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INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The Internet has rapidly become the defining medium for reading comprehension and learning in the 21st century (IRA, 2009; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2006). Initial evidence indicates that online reading requires additional comprehension skills, beyond those required to comprehend printed text (Coiro & Dobler, 2007; Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, & Cammack, 2004; Mayer, 2008; RAND Reading Study Group, 2002). Skills such as querying search engines, understanding search results, and critically evaluating online sources laden with social, commercial, and political motives are important online reading competencies (Eagleton & Guinee, 2002, Henry, 2006; Rouet, 2006).

Unfortunately, we are not yet in a position to effectively teach online reading skills because schools lack valid, reliable, and practical assessments of online reading comprehension that can adequately inform instruction (Kirsch, 2007; Leu, Coiro, Castek, Hartman, et al, 2008; Coiro, 2009; Quellmalz & Haertel, 2008). The Online Reading Comprehension Assessment (ORCA) Project is designed to address this issue.

This roundtable session presents the developmental aspect of our work from the first three years of a five-year project, funded by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), U.S. Department of Education. The ORCA Project is a partnership with the state departments of education in Maine, Connecticut, and North Carolina, the Regional Educational Lab – New England and Islands (REL-NEI), and school districts in New England and North Carolina. The purpose of this project is to develop valid, reliable, and practical assessments of online reading comprehension.

During Years 1 and 2 of this project, initial versions of three formats of online assessments and companion scoring rubrics were developed, tested, and refined in a series of cognitive labs (n = 45) and early pilot studies (n = 205). In Year 3, efforts focused on refining scoring rubrics, developing a back-end data capture/scoring tool, and piloting the assessments with approximately 1,400 seventh graders, in two states in northeastern U.S., using a stratified sampling plan designed to represent all students in each state. As we approach the end of Year 3, we have developed, tested, and refined 24 versions of an Online Reading Comprehension Assessment (ORCA), including one set of eight versions in ORCA-Open, a second set of eight parallel versions in ORCA-Closed, and a third set of eight parallel versions in ORCA-Multiple Choice. The particulars of each format, as well as the process by which each type of assessment was developed, are described in more detail in the rest of this paper.

OVERVIEW

The Online Reading Comprehension Assessment (ORCA) is designed to capture “real-time” online reading products and processes while individuals read for information on the Internet. The underlying design of any ORCA is informed by a new literacies perspective of online reading comprehension that frames reading comprehension as a web-based problem-solving inquiry process involving skills and strategies for locating, critically evaluating, synthesizing, and communicating information on the Internet (Leu, Kinzer, Coiro, & Cammack, 2004; Leu, O’Byrne, Zawilinski, McVerry, & Everett-Cacopardo, 2009). Recent work suggests that previously developed assessments of the reading skills needed to comprehend printed texts do not sufficiently capture the complex and unique comprehension processes required to read for information on the Internet (see Coiro, 2007; Hartman, Morsink, & Zheng, 2010). Prompted by the absence of real-time measures of these new online reading skills, for the past six years (2005-2012), we have developed a range of ORCA’s in a variety of formats and have used them to estimate the online reading comprehension abilities of over 2,600 seventh-
Graders in language arts and science classrooms. Scores on each of these previous assessments have demonstrated adequate validity and reliability (see Leu, Kulikowich, Sedransk, & Coiro, 2009).

Generally, each ORCA experience is designed to engage students in a series of disciplinary online information requests that are framed in a problem-based scenario relevant to middle school students and connected to most middle school curricula. For the current ORCA Project, eight alternative scenarios have been developed to focus on human biology, a scientific domain common to most middle school curricula. Each scenario requires students to locate, evaluate, synthesize, and communicate information that focuses on a different body part (e.g., lungs, heart, eyes, or ears) and a related science topic (e.g., asthma, heart healthy snacks, decorative contact lenses, or safe music volume levels). Appendix A contains a brief overview of all eight ORCA scenarios.

For each ORCA experience, an inquiry question is presented to students in a Facebook-like interface and students have approximately 45 minutes to use the Internet to search for, read, and evaluate information, and then synthesize and compose relevant, cohesive, and audience appropriate responses to several scenario-related tasks using evidence from their readings to support their decisions. For example, in one scenario, the guiding question is: Are energy drinks dangerous to teen heart health? In this scenario, the president of a school board is considering a ban on energy drinks sold in school and students receive an email with a request for more information. Students are then asked to play a role in the decision-making process by conducting online research and emailing the school board with relevant and reliable findings about how energy drinks affect teen heart health. As of Spring 2012, assessment items are contained within eight online information problem solving scenarios that are adapted into three alternative formats, including ORCA-Open, ORCA-Closed, and ORCA-Multiple Choice (described next).

### Three Formats for Measuring Online Reading Comprehension Performance

For this project, each scenario is created in three assessment formats including ORCA-Open, ORCA-Closed, and ORCA-Multiple Choice. The three formats are designed to provide data about how seventh graders read across a range of more and less bounded Internet contexts. Tasks in the ORCA-Open format are designed to assess real-time reading processes and products required as students Locate, Evaluate, Synthesize, and Communicate (LESC) information while reading in the Open Internet, a dynamic and unbounded online digital information environment. For this project, ORCA-Open consists of 32 items, which are grouped into two scenarios, or LESC. Each LESC includes 16 items designed to measure reading processes and products in an unbounded, real-time open Internet environment related to four components of online reading comprehension:

- **Reading to Locate tasks** (4 items) require students to use search engines, efficiently read search results, and identify websites with information that can be used to solve the information problem scenario.
- **Reading to Evaluate tasks** (4 items) require students to identify a website’s author and evaluate his/her level of expertise, consider the author’s point of view, and evaluate the reliability of author claims and evidence related to the problem scenario.
- **Reading to Synthesize tasks** (4 items) require students to integrate information intratextually (across multiple claims within one website) and intertextually (across multiple websites) in their own words, take a position on the issues involved, and use evidence from multiple online sources to support their thinking.
- **Reading and Writing to Communicate tasks** (4 items) require students to access information in an email or wiki space and respond with information they have learned about the scenario in an appropriately crafted, visually organized, and clear message.

A complete ORCA-Open Assessment consists of one 16-item restricted task and one 16-item unrestricted task. An **ORCA-Open Restricted Task** is an online reading task for which the information space to locate relevant
claims is limited to a particular set of online resources found on the Open Internet related to a topic. An ORCA-Open Unrestricted Task is an online reading task for which the information space to locate relevant claims is left open to any online sources found on the Open Internet related to a topic. The combination of restricted and unrestricted items in the assessment provides information about online reading comprehension proficiency when reading in both types of contexts.

A second assessment format is ORCA-Closed. Tasks in the ORCA-Closed format are also designed to engage students with the four LESC processes (locate, evaluate, synthesize, and communicate), but student work is conducted within the confines of a simulated, closed Internet environment. To develop this closed environment, replicas of the websites found in the ORCA-Open environment were created and linked together in a simulated closed space that also contains a fully functioning search engine known as “Gloogle”. Similar to the ORCA-Open tasks, a complete ORCA-Closed assessment consists of one 16-item ORCA-Closed Restricted Task (for which specific online sources within the simulated environment must be used) and one 16-item ORCA-Closed Unrestricted Task (for which any online sources within the simulated environment can be used).

The third assessment format is ORCA-Multiple Choice (ORCA-MC). This format is also designed to measure the four LESC processes. However, rather than asking students to actively use search engines and navigate within and across multiple websites in a real-time manner, screenshots of key stopping points for locating, evaluating, synthesizing, and communicating are paired with prompts and multiple choice items in a closed digital interface. Students are asked to review the screenshots at each step of the inquiry process and respond by selecting the most appropriate choice before moving on to the next item in the scenario.

Scoring Online Reading Comprehension Performance

Two different procedures are used to collect data as students engage in the ORCA experience. First, online reading process data, such as cursor movement, keystrokes, clicking, scrolling, and navigating within search engine results and websites, is collected in a real-time video recording that records a digital movie of all on-screen activity. This process data provides a window into the real-time processes each individual student employs while engaged in the online reading experience without any interruption from the teacher (or test administrator). A short example of a digital recording can be viewed at http://www.orca.uconn.edu.

Second, students’ typed responses, or the products of each online reading session, are collected automatically with a response-capture object designed by the ORCA research team that sits within the ORCA interface. This object is programmed to provide students with the sequence of task prompts at various points during the inquiry process as well as space to type their responses to each prompt. Each student’s typed responses, timing data about how long they visited each website, and other types of information is collected and automatically distributed into individual data sheets at the end of each ORCA task.

Responses are then scored in two ways. An electronic scoring system will be used to machine-score approximately one third of a student’s responses using a two-point rubric scoring system (0 or 1) and the remaining item responses will be scored by hand using that same two-point rubric (see Appendix E for the final scoring rubric used in Year 3 pilot studies). Within a few weeks after administration, performance data at the class level will be shared with schools along with a short summary report of class strengths and weaknesses in the areas of locating, critically evaluating, synthesizing, and communicating online information. Teachers will also be provided a series of companion lessons to support the design of additional learning experiences in areas for which students may need more practice. Individual student data (e.g., video recordings and/or individual item scores) collected from a random sample of students will be available at a later time after administration.
TRACING PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT FOR THREE FORMATS OF ORCA ASSESSMENTS

During Years 1 and 2 of the project (2009-2011), Cognitive Labs were conducted using the following procedures:

1. Participants included a total of 45 seventh grade students from three different middle school representing students with a range of reading levels (N=8 for Phase 1; N=39 for Phase 2; N=15 for Phase 3).

2. Cognitive labs proceeded in three phases, as more sophisticated interfaces were designed to give task prompts and collect responses. Items were first tested in a Survey Monkey interface (Phase 1), then in an Instant Message interface (Phase 2), and finally, in an interface that simulated Facebook with newsfeed and chat features (Phase 3) and a response capture object (RCO).

3. A standardized protocol was designed to guide researchers through the setup, think-aloud prompts, and follow-up interview questions.

4. The following data sources were used to inform the development of assessment items in an iterative process.
   - IShowU video recordings of online screen reading (captures audio, video, and screen movement)
   - Concurrent oral think-aloud comments
   - Retrospective post-item interview questions
   - Researcher notes and observations of participants’ behaviors during and after the cognitive lab experience

5. Individual students engaged in two rounds of cognitive labs each.

6. Weekly team meetings used think-aloud data, performance data, and researcher notes to revise the subsequent week’s items for cognitive labs.
The following sections outlines the six key phases of development and provides screenshots of products as well as a summary of revisions informed by data collected during each phase.

**Phase 1 Cognitive Labs (Fall 2009-Spring 2010) Testing ORCA-Open Items In Survey Monkey**

**Interface:** Survey Monkey used to give prompts and collect responses  
**Purpose:** To pilot early prototypes of Open LESC Topics and get student feedback about how tasks were defined, clarity of directions, vocabulary challenges, and requests for interface design and topics.  
**Population:** N=8 students (2 times each)

Figure 1. Screenshot of Early LESC Prototype in Survey Monkey (for Synthesis and Communicate Items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions Informed by Phase 1 Cognitive Lab Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TASK DEFINITION/SCOREPOINTS**

1. Reorganized lengthy introduction into a numeric list of steps preceded by two sentences to set the scenario.  
2. Clarified synthesis task to “Tell us, in your own words, what you learned from things you read” to move from compiling information to thinking and synthesizing. Also revised synthesis prompts with cues to “use evidence to support your thinking” to force the use of reading online (rather than only referencing prior knowledge).  
3. Refined wording for aspects of critical evaluation (e.g., relevance, reliability, author’s purpose & level of expertise) and continued to grapple with which aspects were most important to capture.

**TIMING**

1. To ensure two LESCs were completed in the one hour time limit, we told students when they began that they would have approx. 30 minutes for each task; and they should complete as quickly as possible.
INTERFACE DESIGN

1. Added “during reading” note taking space within Survey Monkey format (as opposed to a separate word document) but felt it did not authentically capture synthesis.
2. To avoid students closing windows needed later in the task, added wording to locate task steps that said, “Leave the website open. You may need it later.”
3. To avoid data loss, we need to design a plan to help students get back into the capture tool more readily if they accidently close out of it.
4. Student requests for typical composing functions in online communication tools (tabbing, bold, bullets, numbered lists) were not possible in Survey Monkey. However, this finding lead to discussion and concerns about aligning authentic communication purposes and tools.

Phase 2 Cognitive Labs (Fall 2010)
Testing ORCA-Open Items Using Instant Message and Early Facebook Prototypes

Interface: Instant Message and early Facebook prototypes used to give prompts and collect responses

Purposes:
1. To explore three formats of Open ORCA (Hybrid, Notepad, IM) and a range of communication tools (wikis, discussion boards, email, and blogs) using Survey Monkey and IM to capture student responses and outside interfaces
2. To get feedback on clarity of wording, task authenticity, and timing to complete tasks
3. To use student’s skilled searching pathways in Open environment to inform algorithms of websites to be included in the ORCA-Closed environment
4. To use student’s responses to inform rubric development and operationalization of scorepoints

Population: N=39 students (1-2 times each)

Revisions Informed by Phase 2 Cognitive Lab Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK DEFINITION/SCOREPOINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Contextualized tasks with real purpose and authentic communication tool use to less resemble a testing situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prefaced actual assessment with directions that these problems are only scenarios so students are not led to believe they are really true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Refine evaluation tasks to break down into independent scorepoints for author’s name, authority, agenda, and reliability of claims made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Used prompts to parse out synthesis tasks across the whole task (within a website, across two websites; across all four websites) and ask students to “use your own words” and “explain why these are important facts”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Focused communication score points on tool use, tone, organization, and clarity so to not confound with synthesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERFACE DESIGN and TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We still need to resolve the issue that some students still skip embedded introductory links or go right to the task without reading explicit requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We need to embed timed supports to move students along if they can’t locate information, but we need to test appropriate wait time before scaffolds appear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Locating score points will require hand scoring in ORCA-Open until we build a list of relevant
websites to match with the computer, but web pages will still come and go.

4. Scoring the nuances of synthesis (combining information from two sources in your own words) will require hand scoring in ORCA-Open.

Phase 3 Cognitive Labs (Fall 2010):

Testing ORCA-Open Items with Simulated Facebook Interface: Simulated Facebook interface used to give prompts and collect responses

Population: N=15

Purpose: To test all 8 LESC versions with Facebook Internet and timed prompts.

Figure 2. Screenshot of Example LESC in Facebook Interface with newsfeed and chat features

Figure 3. Screenshot of Wiki portion of LESC Example in Facebook Interface
Revisions and Continuing Dilemmas Informed by Phase 3 Cognitive Lab Experiences

**TASK DEFINITION/SCOREPOINTS**

1. Simplified directions for initial locating task (e.g., split into separate prompts) so students don’t begin before they understand the context and what they should do.
2. In the critical evaluation items, deleted the “use of convincing evidence” and kept the “point of view” item to simplify process and make the scorepoint system more scalable.
3. Revised synthesis task from “tell us why this information is important” to “send me a summary of the two sites. Include details from both webpages”.
4. Re-consider multiple “acceptable locations” for wiki post for scorepoints.

**INTERFACE DESIGN and TIMING**

1. We still need to resolve confusion with introductory scenario - do we force students to view the
context setting wiki post (like we do with the email)? Or do we give them directions prior to starting the tasks?
2. Do we turn off the “Instant Google” feature to keep similar to the closed environment or do we keep it and deal with adjusting score points (that may continue to need revision) as Google gets smarter and strategies change?
3. To avoid surprise, preface tasks with directions that prompts may come from several different people within the environment.
4. Consider adding more false information to wiki to encourage text revision rather than adding new information.
5. Consider adding email attachment feature (access with a hyperlink) into the email task
6. Continue testing timed support prompts with a range of students to get an acceptable time limit before help is offered.
7. Because there is no guarantee websites will stay live in the Open environment, if the sites go down we’ll need to decide whether to change the requested site in the Closed environment or to have the Open and Closed restricted tasks involve different websites.
8. The more we scaffold timing and locating skills, the more we remove the complexities of online reading, and the more our tasks look more like assessments of offline reading.

A preliminary rubric (see Appendix B) was also developed during this phase to initially determine whether or not our items were capturing student performance related to each score point. To aid in this process, student responses were examined and a performance-based statement was created to operationalize each score point in a way that could be assessed with a yes/no evaluation. This process would eventually enable us to score each response with score of one (for each acceptable response or performance) or zero (for each unacceptable response or performance).

Phase 4: (Fall 2010-Spring 2011)
Testing Revised ORCA-Open Items with the Simulated Facebook Interface in the ORCA-Closed Environment
After Phase 3 of Cognitive Labs of the Facebook interface in the ORCA-Open environment, the wording of the items and embedded prompts were replicated in the ORCA-Closed environment and tested with a new group of students, of which many happened to be lower-achieving readers. A new set of challenges emerged, including two main challenges:

- excessive administration time (too many tasks; many students got lost; task prompts were hidden by several website windows; an unlimited time amount of time was allotted for the tasks)
- multi-step directions were too complex or skipped and students began searching/reading without obtaining all the information needed to complete the task

In early Spring 2011, items and prompts in the ORCA-closed system were revised to address these challenges. Then, similar changes were made in the ORCA-Open environment to ensure that the task and timing prompts remained fairly constant across the two environments. Appendix C contains a series of screenshots that illustrate the resulting set of items and sample responses on one ORCA-Closed Scenario (Energy Drinks) as they appeared in the Year 3 pilot study in Fall 2011-Spring 2012.

Phase 5: (Summer 2011)

Creation of ORCA-Multiple Choice (MC) Items
During this phase of development, multiple-choice items were constructed to correspond with each of the 16 scorepoints in the ORCA-Closed (and ORCA-Open) environments. This process included the following steps:

1. **Creating images for each correct choice:** Each scenario was completed in the ORCA-Closed environment and screenshots were taken at each key step of the inquiry process (including all three process points and the product point for each ORCA component: locating, evaluating, synthesizing, and communicating). Each screenshot in this initial set was eventually paired with the “correct” answer to each ORCA-MC item.

2. **Creating images for each incorrect choice:** To create images for the “distractor” items, screenshots were taken of websites that were in the ORCA-Closed system, but these sites represented less irrelevant and/or less trustworthy information that students might have encountered during the inquiry task. These images were eventually paired with one of the “distractor” answers in each ORCA-MC item.

3. **Creating item stems and answer choices:** As much as possible, wording for the item stems were designed to closely reflect the constructed response questions posed in the ORCA-Closed and ORCA-Open. This ensured that similar items across the three formats were as parallel as possible.

**Appendix D** contains a series of screenshots that depict examples of four ORCA-MC items from the Energy Drinks Scenario as they appeared in the Year 3 pilot study in Fall 2011-Spring 2012.

**Phase 6: (Summer 2011)**

**Refinement of Rubric Scoring System**

Once items were created in all three of the assessment formats (ORCA-Closed, Open, and Multiple-Choice), the rubric scoring system was revised to reflect changes to items and tasks involving location, critical evaluation, synthesis, and communication that were made as a result of the pre-pilot study in Year 2. In addition, the wording of the criteria within the rubric system was refined to ensure greater reliability among multiple scorers that would be trained to score the larger data set from the Year 3 study. The Year 3 version of the scoring criteria (Fall 2011 and Spring 2012) included a) a question that depicts the online reading behavior we wanted to target; b) a description of where the scorer should look in the scoring system to locate the student’s response; c) a description of what information should be evaluated for that item; and d) a detailed description of criteria each response must meet to be scored correctly (or incorrectly). This description sometimes included precise website titles or numbers assigned to the websites in the closed system to facilitate more efficient scoring. After a “generic” version of this scoring system for the ORCA-Closed was designed, eight separate versions of the scoring rubric were created and then slightly adapted to match the nuances of tasks and websites associated with each of the eight scenarios. **Appendix E** includes a complete version of the scoring rubric for the ORCA-Closed Energy Drinks Task, as applied to the data collected in the Year 3 pilot study.

To score ORCA-Multiple Choice items, the data capture tool automatically scores student responses and reports each choice as correct or incorrect. As of Spring 2012, we are in the process of adapting the ORCA-Closed Rubric system to the ORCA-Open Environment. We anticipate scoring items in the ORCA-Open tasks will be especially challenging, as students have access to the entire Internet to gather their information as opposed to being restricted to the closed, simulated online environment.

**Refinement of A Prior Knowledge Measure**
We have also tested and revised an online method to evaluate the extent of each student’s prior knowledge in the human body system knowledge domains of eye, ears, heart, and lungs. We use classical probe interview and propositional analysis methods for this. This now appears at the very beginning of each LESC testlet across all three assessment formats. Figure 3 below provides an example. We will evaluate this tool using data from our Year 2 pre-pilot study and Year 3 pilot assessment.

Figure 3. The prior knowledge assessment tool appearing at the beginning of each LESC testlet

Refinement of the Data Capture Tool and Interface

We also used data from the pre-pilot study to revise our data capture tool. The data capture tool, illustrated in Figure 4 below, provides two functionalities. First, it captures all student and system activity in a readable, scenario-based, interface. Second, options at the top of the screen, allow the scorer to select many different views of the data so that both research and scoring functions are possible. On the research side, the range of views is extensive. By selecting a number of different combinations of either check boxes or filters, a tremendous number of views into the data are possible. On the scoring side, things are made simple. Selecting a single option, “Report Scoring,” brings up only the data that we find useful for scoring. Both functionalities will continue to be revised in the Summer 2012 based on our pre-pilot and pilot study experience.

Figure 4. The report window of the data capture tool for the ORCA, showing the range of functionalities possible with check boxes, filters, and the ability to configure (and save) specific combinations of data views.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>System Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>User 1</td>
<td>I heard about a new study on dogs and cats. Have you seen it?</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>User 2</td>
<td>I saw on the news that there is a new study on dogs and cats. Have you seen it?</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>User 3</td>
<td>I just made a new post about dogs and cats. Let me know if you have any questions!</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>User 4</td>
<td>I read about the new study on dogs and cats. Let me know if you have any questions!</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>User 5</td>
<td>I just made a new post about dogs and cats. Let me know if you have any questions!</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>User 6</td>
<td>I just made a new post about dogs and cats. Let me know if you have any questions!</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>User 7</td>
<td>I just made a new post about dogs and cats. Let me know if you have any questions!</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>User 8</td>
<td>I just made a new post about dogs and cats. Let me know if you have any questions!</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>User 9</td>
<td>I just made a new post about dogs and cats. Let me know if you have any questions!</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>User 10</td>
<td>I just made a new post about dogs and cats. Let me know if you have any questions!</td>
<td>OffWall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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