SCIFOS)
E2Whetton, Chris (TC#070.3STAAST)
E2Whetton, Chris (TC#100.3STAAST)
E3Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
E3Aurora Public Schools (TC#000.3SCIMAP)
E3Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
E3Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
E3Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
E3CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600.3NEWDIH)
E3CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
E3CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
E3Colison, J. (TC#600.3CONSCI)
E3CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
E3Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
E3Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
E3Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
E3Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
E3Hardy, Roy (TC#600.3OPTSCP)
E3Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
E3Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)

E3KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
E3Lawrence Hall of Science (TC#660.3FOSSWM)
E3Lee, Elaine (TC#620.3DISPRS)
E3Martinello, Marian (TC#600.3MAROPS)
E3NAEP (TC#050.6LEABYD)
E3NY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3NEWYOS)
E3Pine, Jerry (TC#600.3ASSFOH)
E3Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
E3Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#060.3PERAST)
E3Roth, Wolff-Michael (TC#630.6DYNEVA)
E3Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
E3Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
E3Semple, Brian (TC#600.3SCAASA)
E3Shavelson, Richard (TC#600.3NEWTEF)
E3Surber, John (TC#150.6MAPTES)
E4Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
E4Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
E4CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600.3NEWDII)
E4CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
E4CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
E4CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
E4Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
E4Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
E4Hall, Greg (TC#600 3PERAST)
E4Heard, Virgil Gale (TC#600.3SCHIP)
E4Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
E4Jones, M. Gail (TC#500.6PERBAS)
E4Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
E4Kanis, I. B. (TC#600.3NINGRL)
E4KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
E4Lawrence Hall of Science (TC#660.3FOSSWM)
E4Lee, Elaine (TC#620.3DISPRS)
E4Lock, Roger (TC#600.6GENPRS)
E4Martinello, Marian (TC#600 3MAROPS)
E4NAEP (TC#050.6LEABYD)
E4NY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3NEWYOS)
E4O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
E4Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
E4Psychological Corp. (TC#610.3GOALSS)
E4Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#500 3CALPRI)
E4Semple, Brian (TC#600.3PERASS)
E4Small, Larry (TC#600 3SCIPRE)
E4Small, Larry (TC#650.3TEATES)
E5Alberta Education (TC#600 3EVASTI)
E5Aurora Public Schools (TC#000.3SCIMAP)
E5Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
E5Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
E5Colison, J. (TC#600.3CONSCI)
E5CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
E5Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
E5Scottish Examination Board (TC#610 3SCISTG)
E5Scottish Examination Board (TC#640 3BIOSTG)
E6CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
E6CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.6SCIPOW)
E6Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORFOA)
E6Collins, Angelo (TC#600.3PORQUD)
E6Collins, Angelo (TC#600.6PORSCE)
E7Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
E7Aurora Public Schools (TC#000.3SCIMAP)
E7Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
E7Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
E7CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
E7Colison, J. (TC#600.3CONSCI)
E7CT Dept of Ed. (TC#000 3CONCOC)
E7Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
E7Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
E7KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
E7Psychological Corp. (TC#600 3INTASS)
E7Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
E8Alberta Education (TC#600 3EVASTL)
E8Arter, Judith (TC#150 6INTASI)
E8Arter, Judith (TC#150 6PERCRH)
E8CA Assess. Prog. (TC#600 3NEWDII)
E8CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600 3GOLSTB)
E8CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
E8Doran, Rodney (TC#600 3ASSLAS)
E8Gayford, Christopher (TC#600 3CONTOM)
E8Green, Barbara (TC#600 3PERBAA)
E8Hall, Greg (TC#600 3PERAST)
E8Heard, Virgil Gale (TC#600.3SCHIP)
E8Jones, M. Gail (TC#500 6PERBAS)
E8Kamen, Michael (TC#600 6USECRD)
E8Kanis, I. B. (TC#600.3NINGRL)
E8KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
E8Lee, Elaine (TC#620 3DISPRS)
E8Lock, Roger (TC#600 6GENPRS)
E8Martinello, Marian (TC#600.3MAROPS)
E8NAEP (TC#050 6LEABYD)
E8NY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600 3NEWYOS)
E8O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600 3DESANP)
E8Scottish Examination Board (TC#610 3SCISTG)
E8Scottish Examination Board (TC#640 3BIOSTG)
E8Semple, Brian (TC#600 3SCAASA)
E8Semple, Brian (TC#600 3PERASS)
E9CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000 3CONCOC)
E9Surber, John (TC#150.6MAPTES)
E9Vargas, Elena (TC#600 6MAPOUS)
E10Pine, Jerry (TC#600 3ASSFOH)
E10Shavelson, Richard (TC#600 3NEWTEF)
F1Abraham, Michael (TC#650 3UNDMIE)
F1Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
F1Aurora Public Schools (TC#000 3SCIMAP)
F1Baker, Eva L. (TC#000 3CREPEA)
F1Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
F1Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
F1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
F1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600 3SCINED)
F1CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000 3CONCOC)

F1CTB/McGraw-Hill (TC#060.3CAT5PA)
F1Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
F1Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
F1Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
F1Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
F1Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
F1KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
F1Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
F1Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
F1Surber, John (TC#150.6MAPTES)
F1Vargas, Elena (TC#600.6MAPOUS)
F1Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6NATASE)
F1Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6SCIFOS)
F1Whetton, Chris (TC#070.3STAAST)
F1Whetton, Chris (TC#100.3STAAST)
F2Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
F2Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
F2CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
F2CA Dept. of Ed (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
F2CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
F2CT Dept of Ed (TC#000.3CONCOC)
F2Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
F2Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
F2Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
F2Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
F2Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#500.3CALPRL)
F2Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
F3Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
F3CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
F4Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
F4Aurora Public Schools (TC#000.3SCIMAP)
F4Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
F4Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
F4CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
F4CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
F4CT Dept of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
F4CTB/McGraw-Hill (TC#060.3CAT5PA)
F4Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
F4Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
F4Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
F4Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
F4Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
F4Kanis, I. B. (TC#600.3NINGRL)
F4KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
F4Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6LEATHS)
F4Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6WITOBM)
F4Martinello, Marian (TC#600.3MAROPS)
F4O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
F4Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
F4Riverside Publishing Co.(TC#500.3CALPRL)
F4Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
F4Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
F4Small, Larry (TC#600.3SCIPRE)
F4Small, Larry (TC#650.3TEATES)
F5Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
F5Aurora Public Schools (TC#000.3SCIMAP)
F5Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
F5Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
F5CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
F5Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
F6Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
F6Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
F6CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
F6CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
F6CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
F6Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
F6Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
F6Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6LEATHS)
F6Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6WITOBM)
F6Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
F6Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
F7Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
F7Dana, Thomas (TC#600.3STUSHW)
F7Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
F8Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
F8CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
F8CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
F8CT Dept. of Ed. (TC#000.3CONCOC)
F8CTB/McGraw-Hill (TC#060.3CAT5PA)
F8Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
F8Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
F8Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
F8Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
F8Kanis, I. B. (TC#600.3NINGRL)
F8KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
F8Lawrence, Barbara (TC#600.3UTACOC)
F8Lawrence, Barbara (TC#000.6INTUTCv)
F8Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6LEATHS)
F8Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6WITOBM)
F8Martinello, Marian (TC#600.3MAROPS)
F8O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
F8Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
F8Psychological Corp. (TC#610.3GOALSS)
F8Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
F8Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
F8Semple, Brian (TC#600.3SCAASA)
F8Small, Larry (TC#600.3SCIPRE)
F8Small, Larry (TC#650.3TEATES)
F9Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)
F9CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
F9Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
F9KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
F10Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
F10Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
F10Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6LEATHS)
F10Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6WITOBM)
F10Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
G1Alberta Education (TC#600.3DIPEXP)

G1Appalachia Ed. Lab. (TC#600.3ALTASM)
G1Aurora Public Schools (TC#000.3SCIMAP)
G1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
G1CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
G1CTB/McGraw-Hill (TC#060.3CAT5PA)
G1Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
G1Hardy, Roy (TC#600.3OPTSCP)
G1Heard, Virgil Gale (TC#600.3SCIHP)
G1Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
G1Jones, Lee (TC#600.6SCIREC2)
G1Kamen, Michael (TC#600.6USECRD)
G1Kanis, I. B. (TC#600.3NINGRL)
G1KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
G1Lawrence, Barbara (TC#600.3UTACOC)
G1Lawrence, Barbara (TC#000.6INTUTCV)
G1Lawrence Hall of Science (TC#660.3FOSSWM)
G1Lee, Elaine (TC#620.3DISPRS)
G1Lock, Roger (TC#600.6GENPRS)
G1Martinez, M. (TC#600.6FIGRES)
G1O'Rafferty, Maureen (TC#600.3DESANP)
G1Psychological Corp. (TC#610.3GOALSS)
G1Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
G1Small, Larry (TC#600.3SCIPRE)
G1Small, Larry (TC#650.3TEATES)
G1Surber, John (TC#150.6MAPTES)
G1Vargas, Elena (TC#600.6MAPOUS)
G1Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6NATASE)
G1Whetton, Chris (TC#600.6SCIFOS)
G1Whetton, Chris (TC#070.3STAAST)
G1Whetton, Chris (TC#100.3STAAST)
G2Abraham, Michael (TC#650.3UNDMIH)
G2Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
G2Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
G Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
G2Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
G2CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
G2CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
G2CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
G2Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
G2Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
G2Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
G2Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
G2KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
G2Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6LEATHS)
G2Macdonald Educational (TC#600.6WITOBM)
G2Meinhard, Richard (TC#600.6DEVBAP)
G2Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
G2Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
G2Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
G3CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTB)
G3CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3SCINED)
G3Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
G3Green, Barbara (TC#600.3PERBAA)
G3KY Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3PEREVG)
G3Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)
G4Alberta Education (TC#600.3EVASTL)
G4Baker, Eva L. (TC#000.3CREPEA)
G4Bennett, Dorothy (TC#600.6ASSTEVh)
G4Bennett, Dorothy(TC#600.3ASSTEVv)
G4CA Dept. of Ed. (TC#600.3GOLSTE)
G4Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3SCICUA)
G4Curriculum Corporation (TC#600.3TECCUA)
G4Doran, Rodney (TC#600.3ASSLAS)
G4Gayford, Christopher (TC#600.3CONTOM)
G4Hall, Greg (TC#600.3PERAST)
G4Hibbard, K. Michael (TC#000.6TOGSTC)
G4Psychological Corp. (TC#600.3INTASS)
G4Scottish Examination Board (TC#610.3SCISTG)
G4Scottish Examination Board (TC#640.3BIOSTG)

65