

# Assessment Final Proposal

[DATASTD-1550](#)

[DATASTD-1544](#)

**Ask:** ([DATASTD-1550](#)) There is really no reason why this cardinality should differ between the definitions (ObjectAssessment) and the actuals (StudentObjectiveAssessment). ([DATASTD-1544](#)) ScoreResult is required on StudentObjectiveAssessment but is optional on ObjectiveAssessment. It follows that if we are requiring the data at the student level we should also require the metadata to support it.

**Pro:**

- No reason there should be a difference between the two
- Supports scoring when only a score or a performance level are provided at both the ObjectiveAssessment and the StudentObjectiveAssessment level.

**Con:**

- Not changing will continue to force use of workarounds which induce 'bad data'

**Recommendation:**

- Change to optional on both the ObjectiveAssessment and the StudentObjectiveAssessment.

**Update: Data Standard team agrees with recommendation** - Will be changing to optional on both the ObjectiveAssessment and StudentObjectiveAssessment.

## [DATASTD-1357](#)

**Ask:** Rename PerformanceLevel to PerformanceLevelAchieved AND Review whether or not AssessmentReportingMethod should be included in the common

### **Pros:**

- Renaming PerformanceLevel to PerformanceLevelAchieved clearly conveys what is requested.
- Keeping AssessmentReportingMethod in the AssessmentPerformanceLevel is needed to convey the type of reporting that will be used
- Supports use of different types within the same assessment

### **Con:**

- Keeping PerformanceLevel as is will not reduce the confusion and continue to support the theory of sending all possible options and a indicator of which one was met.
- Removing the AssessmentReportingMethod will remove the support to handle different types in the same assessment

### **Recommendation:**

- Rename the PerformanceLevel to PerformanceLevelAchieved
- Keep AssessmentReportingMethod included in the AssessmentPerformanceLevel collection

**Update: Data Standard recommendation** - Remove the performancelevelmet (agreed); Add language to the PerformanceLevel to make it clear the expectation is only receiving the level the individual received. ([DATASTD-1738](#))

Keep the performancelevel and update the definition so it describes and shows how to use the assessmentrepotingmethod to show the use cases discussed in the call (i.e. state vs. local school)

## [DATASTD-1660](#)

**Ask:** Need to support not tested students. WI has a work around they have been using that defaults any student with a ReasonNotTested to the last date of the testing window

### **Proposal:**

WI workaround seems to work and should be shared with the community so others can adopt the same logic.

### **Pros:**

- Solution has been working for WI as a workaround

### **Cons:**

- Additional logic needs to be applied by the schools to support
- Introduces 'bad/incorrect' data since the AdministrationDate is defined as "The date and time an assessment was completed by the student. "

(Ideally the AdministrationDate would be conditional and not required if a value existed in ReasonNotTested')

**Update: Data Standard recommendation** - AdminDate is not part of the key - Move admin date to optional and update doc to say will be null if not there

[DATASTD-1240](#)

[DATASTD-1615](#)

**Ask:** Consider adding administration term to StudentAssessment.

AssessmentPeriod allows for defining start and end dates of the assessment period. Currently this only exists on the Assessment entity, adding to the StudentAssessment would allow for better handling of the cases mentioned in the two tickets.

**Recommendation:** Expand the descriptor option for assessment period to better align with k-12 definitions of periods of time (Semester, quarter, etc). Adding the AssessmentPeriod to the StudentAssessment, allows for better capturing of time period assessed based on the students unique case i.e. testing outside of the assessmentperiod as defined on at the assessment level. On both the collection would remain optional.

Pros:

- Supports the use cases provided but allowing the students attempt to use a different assessmentperiod then the one defined at the assessment level

Cons:

- Could add confusion when the assessmentperiod between the two do not match, but with this being more edge case and still capturing the administationdate date and providing clear documentation on purpose and use cases, this could be mitigated.

**Update: Data Standard recommendation -**

- Increase the descriptors to include not just grading period (big) but also LP.
- Assessment period on the assessment should be a collection and allow many
- Add assessmentperiod on the student only the descriptor

## [DATASTD-1310](#)

**Ask:** How to handle multiple assessment administration dates for one assessment

Assessments are not always administered in a single day, more likely than not they are taking over the course of a couple of days with the split being at the Objective level.

**Recommendation:** Adding an optional administration date to the objective level would support having an assessment that spans over many dates.

Pros:

- Supports the use cases provided by providing a way to report the objective attempts over the course of days.

Cons:

- Date reported at the objective level could fall outside of the assessment period defined which may cause some issues with reporting/ analytics but that is manageable compared to not supporting the date at the objective level.

**Update: Data Standard team agrees with recommendation - Adding administration date to the student objective assessment**

# DATASTD- 1298

Adding assessment time to studentassessment and student objectiveassessment include total mins.

**Update: Data Standard team will be adding time on assessment with definition with text including information that this is supplied by the vendor.**

[DATASTD-1647](#)

Extend the length of the assessment title to 255 characters.

**Update: Data Standard team will be extending the title field to 255 characters to support assessments with longer names.**