

## **Oregon Observational Rating Assessment (ORora) Administration Instructions**

### **ORora Purpose**

The ORora provides instructional and functional information for teachers and parents in four domains: attention, math concepts, expressive communication, and receptive communication. It is administered to students with significant cognitive disabilities (SWSCD) who are not able to access the academic demands of the Oregon Extended Assessment (ORExt), despite the provision of extensive supports and test design features founded in the concepts of universal design for assessment. Assessor(s) responsible for student's instruction should complete this rating scale.

Qualified Assessors (QAs) are to use the following decision rule in determining whether or not to complete the ORora:

***If the minimum participation rule for an ORExt content area assessment is met in English language arts, Mathematics, or Science, the ORora is recommended (only one ORora per student needs to be completed).***

### **Minimum Participation for the ORExt**

Students must complete 5 items on the ORExt to count for Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) participation. QAs should consider stopping administration if a student misses 5 items at any point within the administration of the first 10 items. However, teachers may elect to complete a full test administration and still complete the ORora. Meeting minimum participation of the ORExt is a serious decision with many potential consequences; however, administering the ORExt when a valid score is not feasible is also an inefficient use of teacher and student time.

### **Two ORora Domains: LOI and Communication**

This assessment includes both a level of independence (LOI) and a communication domain (COM), each with their own respective rating scales. The LOI scale helps stakeholders to define how much support a student needs from a teacher in order to become successful in specific areas. The COM scale helps to define the level of the student's functioning in terms of both understanding the intent of others as well as conveying their needs or wants to those around them.

## Level of Independence (LOI)

In the LOI domain, the teacher rates how much assistance the student requires in order to bring them to success in a particular area, using a system of least prompts approach (Wolery, Ault, & Doyle, 1992), beginning with independent function, proceeding to the remaining levels of support only when needed, including verbal/gestural, partial physical, and/or full physical.

## Level of Independence Rating Scale (LOI)

| Level 1                                                                                                                                                                | Level 2                                                                                                                                                                          | Level 3                                                                                                                                     | Level 4                                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Full Physical</b> Requires use of full physical supports from teacher (e.g., holding the elbow/hand) in order to attend to a task, as well as to complete the task. | <b>Partial Physical</b> Requires use of partial physical supports from teacher (e.g., touching the hand/shoulder) in order to attend to a task, as well as to complete the task. | <b>Verbal/Gestural</b> Requires use of verbal/gestural supports from teacher in order to attend to a task, as well as to complete the task. | <b>Independent</b> Able to complete task without direct support from teacher. |

## Clarifying Example

Here is an example of how a QA would work through a classroom activity using a system of least prompts. In a testing context, we are defining the level of support needed for different types of activities.

### Level 4: Independent

Place preferred drink in front of student and wait 3-5 seconds to see if the student responds independently.

### Level 3: Verbal/Gestural

If the student does not respond at Level 4 in 3-5 seconds, direct the child to the drink by pointing or providing a verbal prompt (*Indirect*: Are you thirsty? or *Direct*: Pick up your beverage so you can drink.)

### Level 2: Partial Physical

If the student does not respond to Level 3 support in 3-5 seconds, use tactile physical assistance to prompt the student's hand, but do not use full physical assistance. Partial physical support can be paired with verbal prompting, as well.

### Level 1: Full Physical

If the student does not respond to Level 2 support in 3-5 seconds, use full physical support (e.g., hand-over-hand) to fully assist the student to grab the beverage. Full physical support can be paired with verbal prompting, as well.

## Communication (COM)

The **COM** rating is based on the following scale: 1 = Reactive, 2 = Proactive, 3 = Unconventional, 4 = Conventional. The COM rating captures communication behaviors below the pre-symbolic and symbolic levels assessed on the ORExt. The lowest functioning SWSCD likely have skills somewhere along this continuum—from staying awake and attending to functional and/or instructional objects in the classroom to beginning to work with objects and images. The COM rating scale is supported by a wide research base (Browder & Spooner, 2011; Browder, Wakeman, & Flowers, 2008; Browder, Wood, Thompson, & Ruboffo, 2011; McLean, Snyder-McLean, & Rowland, 1981; Rowland & Schweigert, 1990; Rowland, 2013).

### Communication Rating Scale (COM)

| Level 1                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Level 2                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Level 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Level 4                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Reactive</b><br><br>Student's behavior is not purposeful, but may be reflective of the student's current status (e.g., level of comfort/energy, thirst, hunger). Teachers and parents are able to interpret the student's needs and wants by observing the behaviors (e.g., noises, facial expressions, moving body parts) and making inferences about what the student needs. | <b>Proactive</b><br><br>Student behaves purposefully, but does not realize that s/he can influence the behaviors of others by communicating needs at this level. Teachers and parents interpret the student's needs and wants by observing behaviors and making inferences. | <b>Unconventional</b><br><br>Student uses unconventional pre-symbolic communication. No use of symbols is included, nor does the student follow existing social communication norms. The student is attempting to interact with others to meet personal needs by making noises, facial expressions, and/or moving body parts. | <b>Conventional</b><br><br>Student uses conventional pre-symbolic behaviors to communicate with purpose. They are still below symbolic communication with abstract symbols (e.g., letters, numerals), but are communicating needs and wants in order to influence those around them in a socially accepted manner. Students may communicate by nodding, pointing, waving, hugging, looking toward a desired object, or using other socially appropriate gestures. |

### ORora Narrative Summary

In the open-ended narrative section, teachers can address or identify: (a) prerequisite skills that allow her/him to access instruction, (b) sensory support needs (hearing, vision, orthopedic, medical), (c) effective use of Assistive Technology (AT) (e.g., alternative



behavioral research & teaching

communication devices), (d) relevant functional skills have developed over the past year, and, generally, (e) areas of growth that educators have noted in the prior year (e.g., comparing current to prior ORora scores, if available, or any context for determining the Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance [PLAAFP] for SWSCDs).

### Using Scores from the ORora

The ORora yields four sub-domain scores (**A.** Attention, **B.** Basic Math Concepts, **C.** Receptive Communication, and **D.** Expressive Communication), domain summary scores for the LOI and COM domains, and a summary score composed of both domain scores. These scores can be used for diagnostic purposes to represent student learning and change across time. Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams are encouraged to use the ORora results as one data source to develop appropriate and meaningful Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance (PLAAFP) descriptions, as well as IEP goals and objectives. Here is an example of a student's ORora results reflected in a PLAAFP statement:

*"Student achieved a total score of 70/80 on the ORora this year (87.5%), with a score of 19 in the Attention sub-domain, 18 in the Basic Math Concepts sub-domain, an 18 in the Receptive Communication sub-domain, and a 15 in the Expressive Communication sub-domain. These results reflect overall growth compared to last year's results, where s/he earned a 64/80 (80%). Student made impressive gains in communication, increasing by 4 points in the Expressive sub-domain and 2 points in the Receptive sub-domain."*

IEP goals can also target overall improvement on the ORora, using other sources of data for assessment of objectives. Resources related to increasing student communication level are published on [or.k12test.com](https://or.k12test.com) in the Curricular and Instructional Resources tab.

**NOTE: For electronic and paper/pencil administration ORora scores are entered electronically either on the ORExt Training & Proficiency site in the Student Details, Monitoring tab OR electronic/tablet platform in the Data Entry tab.**

For questions visit the [ORExt FAQ page](https://orext.helpscoutdocs.com) (<https://orext.helpscoutdocs.com>) or contact the HelpDesk at [orextended@k12test.com](mailto:orextended@k12test.com)

## References

- Browder, D. M. & Spooner, F. (2011). *Teaching students with moderate and severe disabilities*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Browder, D. M., Wood, L., Thompson, J., & Ribuffo, C. (2014). *Evidence-based practices for students with severe disabilities* (Document No. IC-3). Retrieved from University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center website:  
<http://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/innovation-configurations/>
- Browder, D. M., Flowers, C., & Wakeman, S. (2008). Facilitating participation in assessments and the general curriculum: Level of symbolic communication classification for students with significant cognitive disabilities. *Assessment in Education: Principles and Practice*, 15:2, 137-151. doi 10.1080/09695940802164176
- McLean, J. E., Snyder-McLean, L., & Rowland, C. (1981). *Process-oriented educational programming for the severely/profoundly handicapped adolescent*. Parsons: University of Kansas, Bureau of Research.
- Rowland, C. & Schweigert, P. (1990). *Tangible symbol systems: Symbolic communication for individuals with multisensory impairments*. Tucson, AZ: Communication Skill Builders. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED319154.pdf>
- Rowland, C. (2013). *Communication matrix for parents and professionals*. Oregon Health & Sciences University. Retrieved from <http://communicationmatrix.org/uploads/pdfs/handbook.pdf>
- Wolery, M., Ault, M. J., & Doyle, P. M. (1992). *Teaching students with moderate to severe disabilities: Use of response prompting strategies*. New York: Longman.