SpringerBriefs in Education

For further volumes:
<http://www.springer.com/series/8914>

J. Joy Cumming

Valuing Students with Impairment

International Comparisons of Practice in
Educational Accountability

J. Joy Cumming
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Messines Ridge Road, 176 Mt Gravatt
QLD 4122
Australia
e-mail: j.cumming@griffith.edu.au

ISSN 2211-1921

e-ISSN 2211-193X

ISBN 978-94-007-2934-6

e-ISBN 978-94-007-2935-3

DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-2935-3

Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011944774

© The Author(s) 2012

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

For all who are different

Contents

1	Toward Equitable Provision of Education for Students with Disability in Education	1
	References	8
2	Educational Reform and Educational Accountability Legislation and Policy in the US, England and Australia	11
	The Road to Educational Reform Through Educational Accountability	11
	Translating Legislation and Policy into Practice: Setting National Performance Standards for Educational Accountability	16
	The US	16
	England	17
	Australia.	19
	Summary	20
	References	21
3	Educational Provision, Equity and Educational Accountability for Students with Disability: Intentions and Practice	25
	The US	25
	Accommodations, Alternate Assessments and Modified Achievement Standards	29
	Limitations to Largesse	30
	England	31
	Accommodations and Access Arrangements in Key Stage 2 Assessments	35
	Australia.	39
	Accommodations and Access Arrangements in Australia's NAPLAN Assessments.	43
	Summary	45
	References	46

4 Constructing the Identity of Students with Disability in Accountability Legislation and Policy	49
Introduction	49
Explicit and Implicit Assumptions Deduced from Policy, Legislation and Practice	51
Assumption 1: Equitable Education Provision for Students with Disability is Valued and a National Priority.	51
Assumption 2: Disability in Education is Identifiable and Quantifiable as a Categorical State	53
Assumption 3: The Proportion of Students Who are Disabled Under Educational Accountability Policy is able to be Restricted Through the Categorization Process	56
Assumption 4: Access and Accommodations Arrangements in Accountability Testing Ameliorate Impairment	58
Assumption 5: It is Possible and Undesirable that Students with Impairment Should be Advantaged by Accommodations to Ensure a Level Playing Field	62
Assumption 6: Students with Impairment are Assumed or Deemed to be Academic Low-Achievers	64
Assumption 7: It is Reasonable that Students with Impairment may be Unable to Access Accountability Measures	69
Assumption 8: Impairment Does not Affect the Construction of Knowledge	72
Summary	75
References	77
5 Developing an Equitable Accountability System for Students with Impairment	81
Introduction	81
A Psychometric Model of Impairment in Educational Accountability	82
Recommendation 1: Rethinking Assessment Forms	85
Recommendation 2: Rethinking Standards	88
Recommendation 3: Rethinking Knowledge	89
Conclusion	91
References	92
Index	95