

2004

# Accountability Testing and Students With Learning Disabilities: Factors of Passing and Failing the Virginia SOL Tests

Paul J. Gerber

*Virginia Commonwealth University*, [pjgerber@vcu.edu](mailto:pjgerber@vcu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/merc\\_pubs](http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/merc_pubs)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

Downloaded from

[http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/merc\\_pubs/40](http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/merc_pubs/40)

This Research Report is brought to you for free and open access by the MERC (Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium) at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in MERC Publications by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact [libcompass@vcu.edu](mailto:libcompass@vcu.edu).

**Accountability Testing and Students  
With Learning Disabilities:  
Factors of Passing and Failing the  
Virginia SOL Tests**

**Final Report**

**Prepared by:  
Paul J. Gerber, Ph.D.,  
Principal Investigator  
School of Education**

**Virginia Commonwealth University  
March 2004**

**Copyright© 2004. Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium (MERC), Virginia Commonwealth University**

**The views expressed in MERC publications are those of individual authors and not necessarily those of the Consortium or its members.**



## Preface

This study was conducted with the support and input of a study team consisting of individuals from MERC school divisions. The author wants to recognize and thank these individuals for their contribution, and to indicate that this report contains the writing, analyses, and conclusions of the study team and author. Without the support of the study team the research could not have been completed.

The study team consisted of the following individuals:

Paul J. Gerber, Virginia Commonwealth University

Joline Allen, Chesterfield County Public Schools

Jo Read, Colonial Heights Public Schools

Amy Ford, Hanover County Public Schools

Rhonda Banks, Henrico County Public Schools

Cheryl Webb, Hopewell City Public Schools

Majorie Watts-Valentine, Richmond City Public Schools



## Table of Contents

Preface	
Review of Literature .....	1
Method .....	2
Subjects .....	3
Procedures .....	3
Themes and Findings .....	4
Findings .....	5
Students Passing the English, Research and Literature SOL Tests	5
Students Failing the English, Research and Literature SOL Tests	6
Recommendations .....	7
Discussion .....	8
References .....	10
Appendix .....	11



## Brief Review of the Literature

Since the landmark work *A Nation At-Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1988), school systems in the United States have been evolving by a myriad of reform efforts, particularly with regard to the “standards movement.” Outcomes of standards-based education are measured by accountability and assessment systems. Currently, all states have some kind of assessment system that (1) provides information about individual student achievement and (2) gauges the success of schools and school systems. Conventional wisdom is if standards are raised *all* students will benefit through greater student achievement and the efforts of educators will, in essence, be validated.

*All students* includes students with disabilities. Their situation is complicated when it comes to accountability testing, particularly for students who are academically-able, like those who are in the high incidence category of learning disabilities. Alternate assessment for students who are severely disabled is even more challenging and comes with an additional set of testing challenges. Efforts to ensure fairness still continue today. These efforts are driven by both legislation and litigation. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), called the Improving America’s Schools Act (IASA), in 1994 mandated fairness in testing students with disabilities, as did the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1997. Moreover, a class action suit on behalf of students with learning disabilities in Oregon (Wrightslaw, 1999) has put all states under scrutiny when testing all students with disabilities.

There are a wide variety of strategies to instruct and test students with learning disabilities. Generally, included are accommodations for instruction and testing that are generated by the IEP committee when formulating the individualized education plan (IEP). Accommodations in instruction usually are the same as those used when testing students with disabilities to evaluate their academic progress. Accommodations for testing students with disabilities are quite varied. Generally, there are four categories – timing/scheduling accommodations, setting accommodations, presentation accommodations, and response accommodations. In total, there are scores of accommodations that can be implemented to meet the specific testing needs of students with disabilities.

There are a number of intended and unintended consequences that emerge from accountability testing of students with disabilities. On the positive side, year 2000 data have shown that



accountability standards have raised the academic performance of students with disabilities. Also, students learn meaningful and necessary accommodations during their school-age years. They take this important information about accommodations into their adult years, to a variety of settings including employment. On the negative side, there are possibilities of lower level IEP objectives to ensure mastery of curricular goals. Teacher burnout is an increased possibility as is student absenteeism and dropout issues. Moreover, from an administrative perspective, accommodations for accountability testing are just one more unfunded mandate imposed on school systems across the country.

With the advent of accountability testing for students with disabilities, especially placed in the same assessment system with non-disabled students, the principle of normalization (Wolfensberger, 1972) has been reached in the educational arena. After many years of being placed in a *de facto* dual system of education, students with disabilities have become part of a truly integrated K-12 educational system with the advent of standards-based testing.

As the Commonwealth of Virginia proceeds on its track of testing all students with accountability tests to ensure the value of its K-12 effectiveness, it is important to explore its effects on students with disabilities, particularly learning disabilities. The purpose of this study is to investigate why middle-school students (grades 6 through 8) with learning disabilities pass and fail the Virginia SOL subtest that measures performance in the area of language. It is this area of instruction and testing that is typically at-risk for students with learning disabilities.

## **Method**

The research was conducted during fall, 2003 in order to answer three questions pertaining to pass and fail outcomes of students with learning disabilities on the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOLs) for the English, Research, and Literature subtest. The research questions were:

1. Why do students with learning disabilities pass the SOLs in English, Research, and Literature?
2. Why do students with learning disabilities fail the SOLs in English, Research and Literature?
3. What variables are key to each outcome – pass or fail in the English, Research, and Literature SOL test?

## **Subjects**

The subjects for this study were students with learning disabilities who had taken the English, Research, and Literature SOL test in eighth grade during the 2002-2003 school year. They were from six school divisions – Chesterfield County, Colonial Heights, Hanover County, Henrico County, Hopewell, and City of Richmond. All subjects were identified as learning disabled consistent with Commonwealth of Virginia law (same as learning disabilities in the federal mandated Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) as well as the rules and regulations of their respective school divisions.

Fifteen cases were randomly selected for investigation - 5 passes and 10 failures. Ten cases were male and 5 cases were female. Moreover, gender-pass/fail rates were as follows: male-fail 6, male-pass 4, female-fail 4, and female-pass 1. (Note: typically males outnumber females in learning disabilities classes by more than a 2:1 ratio.)

All parents/guardians were asked for permission to use their child's records for the study. Procedures for informed consent were followed according to the rules of Virginia Commonwealth University's Institutional Research Board (IRB).

## **Procedures**

Randomly selected cases were accessed and data were collected by way of a four-part research protocol focusing on students, accommodations (for instruction and testing), learning disabilities teachers, and instructional practices. The research protocol was devised by the principal investigator and members of the Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium (MERC) study team, a group comprised of one member from each of the MERC partner school divisions. In addition, data were collected by the MERC study team. All data used in the study were archival in nature. They were obtained from student records, specifically individual education program (IEP) documents, and

fifth grade and eighth grade SOL scores. A copy of the research protocol can be found in Appendix A.

The data were analyzed with an emergent case study design (Yin, 1989). This was the preferred strategy because the research questions were “framed in a how or why format when the investigator had little or no control over events, and when the focus of the study is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context” (p.13). Through this method multiple case studies were used to understand the phenomenon of students with learning disabilities passing and failing the English, Research, and Literature part of the Virginia SOL test in fifth and eighth grades. This specific SOL test was chosen because students with learning disabilities are typically at-risk for reading and associated language skills. The research strategy was exploratory in nature and “sought to illuminate a decision or set of decisions – why they were taken, how they were implemented and with what result” (p. 22). Repeated findings from the data analysis lead to a series of important trends and are discussed below as themes and findings.

### **Themes and Findings**

The analysis of the data yielded two main themes. First, there was a significant pattern of inconsistency of program planning throughout grades 6, 7, and 8 for students with learning disabilities, irrespective of a passing or failing outcome. Each year their individualized education program (IEP) seemed to be “up for grabs.” There was little evidence that there was consistency in such areas as educational placement, instructional strategy, and learning and testing accommodations. The result of this inconsistency was a disjointed middle school experience. In essence, each year seemed to be a new year for students with learning disabilities, with little articulation of program planning from the previous year of special educational services. The result was a cumulative effect of student underachievement that put them at-risk for passing the SOLs.

The second theme that emerged was that when students with learning disabilities fail the English, Research, and Literature SOL test it is largely attributed to a systemic problem in the delivery of educational services. This theme was highly related to the first theme. When students with learning disabilities failed there was a year-to-year

record of decisions *where students were made to fit the system rather than the system being responsive to the specialized needs of the student*. Meaningful coordination with general education programs seemed to be woefully lacking in collaborative planning and meeting student goals. Goals and objectives changed from year to year in a random-like fashion, different reading programs and levels of instruction were implemented, and varying learning and testing accommodations were instituted in a manner that seemed to fit the system or the philosophy of the current teacher rather than the individual needs of students. In the cases that were analyzed the data showed a rather haphazard manner of follow-through and data-driven practices from year to year. Most puzzling was finding a significant number of students in the study who received passing grades (sometimes as high as a B) in their class work but repeatedly failed their SOL test. This disconnect was rather remarkable, in that, in-class performance evaluation simply did not match outcomes of the SOL test.

### **Findings**

A number of key findings emerged from the data analysis. They were gleaned from the areas of inquiry of the study - students, accommodations (for learning and testing), teachers, and instruction. The findings oftentimes are not discreet. Therefore, the four areas tend to overlap each other in the findings statements.

### **Students Passing the English, Research, and Literature SOL Test**

Passing of the English, Research, and Literature SOL in fifth grade was predictive of passing in eighth grade. Students who passed had consistently higher pass grades in related courses from one year to the next. Therefore, their course grades were predictive of a passing score on the SOL test, particularly reading grades. What is not surprising, however, is those students who passed had a learning disability in the area of mathematics or some other area not directly related to performance on the English, Research, and Literature part of the SOL. At the same time, individual education planning for the students who passed showed a pattern of inconsistent planning from year to year (not unlike the students with learning disabilities who failed). Fortunately for the cases analyzed, this did not have a negative impact on SOL performance.

### **Students Failing the English, Research, and Literature SOL Test**

The students who failed the English, Research and Literature part of the SOL test showed great inconsistency in their programs and performance. The following findings are illustrative of the elements that contributed to their failure.

1. Inconsistency was apparent in instruction (particularly reading instruction from year-to-year). Goals seemed to be rather randomly set and sometimes not even sequenced. For example, one year the focus of reading instruction might be vocabulary and the next year might stress phonemic awareness and fluency. The following year might target vocabulary again.
2. There was no continuity in learning and testing accommodations from year-to-year. In fact, it was not uncommon for them to be different each year (or have very little overlap) and not be coordinated with instruction, in-class testing, and SOL testing.
3. The number of years of service for special education teachers did not have a bearing on students failing SOLs. The range of endorsed teaching experience was from 2 to 27 years. In very few cases students with learning disabilities had the same teacher for two consecutive years. Only one teacher in the study had a provisional endorsement.
4. The number of years receiving special education services tended to have a detrimental impact on the failure rate. In most cases the more years receiving learning disabilities services the more chance of failing the SOLs.
5. Grades were given relative to individual education plan (IEP) goals, but grades were not aligned to SOL tests. Failure resulted when a student with learning disabilities was tested at their instructional level but oftentimes far below the level of the eighth grade content of the SOL test. This was also reflected in the gap between report card grades and SOL scores. There was a pronounced disconnect in this area.
6. There was too much promotion from grade to grade when, in fact, it was not warranted nor educationally defensible. Students did not seem to be able to catch up. There simply was not enough time. In essence, the issue boiled down to time because it was needed to raise the student with learning disabilities to the level needed to compete successfully during SOL testing. It seemed students with

learning disabilities who failed never could close the gap. Moreover, it was found that retention as well as summer school did not have any positive effect on the students who failed their eighth grade English, Research, and Literature SOL test.

7. Accommodations for students with learning disabilities were all over the map. The whole notion of accommodations seemed to be a process of trial and error, changing from year to year, sometimes without repeat or coincidence. Thus there was little or no consistency when it came to the issue of accommodations. In a number of cases there did not seem to be a good reason for the accommodations listed on the students individualized education program (IEP). Therefore, students with learning disabilities lost valuable time and fell behind in instruction. This had a deleterious effect on their SOL performance.
8. Very few students in the study had ancillary services as part of their individual education program (IEP). Only speech and language services were indicated. These services did not seem to have an effect on SOL outcomes.

### **Recommendations**

1. Students with learning disabilities should be assured of continuity in instructional methodology and focus, accommodations, and modifications in order to promote mastery of SOL content through application of specialized strategies and recall and application of information. This could be accomplished, in part, through a transition planning process as each student progresses through grade levels annually.
2. Because students with learning disabilities tend to fall behind in reading the farther they proceed through the grades, intensive tutoring/remediation should begin in grade 4 (based on third grade SOL results). Moreover, it seems advisable for IEP committees to consider services in a self-contained setting if students do not pass the third grade Reading SOL.
3. Reading goals/objectives included on IEPs need to focus on proficiency in all five areas of reading – from phonemic awareness to fluency. Students need “learn to read” techniques not just “read to learn techniques.”
4. Yearly evaluation and analysis of educational progress for students with learning disabilities should focus on the correlation of grades in core classes and SOL scores.

This also should include evaluation of the appropriateness of the service delivery model for each individual student with learning disabilities.

5. Classroom instruction needs to be focused on SOL objectives and SOL objectives need to be reflected in IEP goals and objectives. Grade specific objectives need to be taught prior to administration of SOL tests. Successful completion of these objectives should determine grade placement and impact of service delivery model from year to year.
6. Extended learning time needs to be built in for students with learning disabilities so they have a chance to “catch up” in deficit areas. Currently, there does not seem to be enough time to address areas of needed improvement. If necessary, time needs to be found before or after school, during the summer, or even as a replacement for elective classes.

### **Discussion**

High stakes testing in the form of SOLs provide demanding challenges for students with learning disabilities as well as the school divisions that are charged with educating them. Failure has very harsh consequences. The student with learning disabilities who does not pass the SOLs cannot lay claim to an academic high school diploma. The school division that has students with learning disabilities failing SOLs is at-risk for bureaucratic sanctions under state and federal mandates because their results are aggregated with non-disabled students. It is in the interest of all to remedy the systemic and structural problems in the delivery of educational services that foster failure in students with learning disabilities.

At this time it simply is not enough to show “compliance” for special education services for students with learning disabilities. With the infusion of the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOLs) and the federal mandates of No Child Left Behind there is greater need for more precise educational planning for students with learning disabilities. That means educational services, more than ever before, need to be aligned according to the specific needs of students with learning disabilities. Therefore, educational delivery systems must put the student first in its planning year after year

with a consistent and coherent program that prepares them for accountability tests like the SOLs.

Currently, the majority of students with learning disabilities attend school until their twelfth grade year. Some (and in a number of geographical areas many) drop out for a variety of reasons – the newest reason being the realization that they are destined not to pass the SOL tests that lead to a high school diploma. Modified diplomas and certificates of attendance are perceived in a variety of ways by students, parents and potential employers, some positive and some negative. Therefore, a possible unintended consequence of SOL failure is a greater demand of students with learning disabilities extending their stay in school beyond their senior year and potentially up to their twenty-second birthday as provided by state and federal law. At this time, it would seem prudent to address the weaknesses in educating students with learning disabilities in this era of accountability testing uncovered in this study, particularly from the middle grades on, in order to prevent further (and possibly irreversible challenges) in the latter years of high school.





## References

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1988).

*A Nation At-Risk*. Washington, DC.

Wolfensberger, W. (1971). *Normalization*. Washington, DC: National Institute on Mental Retardation

Wrightslaw. (2001). Joint Policy Memorandum. Students with learning disabilities and state of Oregon settle class action suit over high-stakes assessments in public schools.

Retrieved from <http://www.wrightslaw.com>.

Yin, R.K. (1989). Case study research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.



## Data Coding Sheet

School Division - \_\_\_\_\_

Student (first name, last initial) \_\_\_\_\_

Pass or Fail Profile for study (in 8<sup>th</sup> grade) \_\_\_\_\_

### Cluster 1: Students

1. Differences of IEPs in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8
  
2. Pass or fail grade 5 and 8 on English, Research and Literature SOL
  
3. # of years in special education
  
4. # of absences and tardies in grades 6, 7, 8 (list separately)
  
5. Must not be a transfer student from outside school division !  
If transfer from another school in school division please list.
  
6. Grades from English/Language Arts taken in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8.

7. Promotion, retention or places in grades 5,6,7,8

8. Race \_\_ gender \_\_ ethnicity \_\_\_\_\_ native language \_\_\_\_\_

### **Cluster 2: Accommodations (Testing and Instruction)**

1. Testing - whole group, small group, 1:1

instruction – whole group, small group, 1:1

2. Accommodations – what kind in testing

What kind in instruction?

3. 5<sup>th</sup> to 8th grade – added/deleted accommodations

### **Cluster3: Teachers**

1. Teacher LD certified in grades 6, 7, 8 ?

2. # of years teaching LD at middle school level.

## Cluster 4: Instruction

1. Access to specialized reading programs?

What kind?

Duration?

2. What kind of service in 6, 7, 8 grade?

Self-contained, collaborative, resource room, consultation

3. Extended Learning Time (after school, extended school year, tutoring)

What kind?

Duration?

