# PCAP 2023 Assessment Framework





# **Pan-Canadian Assessment Program**

# PCAP 2023

# **Assessment Framework**



Conseil des miniștres de l'Éducation (Canada) The Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) was formed in 1967 by the provincial and territorial ministers responsible for education to provide a forum in which they could discuss matters of mutual interest, undertake educational initiatives cooperatively, and represent the interests of the provinces and territories with national educational organizations, the federal government, foreign governments, and international organizations. CMEC is the national voice for education in Canada and, through CMEC, the provinces and territories work collectively on common objectives in a broad range of activities in early childhood education, elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels and in adult learning.

Through the CMEC Secretariat, the Council serves as the organization in which ministries and departments of education undertake cooperatively the activities, projects, and initiatives of particular interest to all provinces and territories. One of the activities on which they cooperate is the development and implementation of pan-Canadian testing based on contemporary research and best practices in the assessment of student achievement in core subjects.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada 95 St. Clair Avenue West, Suite 1106 Toronto, Ontario M4V 1N6

Telephone: 416-962-8100 E-mail: cmec@cmec.ca Web: www.cmec.ca

© 2024 Council of Ministers of Education, Canada

Ce rapport est également disponible en français.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
What is the Pan-Canadian Assessment Program?	1
PCAP assessment cycle	1
Large-scale assessments and classroom assessments	2
Large-scale assessments in science, reading, and mathematics	2
Purposes of assessment	3
Mode of administration	4
Assessment assumptions	4
Presentation of PCAP results	5
Reporting by language	6
Reporting PCAP achievement over time	6
Applications of PCAP data	6
Chapter 2: Science Assessment Framework	8
Historical context for developing a science assessment framework	8
More recent contexts for developing a science assessment framework	10
Science within the provinces and territories	11
Why scientific literacy	11
Defining scientific literacy	12
PCAP definition of scientific literacy	13
PCAP science assessment framework	14
What the assessment measures	15
Competencies	15
Subdomains	18
Attitudes	19
Assessment design	19
General design of the assessment	19
Contexts	20
Challenges for assessment unit developers	20
Limitations of the assessment tasks	21
Assessment specifications	21
Cognitive levels	21
Performance-level descriptors	23
Understanding the performance levels in science	24
Chapter 3: Reading Literacy Assessment Framework	26
Theoretical background for reading comprehension	26
A definition of reading literacy	27
The reader	27
The text	28
The reader's purpose	28
The context	29
The interaction	29

Subdomains of the assessment	. 29
Understanding texts ("reading the lines")	. 30
Interpreting texts ("reading between the lines")	. 30
Responding personally and critically to texts ("reading beyond the lines")	. 31
Text types and forms	. 33
Fiction	. 33
Non-fiction	. 34
Assessment specifications	. 34
Sample texts and test items	. 34
Chapter 4: Mathematics Assessment Framework	.35
Context for developing a mathematics assessment framework	. 35
Domain assumptions	. 35
Large-scale assessments in mathematics	. 35
School Achievement Indicators Program (SAIP)	. 36
Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)	. 36
Trends in Mathematics and Science Survey (TIMSS)	. 37
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards	. 37
Mathematics within the provinces and territories	. 38
Working definition of mathematics	. 38
Assessment design	. 40
Specific considerations	. 41
What the assessment measures	. 41
Specific conceptual and procedural knowledge being assessed	. 41
Cognitive levels	. 46
Assessment specifications	. 48
Chapter 5: Questionnaire Framework	.49
Contextualization of the Educational Prosperity framework for PCAP	. 50
Prosperity Outcomes	. 51
Foundations for Success	. 52
Elements of the EPF in the PCAP questionnaires	. 55
Data on equality and equity	. 56
Chapter 6: Assessment Design	.58
Overview	. 58
PCAP 2023 assessment design	. 58
Characteristics of the items	. 59
Selected-response characteristics	. 59
Constructed-response characteristics	. 60
Releasing material to the public	. 60
Contextual questionnaires	. 60
Further research	. 60
Reference Glossary for PCAP	.61
References	.63

# What is the Pan-Canadian Assessment Program?

The Pan-Canadian Assessment Program (PCAP) is a collaborative project that provides data on student achievement and related contextual data from Canadian provinces and territories.<sup>1</sup> It is part of the ongoing commitment of the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC) to inform Canadians about how well their education systems are meeting their intended goals and the needs of students and society. Every three years, close to 30,000 Grade 8/Secondary II<sup>2</sup> students from across Canada are assessed with respect to their achievement of the curricular expectations common to all provinces and territories in three core learning domains: reading, mathematics, and science. The information gained from this pan-Canadian assessment provides ministers of education and other stakeholders with a basis for examining their provincial curriculum and other aspects of their school systems.

School programs and curricula vary from province to province and from territory to territory across the country, so comparing results in these domains is a complex task. However, young Canadians in different provinces and territories learn many similar skills in reading, mathematics, and science. PCAP has been designed to determine whether students across Canada reach similar levels of performance in these core disciplines at about the same age, and to complement existing provincial/territorial assessments with comparative Canada-wide data on the achievement levels attained by Grade 8/Secondary II students. PCAP is coordinated by CMEC.

# **PCAP** assessment cycle

PCAP assessments are administered every three years to students who are in Grade 8/ Secondary II. Each assessment cycle collects achievement data using a cognitive test with a major emphasis on one of the three learning domains — reading, mathematics, or science and a minor emphasis on the two remaining domains. PCAP also collects a significant range of contextual information (e.g., on demographics, socioeconomic factors, and school teaching and learning conditions) to enhance interpretation of student performance.

Each PCAP assessment includes questions on all three domains, although the focus shifts, as shown in Table 1.1. The repetition of the assessments at regular intervals yields timely data that can be compared across provinces and territories, and over time. For the sixth assessment, in 2023, the focus was on science, as it had been in the third assessment, in 2013, with reading and mathematics as the minor domains.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All ten provinces have participated in each PCAP administration. The three territories did not participate in PCAP 2023.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> PCAP is administered to students in Secondary II in Quebec and Grade 8 in the rest of Canada.

#### Table 1.1 PCAP assessment cycle

		Cycle 1			Cycle 2	
	Spring 2007	Spring 2010	Spring 2013	Spring 2016	Spring 2019	Spring 2023*
Major	Reading	Mathematics	Science	Reading	Mathematics	Science
Minor	Mathematics	Science	Reading	Mathematics	Science	Reading
Minor	Science	Reading	Mathematics	Science	Reading	Mathematics

\* The administration of PCAP 2022 was delayed until 2023 in response to health concerns related to the global pandemic and to minimize overlap with the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which was delayed one year, from 2021 to 2022.

#### Large-scale assessments and classroom assessments

Large-scale assessments cannot and should not attempt to duplicate or imitate classroom assessments as if they were identical processes. According to curricula across Canada, classroom assessments serve both formative and summative purposes, each informing the other reflexively. However, they are aimed more at helping students take the next steps in learning than at judging the end points of achievement. Multiple modes of assessment, including observation and interviewing, are needed to provide a complete picture of the students' competency. In contrast, large-scale assessments are mainly one-time measures. The content and the administration procedures are standardized to ensure that the results mean the same thing in different contexts.

The difference between classroom assessments and large-scale assessments is based on the need for quite different information: immediate and contextualized data for the former as opposed to rigorously comparable results for the latter. However, both types of assessment are useful at different levels of the education system. Assessments external to schools are used for system accountability and to inform planning for board improvement. They can have a valuable impact on teaching practices and function as a pedagogical resource, provided the education community uses the results in the ways for which they were designed.

#### Large-scale assessments in science, reading, and mathematics

The overall assessment framework for PCAP is informed by other major national and international assessments, including its predecessor, the School Achievement Indicators Program (SAIP); the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), conducted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); and, the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), both of which are administered by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

SAIP (1993–2004)	РСАР	PISA	PIRLS	TIMSS
National assessment	National assessment	International assessment	International assessment	International assessment
13- and 16-year- olds	Grade 8/ Secondary II	15-year-olds	Grade 4	Grade 4 and Grade 8/ Secondary II
Cyclical basis (reading, writing, mathematics, and science)	Three-year cycle (reading, mathematics, and science)	Three-year cycle (reading, mathematics, and science)	Five-year cycle (reading literacy)	Four-year cycle (mathematics and science)

#### Table 1.2 Comparison of SAIP, PCAP, PISA, PIRLS, and TIMSS assessments

#### **Purposes of assessment**

PCAP must reflect the changes in our understanding of assessment that have happened since the first administration of SAIP. It is important to understand these changes in order to clarify our understanding of the purpose and limitations of country-wide large-scale assessments.

Although public attention is often focused on the results of large-scale pan-Canadian and international assessments, research suggests that valid and reliable classroom assessments used by teachers in their daily practice provide powerful tools to improve student achievement (Olson, 2002).

Provincial/territorial examinations and large-scale assessments usually have different purposes than in-class assessment and evaluation practices. They can be used for varying purposes, which can include the following:

- providing information for teachers to improve student achievement;
- selecting students who go on to postsecondary studies;
- certifying graduates;
- fostering accountability for schools, school systems, and provincial/territorial systems here in Canada, and for national systems abroad.

Large-scale assessments such as PCAP may be used to inform education policy, but they are not used to certify and select individual students. Individual students do not have any personal stake in doing well in large-scale assessments; therefore, communication about their purpose and use is critical. Clarity of purpose will help students, teachers, and administrators to understand the importance of these assessments and to take them seriously so that the results accurately reflect the amount of learning that has taken place (Simon & Forgette-Giroux, 2002).

For the purpose of understanding the role of large-scale assessments, it is useful to consider the following three major purposes of assessment that can be used in conjunction with each other to improve student achievement (Earl, 2003): assessment for learning, as learning, and of learning, as described below:

- "Assessment *for* learning" is part of effective planning for teaching and learning. It involves both the teacher and students in a process of continual reflection on and review of progress. When students are given quality feedback, they are empowered to understand how to improve their learning. When teachers are given quality feedback by assessing student understanding, they can reflect and adjust their teaching strategies in response.
- "Assessment *as* learning" actively involves students in their learning processes. Students take responsibility for their learning, constructing meaning for themselves. They develop the ability to determine what they have already learned and decide how to further organize and enhance their learning. Teachers assist this student-driven process by providing opportunities for reflection and critical analysis.
- "Assessment *of* learning" provides a snapshot of student achievement relative to specific curriculum requirements. Assessment of learning is often associated with large-scale assessments, and data collected from these assessments are often made public and can be used to inform allocation of resources, monitoring of standards, and approaches to teaching and thus to promote accountability. Assessment of learning provides evidence of achievement for public reporting (Stiggins, 2002) and requires precision tools and elements such as tables of specifications, rating scales, and criteria to be used in the development, delivery, grading, and reporting of the assessment tasks.

PCAP is an assessment of learning.

# Mode of administration

PCAP 2019 marked the beginning of the transition from a paper-based assessment to an online assessment. Students today interact extensively with technology — both in the classroom and in their daily lives. Digital interaction and engagement is now a permanent and ubiquitous part of our society. Accordingly, the move to an online assessment is aligned with current educational and social practices, and supports increased student engagement. PCAP 2023 was administered digitally to students.

#### Assessment assumptions

A few assumptions are inherent in the design of PCAP:

- Although the assessment is administered to Grade 8/Secondary II students, it also assesses understandings learned in earlier grades.
- PCAP is not a student assessment but a program assessment.
- Provinces and territories want enough information at the domain levels to reliably identify strengths and weaknesses in their programs.

#### **Presentation of PCAP results**

Every PCAP report provides data for the three learning domains in the form of mean scores. While overall mean scores, and the comparison of provincial results to the Canadian mean scores, are useful indicators of the performance of education systems overall, they do not provide much information about student learning.

To provide a detailed understanding of what students know, understand, and can do, PCAP has developed useful benchmarks or performance levels that align a range of scores to levels of knowledge and skills measured by PCAP as an assessment of learning. For the major domain, which was science in 2023, PCAP will continue to use four performance levels, which provide an overall picture of students' accumulated proficiency at Grade 8/Secondary II. Performance levels will be reported for the overall domain as well as by subdomain.

A standard-setting exercise is used to determine the performance levels for the major domain. A group of educators from each province set the "cut scores" for each level using the "bookmark" method (Lewis et al., 2012) — that is, determining the relative difficulty of the full set of assessment instruments and delineating the point along a scale that defines the achievement of each level of success, thus determining the "cut score." Once suitable cut scores are set, student performance within the range of cut scores is refined. These refined descriptors of performance-level results more clearly indicate what students should know and be able to do at each level.

The achievement results in the minor subject domains (reading and mathematics, in 2023) are reported only as overall mean scores. Together, these two minor domains constituted approximately one-third of the assessment. Because the students responded to a smaller subset of items for the two minor subject areas, their results by subdomain and by performance level will not be reported.

PCAP results are weighted based on population size — provinces with a larger population have a greater weight. This weighting has implications for the mean scores: because English-language students from Ontario and French-language students from Quebec contribute the greatest number of test results, their average scores are more likely than those of any other population to be closest to the Canadian English mean and Canadian French mean, respectively.

The actual results from students' assessments are called "raw scores." The raw scores are converted to a scale, which has a range of 0 to 1000. These raw scores are standardized, providing a common measurement so that meaningful comparisons can be made of scores obtained from different populations over time and on different versions of a test. The standardized scale used for PCAP assessments places scores on a normal distribution with a midpoint or mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100. The scale midpoint of 500 is equal to the pan-Canadian average for each subject in the baseline year.<sup>3</sup> The majority of students in Canada — about two thirds — will score between 400 and 600, or within one standard deviation of the mean. This mean can then be used as a reference point that allows the comparison of Canada-wide results.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The baseline year is the year in which the domain was the major domain assessed (2007 and 2016 for reading, 2010 and 2019 for mathematics, and 2013 and 2023 for science).

### **Reporting by language**

English and French versions of the assessment are equivalent. The results obtained from students educated in the francophone school system of their respective provinces are reported as French. The results obtained from students educated in the anglophone school system of their respective provinces are reported as English. Results achieved by French-immersion students who wrote in French will be calculated as part of the anglophone results, since these students are considered to be part of the English-language cohort.

#### **Reporting PCAP achievement over time**

One of the strengths of PCAP is its measurement of changes over time in student performance. The PCAP achievement scales provide a common metric on which provinces can compare students' progress at the Grade 8/Secondary II level in the three core subjects from one assessment year to another. Items that were administered in the baseline years, known as "anchor items," provide the basis for linking the assessment results. Such links enable provinces to have comparable achievement data from 2007, 2010, 2013, 2016, 2019, and 2023, and to analyze changes in performance over time.

# **Applications of PCAP data**

PCAP is designed as a system-level assessment to be used primarily by provincial ministries of education to monitor and assess their respective education systems. PCAP data are reported by province (and, where data are available, by territory), by language of the school system, and by gender.

The goal of national (and international) large-scale assessments is to provide reliable information about academic achievement and insight into the contextual factors influencing it. The data from studies such as PCAP provide policy-makers, administrators, teachers, and researchers with meaningful insights into the functioning of education systems and how they might be improved.

It should be noted that PCAP is not designed to report valid results at the student, school, or school board level; its results complement classroom assessment but do not replace it. Although public attention is often focused on the results of large-scale, standardized assessments, research suggests that valid and reliable classroom assessments used by teachers in their daily practice provide powerful tools to improve student achievement (Olson, 2002). Therefore, it is important to recognize the key roles of both classroom assessments (formative and summative) and larger-scale summative assessments such as PCAP in providing valuable information about student learning. Table 1.3 summarizes the similarities and differences between large-scale assessments like PCAP and classroom assessments.

# Table 1.3 Comparison of large-scale and classroom assessment

Large-scale assessment	Classroom assessment
Summative assessment	Program of formative and summative assessments
Standardized procedures, randomly administered	Multiple modes and instances of assessment adapted to student learning needs
Supports analysis of education systems	Supports and assesses the learning of individual students
Fosters system accountability	Provides educators and students with immediate, context-specific feedback on learning
Differentiates by student achievement	Differentiates by student achievement, learning needs, and strengths



The PCAP science assessment framework delineates the conceptual understandings used to create the science component of PCAP (PCAP Science). It is informed by past national science curriculum initiatives of CMEC, historical and current theoretical perspectives in science education, and the provincial and territorial science curricula of the participating populations (CMEC, 2005b).

This framework lays out a theoretical foundation based on current research and sound practices in the field of science education. It provides a working definition of scientific literacy upon which assessment items are designed and builds upon other CMEC initiatives in Canadian science education: SAIP Science assessments and the *Common Framework of Science Learning Outcomes K* to 12 (CMEC, 1997).

# Historical context for developing a science assessment framework

In 1984, the Science Council of Canada published a report entitled *Science for Every Student: Educating Canadians for Tomorrow's World*. Recommendations were organized around three general areas: science education for all, redirecting science education, and monitoring science education. The report endorsed the concept of science for all and described the importance to Canada of having its citizens acquire a good working knowledge of science concepts and develop inquiry skills to apply these concepts to the world around them. "Science education must be the basis for informed participation in a technological society, a part of a continuing process of education, a preparation for the world of work, and a means for students' personal development" (Science Council of Canada, 1984, p. 18).

Upon the release of Science for Every Student, science curriculum development in Canada's provinces and territories began to emphasize the importance of developing a scientifically literate population while continuing to encourage and support students who demonstrate a strong interest in the sciences and in possibly pursuing science-related postsecondary studies and careers.

In 1996, CMEC began to administer SAIP Science as an "assessment of scientific literacy" (CMEC, 1996). The assessment items in SAIP Science were intended to provide information about students' ability to relate their understanding of science to real-life situations.

"Students' knowledge of science concepts and their application to society around them, as well as the understanding of the nature of science, were measured by responses to multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. Questions were presented in groups within simple and common scenarios that required the application of knowledge to situations familiar to young people" (CMEC, 1996, p. 9). Student achievement was assessed through questions that addressed:

- knowledge and concepts of science:
  - physical sciences chemistry

- physical sciences physics
- life sciences biology
- Earth and space sciences
- the nature of science
- the relationship of science to technology and societal issues

In 1997, CMEC published the *Common Framework of Science Learning Outcomes K to 12* as part of the Pan-Canadian Protocol for Collaboration on School Curriculum. The intent of this document was to provide direction for curriculum developers across Canada and to harmonize science learning when revising science curricula for their particular provinces and territories (CMEC, 1997).

The Common Framework built upon the work of the Science Council of Canada and stated the following vision for scientific literacy in Canada:

Scientific literacy is an evolving combination of the science-related attitudes, skills, and knowledge students need to develop inquiry, problem-solving, and decision-making abilities, to become lifelong learners, and to maintain a sense of wonder about the world around them.

Diverse learning experiences based on the framework will provide students with many opportunities to explore, analyse, evaluate, synthesize, appreciate, and understand the interrelationships among science, technology, society, and the environment that will affect their personal lives, their careers, and their future. (CMEC, 1997, p. 4)

The foundation statements in the common framework delineated four critical aspects of students' scientific literacy upon which the pan-Canadian document is organized. Although presented separately, they were intended to be interrelated.

- *Foundation 1: Science, technology, society, and the environment (STSE)* Students will develop an understanding of the nature of science and technology, of the relationships between science and technology, and of the social and environmental contexts of science and technology.
- *Foundation 2: Skills* Students will develop the skills required for scientific and technological inquiry, for solving problems, for communicating scientific ideas and results, for working collaboratively, and for making informed decisions.
- *Foundation 3: Knowledge* Students will construct knowledge and understandings of concepts in life sciences, physical sciences, and Earth and space sciences and apply these understandings to interpret, integrate, and extend their knowledge.
- *Foundation 4: Attitudes* Students will be encouraged to develop attitudes that support the responsible acquisition and application of scientific and technological knowledge to the mutual benefit of self, society, and the environment.

Until 2015, the Common Framework significantly influenced Canadian science curriculum development, to the extent that many provinces incorporated outcomes that addressed the four foundations and shared many grade-level science topics from Kindergarten to Grade 10 (Tippett et al., 2019). Even though they are now 20 years old, science curricula created using the Common Framework are still being used by many provincial education ministries. Some science educators have attributed the successful performance of Canada in large-scale science assessments such as PISA to the Common Framework and have called for a nationwide deliberative process for its refresh (Tippett et al., 2019). In the past five years, British Columbia and Newfoundland and Labrador have both moved away from the Common Framework and fully revised their science curriculum document for all grade levels (Tippett et al., 2019).

### More recent contexts for developing a science assessment framework

More recently, the Ministers of Education articulated six broad global competencies in the *Pan-Canadian Systems-Level Framework on Global Competencies* (CMEC, 2020). The global competencies are: critical thinking and problem solving; innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship; learning to learn and to be self-aware and self-directed; collaboration; communication; and global citizenship and sustainability (CMEC, 2020). These competencies are described as "an overarching set of attitudes, skills, knowledge and values that are interdependent, interdisciplinary, and can be leveraged in a variety of situations both locally and globally" (CMEC, 2020). The shift from the Common Framework to a more competency-based science curriculum could impact the foundational elements in the future science framework.

For example, British Columbia had been working on a more competency-based curriculum well before 2016 and was the first province to move toward a more competency-based structure integrating 21<sup>st</sup>-century learning (Blades, 2019). Blades describes the structure of the science curriculum in BC as a set of three gears representing the core competencies, the big ideas and the learning standards where the processes are given more emphasis and science content provides the context for competency development. Another characteristic identified in the BC science curriculum is the move from emphasizing science, technology, society, and environment (STSE) approaches to science education to more science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) approaches to science (Blades, 2019). Other provinces, such as Ontario and Manitoba, have begun to develop more competency focused curricula, which will impact science programming in the future.

In addition, a distinguishing feature of many Canadian science curricula is the reference to the inclusion of Indigenous perspectives. The recommendations for inclusion within curricula are evident in different ways: Indigenous perspectives might be included as outcomes or expectations for science topics, the front matter of curriculum documents might describe how Indigenous perspectives are connected to the science curriculum, and/or instructional resources might be developed in collaboration with Elders (Tippett et al., 2019).

#### Science within the provinces and territories

A literature review of Canadian Grade 8/Secondary II science curricula conducted in preparation for PCAP (CMEC, 2005c) clearly identified scientific literacy as the goal of science education in all Canadian provinces and territories. The PCAP framework provides a working definition of scientific literacy for PCAP Science that underpins the design of this PCAP assessment component.

### Why scientific literacy

Tan (2016) noted that there are two ways to describe a scientifically inclined person: *science* literate and *scientifically* literate. Science literacy enables one to process quantities of information and assess fact versus fiction. Scientific literacy moves beyond that, to the point of learning how science fits within personal and global perspectives for a more complete understanding of issues. These two constructs together create a more holistic understanding of science.

There is general consensus that scientific literacy is an important goal for school science (Bybee et al., 2009; Heinsen, 2011; Osborne, 2007; Roberts, 2007, 2011). This notion is reflected in the science curriculum documents not only of Canadian provinces and territories but in the documents of other countries too, such as the US National Research Council's *A Framework for K–12 Science Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts, and Core Ideas* (National Research Council, 2012) and *The Australian Curriculum: Science*, that country's science curriculum from Kindergarten to Year 10 (ACARA, 2012). Much has been written about what should be included as part of a science curriculum in order to promote a scientifically literate population (Bybee, 1997; Fensham, 2000; Hodson, 2002).

Scientific literacy reflects the emphasis of "science for all" and is inclusive of both those who choose to pursue further study in science and those who choose other careers and interests that are not specific to science. Both science and technology are creative human endeavours with a long history in all cultures of the world. The intent of scientific literacy is to appreciate the nature of science and technology, the relationships between them, and their social and environmental contexts. Scientific literacy pertains to the application of science and how it helps or hinders humankind. It involves social issues and careers.

Scientific literacy also involves using knowledge to critically assess information, and it is important for Canadians to be able to make informed decisions about science-related issues that society faces, which can include:

- the usefulness of science to society;
- the negative effects or unintended consequences of science;
- scientific principles that could enable scientific research or result in the development of new or improved technologies;
- issues related to science, taking into account personal, community, and environmental factors;

- social issues; and
- careers.

Almost daily, we are bombarded with science-related issues that affect our environment, our health, our food, and our economy. A scientifically literate person may be better able to draw appropriate conclusions from the evidence and information that is provided by others and to distinguish personal opinion from evidence-based statements. That person may also be better prepared to distinguish the kinds of questions and problems that can be solved by science and technology from those that cannot be answered in these ways.

# **Defining scientific literacy**

Although recognized as a goal of school science, the term "scientific literacy" continues to elude a clear definition (Osborne, 2007; Roberts, 2007, 2011; Sjöström & Eilks, 2018; Valladares, 2021; Yore, 2012). Hodson (2006) suggests that there are some commonalities and that a reasonable definition of scientific literacy should include:

- a general understanding of some of the fundamental ideas, principles, and theories of science;
- some knowledge of the ways in which scientific knowledge is generated, validated, and disseminated;
- some ability to interpret scientific data and evaluate their validity and reliability;
- a critical understanding of the aims and goals for science and technology, including their historical roots and the values they embody;
- an appreciation of the interrelationships among science, technology, society and the environment; and
- an interest in science and the capacity to update and acquire new scientific knowledge and technological knowledge in the future. (p. 294)

Roberts (2007, 2011) describes two visions of scientific literacy, with Vision I focusing on science looking within itself as well as its products and processes, and Vision II focusing on the situations in which science plays a role in society and everyday life.

More recent descriptions of scientific literacy call for an element of engagement (Tippett et al., 2019; Vallares, 2021). Tippett et al. (2019) call for a definition of scientific literacy that includes three components: fundamental, disciplinary, and applied. The fundamental dimension includes the competencies required to engage with experiences, data, and information sources; the disciplinary dimension is knowledge about and understanding of science (nature of science, scientific inquiry, engineering design, content); the applied dimension includes actions based on knowledge and abilities (participation in decision-making about social scientific issues).

#### PCAP definition of scientific literacy

PCAP Science defines "scientific literacy" as:

a student's evolving competencies of understanding the nature of science using sciencerelated attitudes, skills, and knowledge to conduct inquiries, to solve problems, and to reason scientifically in order to understand and make evidence-based decisions about sciencerelated issues.

This definition is amplified in the following paragraphs to ensure the clarity of its intent.

... scientific literacy ...

The PCAP definition of scientific literacy includes more than information recall. Using the term "scientific literacy" rather than "science" highlights the importance that PCAP places on assessing an understanding of the nature of science and the use of scientific knowledge and skills within societal and environmental contexts. The definition also acknowledges that the disposition to use scientific knowledge and skills is mediated by a student's attitudes toward science and the importance of engaging in science-related issues as a reflective citizen.

... evolving competencies of ...

Scientific literacy is a continuously evolving process and is part of being a lifelong learner. The PCAP definition of scientific literacy recognizes that students continue to evolve and develop competencies as they move from grade to grade and mature into adulthood. The term "competency" is used to articulate the importance of students being able to identify questions or issues to pursue science knowledge that will inform the question or issue; to seek answers to practical problems requiring the application of their science knowledge in new ways; and to reason scientifically when making decisions based on an understanding of the relationships among science, technology, society, and the environment when engaging with science-related issues.

... understanding the nature of science ...

A key aspect of scientific literacy is an understanding of the nature of science as a human endeavour. Some important characteristics of science include the type of questions posed and the approaches to data collection; the obligation to make connections to current and historical knowledge; the reporting of methods and procedures used in obtaining evidence; the use of logical, evidence-based arguments and explanations; addressing issues of relevance, reproducibility, validity, integrity, and accuracy; the tentative nature of knowledge claims; and an openness to skeptical review. Thus, science is always evolving, and new knowledge and theories supersede existing ones.

... using science-related attitudes, skills, and knowledge ...

Being scientifically literate implies an understanding of the importance of understanding science and its role in and its interrelationships with technology, society, and the environment in order to make informed, evidence-based decisions on which to base one's actions. This requires applying science knowledge to science-based issues. Skills such as questioning and planning, data collecting, interpreting, and communicating, as well as attitudes such as an interest in and awareness of science-related issues, respect for scientific inquiry, and a sense of stewardship are brought to bear in a variety of science-related contexts.

#### ... to conduct inquiries ...

Carrying out scientific inquiries requires combining an understanding of how scientific studies are undertaken and the use of content knowledge, research skills, knowledge of the nature of science, and science-related attitudes to gather verifiable evidence that supports explanations of natural phenomena. It is understood that students must often acquire knowledge that is new to them, not necessarily through their own scientific investigations, but through libraries, the internet, and other resources. Students should recognize important characteristics of scientific investigations and the types of answers one can reasonably expect from science.

... to solve problems ...

While scientific inquiry involves answering questions, solving problems involves searching for solutions to practical problems. For PCAP, this includes applying science knowledge in solving problems, identifying criteria, and evaluating solutions.

... and to reason scientifically ...

Reasoning scientifically involves using evidence to draw conclusions or develop and use models. It includes the ability to identify relationships, analyze numerical and pictorial information, and understand the basis for and limitations of models.

# ... in order to understand and make evidence-based decisions about science-related issues

Making evidence-based decisions implies knowing, selecting, and evaluating information and data critically using scientific reasoning. Science-related issues are omnipresent and vary in complexity, often including different perspectives such as political, economic, health, and public safety. Students need to recognize that, for many issues, there may not be sufficient information to make valid evidence-based decisions, rendering it necessary to be cautious in the interpretation and the communication of the decisions.

# PCAP science assessment framework

PCAP builds upon the earlier work of SAIP and reflects the changes in Canadian science curricula since SAIP was first administered in 1996. It also reflects our evolving understanding of effective assessment instruments since SAIP.

The PCAP science assessment framework:

- describes the competencies and subdomains of PCAP Science;
- recommends using contexts that provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their use of science-related skills and knowledge;
- describes the types and characteristics of the assessment items;

- contains tables of specifications to guide item development; and
- discusses scoring and reporting scales.

This framework also takes into account findings from large-scale international assessments.

#### What the assessment measures

For PCAP assessment purposes, the domain of science is divided into three competencies and four subdomains, and assessment items are presented within given contexts. Figure 2.1 articulates the organization of PCAP Science as a primary domain for assessment. It reflects the intended science curricula for students in Canadian provinces and territories,<sup>4</sup> as well as the foundation statements in the pan-Canadian *Common Framework of Science Learning Outcomes K to 12* (CMEC, 1997).

#### Figure 2.1 PCAP science assessment framework



#### Competencies

An understanding of science is important for young people to be able to participate in and understand that science and technology affects their lives both in the present and in the future. Scientific literacy is developed when students are engaged in demonstrating the competencies of scientific inquiry, problem solving, and scientific reasoning. PCAP Science places a priority on being able to assess these competencies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> For updated science curricula, please visit the official websites of provinces and territories.

*Scientific inquiry: Understanding how inquiries are conducted in science to provide evidence-based explanations of natural phenomena* 

Scientific inquiry requires students to address or develop questions about the nature of things, involving broad explorations as well as focused investigations (CMEC, 1997). It is from the perspective of the student in that they focus on the "why" and "how" of science.

The PCAP assessment of students' ability to use scientific practices provides evidence that they can:

- formulate hypotheses;
- make observations;
- design and conduct investigations;
- organize and communicate information;
- analyze and interpret data (e.g., using graphs and tables);
- apply the results of scientific investigations;
- select alternative conclusions in relation to the evidence presented;
- provide reasons for conclusions based on the evidence provided; and
- identify assumptions made in reaching their conclusion.

# *Problem solving: Using scientific knowledge and skills to solve problems in social and environmental contexts*

Problem solving requires students to seek answers to practical problems requiring the application of their science knowledge in new ways (CMEC, 1997). Students demonstrate this competency by applying their knowledge of science, their skills, and their understanding of the nature of science to solve science-related problems. It is part of the problem process that includes problem finding and problem shaping, where "problem" is defined as the state of desire to reach a definite goal.

The PCAP assessment of students' ability to solve problems provides evidence that they can:

- define the problem;
- formulate questions;
- communicate the goals related to the problem;
- solve problems by recognizing scientific ideas;
- select appropriate solutions in relation to an identified problem;

- verify and interpret results (communicate, reflect);
- generalize solutions (recognize and apply science in contexts not typically thought of as scientific);
- provide reasons for the solution and how it meets the criteria to solve the problem;
- identify assumptions made in solving the problem; and
- show an awareness of sustainable development and stewardship when addressing problems.

*Scientific reasoning: Being able to reason scientifically and make connections by applying scientific knowledge and skills to make decisions and address issues involving science, technology, society, and the environment* 

Scientific reasoning involves comparison, rationalization, or reasoning from the student in relation to an existing theory or frame of reference. Students demonstrate this competency by applying their knowledge of science, their skills, and their understanding of the nature of science to make informed, evidence-based decisions. They draw conclusions or make comparisons to an existing frame of reference or perspective. Students identify questions or issues and pursue science knowledge that will inform the question or issue.

The PCAP assessment of students' ability to reason scientifically provides evidence that they can:

- recognize patterns;
- develop plausible arguments;
- verify conclusions;
- judge the validity of arguments;
- construct valid arguments and explanations from evidence;
- connect scientific ideas and thereby build one on another to produce a coherent whole;
- use reasoning in order to make an informed decision for a particular issue in relation to the evidence;
- use reasoning in order to understand a science-related issue;
- provide reasons for the decision based on the evidence provided;
- identify assumptions and limitations of the chosen decision for that issue;
- develop and use models;

- show respect and support for evidence-based knowledge; and
- display interest in and awareness of science-related issues.

For each competency, students are assessed on their understanding and ability to critique the practices and processes related to these competencies.

#### Subdomains

The four subdomains targeted by PCAP Science are aligned to pan-Canadian science curricula and the *Common Framework of Science Learning Outcomes K to 12* (CMEC, 1997). They include nature of sciences, life sciences, physical sciences, and Earth sciences, and are assessed using the following descriptors.<sup>5</sup>

#### Nature of sciences

The PCAP assessment of students' understanding of the nature of sciences provides evidence that they can:

- understand how collecting evidence, finding relationships, and proposing explanations relate to the development of scientific knowledge;
- distinguish between processes and terminology that are scientific and those that are not;
- describe the processes of scientific inquiry and problem solving in evidence-based decision making;
- distinguish between qualitative and quantitative data;
- identify characteristics of measurement (e.g., replicability, variation, accuracy/precision in equipment and procedures);
- give examples of scientific principles that have resulted in the development of technologies; and
- demonstrate scientific literacy with respect to issues related to the nature of science.

#### Life sciences

- Describe the characteristics and needs of living things;
- Distinguish between plant and animal cells;
- Describe the relationship between the needs and functions of various cells and cell components; and
- Describe structural and functional relationships among cells, tissues, organs, and organ systems in living things.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Please note that, although these descriptors reflect the commonalities of pan-Canadian curricula, they are not intended to be an exhaustive list.

#### Physical sciences

- Explain the particle theory of matter and its relationship to states of matter;
- Describe the properties of fluids (e.g., viscosity, density, compressibility) and factors that affect these properties (e.g., temperature and pressure);
- Explain differences in properties of various fluids using the particle theory of matter; and
- Explain procedures for separating mixtures.

#### Earth sciences

- Explain how water is a resource for living things;
- Explain how water cycles through the environment (including the concept that water is a finite resource and must be recycled);
- Describe the impacts that humans have on the water cycle and related issues such as erosion and weathering; and
- Explain patterns of change related to climate.

*NOTE:* Although the interrelationships between science and technology are an important part of developing scientific literacy, it must be emphasized and made clear that PCAP Science is not designed to assess the technological literacy of students writing this assessment.

#### Attitudes

Attitudes toward science determine students' interest to pursuing scientific careers (Osborne, Simon, & Collins, 2003). Since the creation of new scientific knowledge is essential for economic growth, students' attitudes toward science are a subject of societal concern and debate in many countries (OECD, 2006a). Although students' attitudes toward science are an important part of scientific literacy, PCAP Science is not designed to assess them.

#### Assessment design

#### General design of the assessment

The items in the PCAP Science assessment are presented in units with simple and developmentally appropriate contexts. The contexts are distributed across four versions of the assessment to ensure each version is made up of items spanning all three competencies and the four subdomains; each assessment item is coded to one of the three competencies and one of the four subdomains. Students do not respond to all contexts; rather, each version contains a subset of the contexts.

In each context, the groups of items may contain selected-response and constructed-response items. The number of items per group may vary slightly, depending on the distribution of item types in the group. No group would contain only one type of item.

The assessment should be accessible to all participating students; therefore, the reading level and vocabulary used are consistent with what can be expected of Canadian Grade 8/Secondary II students. As well, information in the items is represented in a variety of modes (e.g., graphical, tabular, symbolical, written).

#### Contexts

Each assessment unit has a context that is interesting and relevant to Grade 8/Secondary II students and relates to the science, technology, society, and environment (STSE) component of Canadian science education. Health, sports, media, the environment, and consumerism or consumption are possible areas of application relevant to Grade 8/Secondary II students where science and technology has an effect on their lives. Developers of the assessment items ensure that the contexts are developmentally appropriate and not culturally or geographically dependent.

The selection of contexts is mindful of the scientific competencies and understanding that students have acquired by the end of Grade 8/Secondary II. In the majority of Canadian education systems, this grade marks a transition period in the curriculum.

PCAP Science recognizes that as students advance from grade to grade, their ability to use science-related skills and knowledge builds over time. Students who are in Grade 8/Secondary II are at the stage of early adolescence and experience dramatic changes in physical, intellectual, social, and emotional growth. Their social and environmental experiences are more personal and local, although they are highly curious and can relate to real-life problems and situations. It must be recognized that, in this period of early adolescence, Grade 8/Secondary II students are idealistic, have a strong sense of fairness, and are reflective and introspective in thoughts and feelings. They confront moral and ethical questions head-on and have a willingness to learn new things they consider useful (Forte & Schurr, 1993).

The contexts chosen for PCAP science assessment units were intended to captivate the interests of Canadian Grade 8/Secondary II students and thereby increase their motivation to participate in writing the assessment.

PCAP Science item developers identify appropriate and relevant contexts for Canadian Grade 8/ Secondary II students. A question they asked themselves was "What is important for Grade 8/ Secondary II students to know, value, and be able to do with respect to understanding science within a situated context?" Contexts must be relevant to students' interests and lives and need to be sensitive to linguistic and cultural differences. The context for the assessment unit is introduced through an opening situation and could be in the form of a brief narrative and include tables, charts, graphs, or diagrams.

# **Challenges for assessment unit developers**

The overall purpose of PCAP Science is to measure scientific literacy, and assessment items therefore focus on critical components (competencies and subdomains) that contribute to scientific literacy. This is different from traditional test items in science, which may have a greater emphasis on knowledge recall and application. All items must be clearly mapped to both a competency and a subdomain. PCAP Science items provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate both competency and knowledge regarding the practices of science.

### Limitations of the assessment tasks

Although the design of this framework has been consistent with the intent of science curricula across Canada, PCAP Science is not a comprehensive assessment that includes every aspect of content knowledge and skills that are in every science curriculum for Canadian Grade 8/ Secondary II students.

PCAP Science does not have a performance-based practical component. Performance-based tasks usually require observation and the completion of a product or practical task. The time constraints for PCAP Science are such that the test is written by students in 90 minutes, with each version containing assessment items for both the primary domain (science) and the minor domains (reading and mathematics). These time constraints, as well as financial considerations, do not allow for practical items. Teamwork and cooperative skills identified as important in Canadian science curriculum documents are not evaluated in this domain.

#### Assessment specifications

A table of specifications is a guide for assessment that indicates the emphasis placed on the measurement of students' understandings within various learning domains and reflects the degree of curricular commonality among Canadian provinces and territories. Table 2.1 summarizes the percentages devoted to each competency and subdomain in the assessment.

#### Table 2.1 Distribution of competencies and subdomains in PCAP Science

Competencies	Percentages	Subdomains	Percentages
Scientific inquiry	30–40%	Nature of science	20–30%
Problem solving	15–25%	Life sciences	20–30%
Scientific reasoning	40–50%	Physical sciences	20–30%
		Earth sciences	15–25%

Assessment items may be either selected-response (70–80% of items) or constructed-response (20–30% of items) in format.

#### Cognitive levels

Cognitive demands are defined by the reasoning required by the student to correctly answer an item, thus referring to the complexity of mental processing that must occur to answer a question, perform a task, or generate a solution. There are a number of different taxonomies (e.g., Bloom's taxonomy) that can be used to identify cognitive levels of complexity. PCAP utilizes a three-level system.

#### Cognitive Level I (lower complexity)

Items at this level ask students to recall or recognize concepts and principles. Responses do not require an original method or solution. Students may be asked to:

• compute

- perform
- evaluate
- solve single-step problems
- draw
- measure

#### Cognitive Level II (moderate complexity)

Items at this level involve more flexibility of thinking, and choice among alternatives. They typically require a response that goes beyond the habitual, require more than a single step, and require a decision. Level II items bring together skills and knowledge from different domains. Students may be asked to:

- represent information in more than one way
- select and use information
- solve multi-step problems
- compare
- justify
- interpret
- extend a pattern
- retrieve information and solve with multi-step approach
- formulate a routine problem from given information
- interpret a simple argument

#### Cognitive Level III (higher complexity)

These items place heavier demand on students, requiring thinking in more abstract and sophisticated ways. Level III questions may involve the following instructions:

- Describe how different representations can be used for different purposes.
- Perform a procedure having multiple steps and multiple decision points.
- Analyze similarities and differences between procedures and concepts.
- Generalize a pattern.

- Formulate an original problem.
- Solve a novel problem.
- Solve a problem in more than one way.
- Explain and justify a solution to a problem.
- Describe, compare, and contrast solution methods.
- Formulate a mathematical model for a complex situation.
- Analyze the assumptions made in a mathematical model.
- Analyze or produce a deductive argument.

Table 2.2 presents the approximate breakdowns by cognitive level within the assessment.

### Table 2.2 Distribution of cognitive levels in PCAP Science

Cognitive levels	Categories of cognitive demand	Percentages
1	Low cognitive demand	15–25%
II	Moderate cognitive demand	50–60%
III	High cognitive demand	15–25%

# **Performance-level descriptors**

Performance-level descriptors can be used to demonstrate achievement in science. The PCAP 2023 assessment is designed to report on how provincial performances measure up to the expected level of achievement on two factors: cognitive demand and degree of difficulty of the items. The cognitive demands are defined by the level of reasoning required by the student to correctly answer an item, from low demand to high demand, while the levels of difficulty are determined by a statistical determination based on the collective performance of the students on the assessment. These descriptors are determined at a standard-setting session once the assessment is complete. See Table 2.3 for the operationalization of the descriptors for the four levels of performance based on PCAP 2013 (Science).<sup>6</sup>

Reporting this level of specificity will support provinces and territories in developing, adopting, and adapting education policies and programs so as to focus on continuous improvement. As cited in Crocker (2005), "It will also enable provinces and territories to improve their own assessments and to validate their results by comparing them to both national and international results" (p. 1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The performance-level descriptors will be updated for 2023 upon completion of the standard-setting session.

#### Table 2.3 Performance-level descriptors

Level	Performance-level descriptors
1	Students at this level were able to:
	<ul> <li>recognize some valid scientific procedures (e.g., replicability)</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>use direct reasoning to interpret simple diagrams, graphs and tables given one source of information</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>provide simple explanations or literal interpretations in familiar contexts (e.g., impact of water on land forms)</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>identify questions that could be answered using scientific experiments</li> </ul>
2	Students at this level were able to:
	<ul> <li>identify good inquiry practices and have basic science skills</li> </ul>
	• in a simple experiment in a familiar context, formulate a hypothesis, identify a suitable way
	to test a hypothesis, make a prediction, and draw direct conclusions from given evidence
	<ul> <li>evaluate the validity of a source of information and use it as evidence to support given statements or draw simple conclusions</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>select and apply a simple problem-solving strategy and make decisions based on their</li> </ul>
	scientific knowledge
	• make connections using scientific knowledge in an everyday environment using more than
	one source of data
3	Students at this level were able to:
	<ul> <li>demonstrate evidence-based decision making and draw from multiple sources of</li> </ul>
	information when making decisions in an experimental context
	<ul> <li>evaluate hypotheses, identify trends, and draw conclusions from observations and data</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>demonstrate a holistic understanding of a scientifically valid test and the need for variables in science</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>identify a solution to a problem in a given context and relevant assumptions required to</li> </ul>
	make predictions
	<ul> <li>generate a solution to a problem using two or more types of information and then</li> </ul>
	communicate their reasoning
	formulate an argument to defend their point of view on environmental or societal issues
4	Students at this level were able to:
	demonstrate advanced science inquiry skills
	<ul> <li>understand the need for variables holistically and design novel experiments to verify or</li> </ul>
	validate information, and also evaluate and modify procedures to improve experiments
	<ul> <li>understand the need for precise measurements in science and apply knowledge in complex and neural situations.</li> </ul>
	and novel situations
	to propose solutions and communicate their reasoning
	<ul> <li>formulate an argument to defend their point of view on environmental or societal issues</li> </ul>

#### Understanding the performance levels in science

To meet the intended goal of PCAP Science to be an assessment of scientific literacy, the development of numeric scales of student achievement is required. The process of arriving at these scales is iterative and draws upon past experiences of assessing science achievement; it is also informed by the research into the cognitive development of science. Reporting scales need to be revisited each time science is the primary domain.

For the PCAP 2013 science assessment (O'Grady & Houme, 2014), the four performance levels

were illustrated by test items and examples of student work showing the levels assigned to them and explanations for the scores. A comprehensive set of sample items is available in issue 8 of *Assessment Matters! PCAP 2013: Science resources for teachers.* 

This chapter delineates the conceptual framework of the reading component of PCAP. It is informed by the curriculum objectives, goals, and outcomes of the participating provinces and territories.<sup>7</sup> As well, it reflects current research findings and best practices in the field of literacy development and the learning of reading.

In Canada, all curricula seek to develop student literacy in the broadest sense of the word, including the ability to understand, critically analyze, and create a variety of forms of communication (i.e., oral, written, visual, digital, and multimedia). These curricula recognize that reading is a cross-curricular skill necessary in all school subjects, as well as a life skill with applications beyond the classroom. This particular PCAP framework design was shaped by careful attention to Canadian curriculum guidelines for those classes and grades that serve Grade 8/Secondary II students. Consequently, it reflects provincial and territorial language-arts curricula, of which literacy is an integral component.

The framework lays out a theoretical foundation based on sound research and practice. It establishes a practical blueprint for the test and defines reading literacy and its elements. It describes the subdomains of this reading literacy assessment and identifies the types of texts and the characteristics of the items. The test design, including tables of specification, is provided, along with rationales for the various elements and descriptions of performance levels.

# Theoretical background for reading comprehension

Our understanding of the reading process has evolved over time, leading to a number of different theories and models in linguistic and cognitive fields (see Ruddel & Unrau, 2004; Rayner & Reichle, 2010; and Snowling & Hulme, 2005, for reviews). One of the most influential theories today remains the theory of van Dijk and Kintsch (1983), which was extended to the so-called "construction-integration" model (Kintsch, 1988, 1998). This model describes all steps of reading comprehension, from decoding words to constructing coherent textual representation. According to researchers, the process of comprehension operates at two levels:

- a textbase corresponding to a knowledge structure derived from information within the text; and
- a situation model consisting of propositions that link the text to world knowledge and personal experiences.

Thus, the textbase represents the actual meaning of a text, and the situation model refers to the situation described by the text. The information that is derived directly from the textbase is usually insufficient for full comprehension. Therefore, in addition to the text, the situation model involves prior knowledge stored in long-term memory. Integration of this knowledge helps fill in the gaps in the text and create a mental representation that is complete and coherent. Because background knowledge differs from one person to another, reading of the same text results in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> For updated reading curricula, please visit the official websites of the provinces and territories of Canada.

the construction of different situation models. Featuring personal associations, inferences, and personal experiences, such models would be subjective and unique.

The role of background knowledge in reading is also emphasized in schema theories that postulate the existence of abstract memory structures, such as frames (Minsky, 1975), scripts (Schank & Abelson, 1977), plans (Schank, 1982), or simply schemata (Anderson, 1984; Schallert, 1982, 1991). Schemata represent a sort of template that allows us to remember and recognize the information. In the context of reading comprehension, they enable us not only to recognize different text types (e.g., novels, detective stories, news articles, research articles, recipes, etc.), but to process and recall the texts as well. It is hypothesized that a text schema is activated in memory after reading the first paragraph and guides us through the rest of the text (Wallace, 1992). In education, schema theories have led to an awareness of why certain textbooks are difficult for learners and how the activation of appropriate text schemata in memory could improve teaching and learning (Harrison, 2004).

The importance of the reader's prior knowledge is also stressed in studies related to student vocabulary. Indeed, a high level of reading comprehension is not possible without adequate vocabulary (Biemiller, 2006). Many studies now conclude that vocabulary is a significant predictor of reading ability (Blachowicz et al., 2013; Scarborough, 2002; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002). For instance, Biemiller and Slonim (2001) found that children who were behind in vocabulary knowledge in Grade 3 remained behind throughout their entire schooling.

Overall, successful reading relies on the trio of author, text, and reader. Theories in both the psychology of reading and English literature are now concentrating on the latter: the reader and the reader's knowledge (Harrison, 2004). Indeed, any text is incomplete without the reader's contribution, as it is the reader who makes meaning of it, brings their own experience to it, and resolves any inconsistencies in it.

# A definition of reading literacy

While earlier PCAP assessments focused solely on the process of reading, PCAP 2016 and 2019 combined two terms: reading and literacy. Adding the term "literacy" broadens the meaning of the ability to read to include skills that will be relevant throughout life for attaining individual and societal goals (Mullis et al., 2009; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2013; Smith et al., 2000).

For PCAP, reading literacy is defined as the ability to construct meaning from texts through understanding, interpreting, and responding personally and critically to text content in order to make sense of the world and participate in society. It also includes metacognitive competencies that allow for awareness and application of different reading strategies appropriate to a given context. Reading literacy effectively involves the interaction of reader, text, purpose, and context before, during, and after reading.

#### The reader

In order to make meaning of a text, the reader must make a connection between what is in the text and what the reader knows or brings to the text. The reader's personal experiences, real or vicarious, allow greater or lesser access to the content and forms of what they read.

Students have varying degrees of:

- knowledge of and about language and texts;
- facility with language strategies;
- knowledge of the way language works in print and in the digital world.

Each bullet is elaborated below:

- 1. Knowledge of language refers to vocabulary, syntax, punctuation, text structures, and rhetorical devices.
- 2. Facility with language strategies includes those used before, during, and after reading, such as accessing prior knowledge of content and form or type of text; making predictions; making connections; asking questions during reading and building mental images; determining key ideas and noting important supporting details; using "fix-up" strategies when meaning fails; making inferences; synthesizing; assessing the validity of content; making comparisons with other sources of information; summarizing; and the like.
- 3. Knowledge of the way language works in print and in the digital world may include the ways in which linear text (or hypertext), formatting practices, visual additions, and the general structuring of text on the page (or web page) affect the construction of meaning in the text. These elements have become more significant in contemporary websites and in promotional texts in particular.

#### The text

Definitions of "text" have evolved over time in parallel with changes in technological culture and society. In the modern world, the notion of "text" has expanded and is now used to describe any language event (see, for instance, the *Foundation for the Atlantic Canada English Language Arts Curriculum*, K–12<sup>8</sup>). In this context, communication that uses words, graphics, sounds, and/or images in print, oral, visual, or digital form to present information and ideas can be considered a text. This expanded concept of text takes into account the diverse range of language forms with which people interact and from which they construct meaning.

Students must engage with a variety of print and digital texts, such as those generally considered fiction, non-fiction, or a combination of the two. Examples could include: short stories, poetry, novels, plays, video clips, pamphlets, labels, instructions, magazine articles, editorials, websites, or online exchanges. Within that range, texts have different degrees of complexity in terms of structure, vocabulary, syntax, organization, ideas, rhetorical devices, and subject matter. The form or type of a particular text plays a part in determining students' success in accessing it.

#### The reader's purpose

The purpose of the reading activity affects the reader's construction of meaning. Students read texts for a variety of purposes, ranging from the pleasure they get from the text's content and style to the practical information or point of view they acquire from engaging with it. The student's

Available at https://www.princeedwardisland.ca/sites/default/files/publications/eelc\_language\_arts\_foundation\_document.pdf

purpose for reading a particular text also influences the strategies and stance they take. Texts of any type may be read for many different purposes. Whereas particular forms or types of text are often considered aesthetic or pragmatic in intention, the reader's purpose may differ from that intent. For example, students of social studies may be required to read a novel or access a website to develop knowledge of a particular culture, era, or event.

#### The context

Context is important in any reading act because it affects the stance the reader takes toward the text. Context refers specifically to the physical, emotional, social, and institutional environment at the time of reading. It includes where, when, and why the student is reading. One of the challenges of large-scale assessment, for example, is that it is inescapably a testing situation, which, in turn, influences the state of mind brought to the reading act. Pre-reading prompts in this test offer some sense of context beyond the testing situation.

As well, context refers more broadly to the world view of the reader. Any meaning constructed by a reader is a reflection of the social and cultural environment in which the reader lives and reads (Bruffée, 1986; Emerson, 1983; Gee, 1996; Heath, 1983; UNESCO, 2011). Peers, family, and community values affect the stance readers take as they engage with text. This interrelationship is described for print media by Johnston and Costello (2005):

Although we often think of literacy as a set of all-purpose skills and strategies to be learned, it is more complex, more local, more personal, and more social than that. Becoming literate involves developing identities, relationships, dispositions, and values as much as acquiring strategies for working with print. (p. 256)

#### The interaction

Contemporary concepts of reading recognize that the process of reading involves the interaction of reader, text, purpose, and context before, during, and after reading. The interaction is critical for print media (Binkley & Linnakylä, 1997; Bruner, 1990) and even more important for digital media, where the sociocultural contexts are more complex (Legros & Crinon, 2002). There is also recognition that reading is not a finite set of discrete skills, knowledge, and concepts. Rather, it is a process of continuous growth in which readers constantly expand the boundaries of their understanding, interpretation, and response to texts. In doing so, they refine the fluency of their integrated reading processes (Paris, 2005).

# Subdomains of the assessment

In light of the interactive process of reader, text, purpose, and context, this assessment of reading literacy considers the reader's engagement with text and response to it. Curricula across Canada identify the following major aspects of reading literacy:

- understanding texts;
- interpreting texts;
- responding personally and critically to texts.

These three subdomains are parallel to Gray's (1960) distinction between "reading the lines," "reading between the lines," and "reading beyond the lines" — terms commonly used by Canadian teachers. In each of these categories, there will be different levels of complexity and difficulty. A few examples of types of questions are given below each subdomain description. This is not an exhaustive list and does not represent the full scope of the assessment.

#### Understanding texts ("reading the lines")

Understanding, or "reading the lines," refers to the process of constructing meaning based on the information directly included in the text. Students use a variety of appropriate strategies to confirm meaning in a variety of familiar and unfamiliar texts. They identify and use concrete and abstract vocabulary, stated conclusions, principal ideas, important details, and/or some aspects of the style and structure of the text. They also make straightforward inferences that are text-based and require very little effort from skilled readers (e.g., determining the referent of a pronoun, describing the link between two characters, etc.).

Students may demonstrate their ability to understand by:

- identifying principal ideas and differentiating them from secondary ideas;
- locating important details;
- using knowledge of vocabulary and cueing systems to make meaning in both familiar and unfamiliar contexts; and/or
- recognizing aspects of style, organization, links between elements, and/or complexity in the text.

Examples of questions targeting understanding include:

- 1. What were the key ideas in the information you read? Why are they important?
- 2. What word or phrase best describes the character?
- 3. Identify the ways that the main character uses to accomplish his or her mission.
- 4. Put the events of the story in order.
- 5. Select the graphic that best illustrates the main idea.

#### Interpreting texts ("reading between the lines")

In order to construct a coherent representation of the text, students need to develop an understanding of the relationships of discrete elements to the whole, or "read between the lines." Readers use symbols, patterns, text features, and other elements to analyze the story in narrative texts, the general idea in information texts, and the arguments in persuasive texts. They make high-level inferences, synthesize information, and draw conclusions about the broader meaning and intent of the text; that is, they consider relationships among elements and ideas in the text to construct deeper meaning and discern more significant implications.
Students may demonstrate their ability to interpret by:

- communicating a broader perspective and/or meaning of the text by recognizing relationships and integrating elements;
- identifying and supporting a thesis with references to details, events, symbols, patterns, and/or text features;
- making logical inferences referring to relevant textual details;
- analyzing and synthesizing elements of the text;
- relying on the text to inform meaning, draw conclusions, and/or connect aspects of the text to each other;
- relating visual elements (diagrams, graphics, photographs, etc.) to the text;
- establishing links between elements of the text and elements from complementary texts; and/or
- explaining how authors use various techniques to create meaning and achieve different purposes (e.g., symbolisms, text features).

Examples of questions targeting interpretation include:

- 1. Explain how the main character changed from the beginning to the end of the story and the events that led to those changes.
- 2. Why did the author italicize the four words in this article?
- 3. Explain how the two points of view in this interview are similar.
- 4. Using the three texts, explain why the speakers' attitudes are different from each other.
- 5. What ideas are common between the table, the graphics, and the text?

# Responding personally and critically to texts ("reading beyond the lines")

In responding personally and critically to texts, readers go beyond basic comprehension, or "read beyond the lines." They may engage with the text in any number of ways, such as making personal connections between aspects of the text and their own prior experiences, knowledge, values, or points of view; responding emotionally to central ideas or aspects of the text; and taking evaluative stances about the quality or value of the text, possibly in relation to other texts and/or social or cultural factors.

Canadian curricula in reading generally distinguish between personal and critical responses.

# Personal response

In personal responses, readers reflect on their own experiences in light of the text and/or identify with aspects of the text. They elaborate personal connections and reactions to the text

by providing extended explanations, examples, and supporting arguments from their own experience and knowledge.

The reader may respond personally to the text by:

- identifying parallels and/or disconnections between their own prior experiences and elements of the text;
- expressing personal implications and insights;
- making connections supported by their own prior experiences, the text, examples, explanations, or thoughtful justifications; and/or
- using evidence (specific details, examples, citations) from the text and their own experience to explain their understanding of the argument.

Examples of questions targeting personal response include:

- 1. Which character's attitude most closely resembles your own? In what way?
- 2. After viewing the ad, would you consider donating to the program? Why or why not?
- 3. Do you feel empathetic toward the main character? Why or why not?
- 4. Does reading about another point of view make you think about this issue differently? Explain.

# Critical response

In critical responses, readers stand apart from the text, considering the text as an artifact or object and evaluating its quality and/or appropriateness to the world at large. Readers evaluate content, elements of style, or the author's stance. They reflect on the choice of content, sources, quality, accuracy, or relevance of information, relationships, and ideas. Readers support their responses by providing specific, appropriate details and evidence from the text and other sources about issues, themes, characterization, and elements of style.

The reader may respond critically to the text by:

- evaluating elements of the text, based on social, cultural, and/or literary constructs;
- evaluating the quality, sources, accuracy, or relevance of issues, themes, and/or elements of style presented in the text;
- supporting their response with details, examples, explanations, or justifications;
- supporting their response with reference to the author's style (e.g., voice, stance, organization, structure);
- evaluating elements of the text (e.g., character development, believability, credibility, bias, stereotypes, intrigue);

- recognizing ways in which print media contain bias;
- comparing the text with other sources; and/or
- identifying contradictions and ambiguities within the text and/or with a broader world view.

Examples of questions targeting critical response include:

- 1. Give examples of how the author's arguments were supported by credible evidence.
- 2. What do the types of sources in the reference list tell you about the author's biases?
- 3. Would you trust the information in this newspaper? Explain.
- 4. Are the feelings of the characters justified?
- 5. Explain how and why this reading selection changed your mind about the question.

# Text types and forms

Texts come in a variety of types or forms that students read for practical or pragmatic purposes: continuous and non-continuous, print or digital, literary or informational, academic or recreational. These texts may include articles, instructions, websites, and other media texts with graphics and other visuals.

The PCAP 2023 assessment includes a range of text types and forms of varying levels of difficulty. These are broadly identified as fiction or non-fiction, recognizing that texts frequently mix forms. (While digital forms are still outside the scope of PCAP 2023, representations of information are diversified as much as possible to move in this direction.)

# **Fiction**

Fiction texts usually have a strong narrative aspect, including elements such as character, setting, conflict, plot, theme, and style. Most frequently, students are expected to engage with fiction texts primarily for literary and aesthetic purposes.

Literary reading involves two levels of text processing: (1) extracting information and (2) experiencing it as literature. The two levels can sometimes interfere with each another, and aesthetic experience can be lost if too much factual analysis is involved (Rosenblatt, 1980). Thus, even if literal comprehension of the text ("reading the lines") must usually precede experiencing it as literature (Church & Bereiter, 1983; Peskin, 1998), the degree to which this comprehension is necessary is open to question. For this reason, achievement tests should not call for pointless and unproductive information finding and inference. The challenge of PCAP is to get to the depth of literary comprehension and to test the most vital aspect of it — understanding a story in terms of people's motivations, goals, and social relations.

# Non-fiction

Non-fiction texts, such as expository material (textbooks, essays, lab reports, newspaper articles), generally have a different structure from fiction. For example, expository texts explain information, ideas, or a perspective through definition, sequence, categorization, comparison, contrast, enumeration, process, problem/solution, description, or cause/effect. Some non-fiction texts, however, do include narrative elements.

Non-fiction texts also include those written to argue a particular perspective and those written to persuade the reader to take some particular stand or action (persuasion/argument). These texts may include advertisements, editorials, letters to the editor, and speeches. Frequently, they also include visual components.

When assessing the reading of opinion or argument, it is important to distinguish two components: (1) understanding the argument and (2) forming a judgment on the issue. The understanding part is a more direct reflection of reading competence, and it is also far more readily testable. Forming one's own opinion is influenced by a number of factors, of which understanding the opposing arguments is only one, but there are other factors that carry much more weight. Indeed, contemporary research indicates that people arrive at opinions and judgments quickly and spontaneously, bringing in evidence and logic after the fact to justify them (Kahneman, 2011; Stanovich & West, 2000). From a literacy perspective, the route to more rational opinion and judgment lies not in thinking-skill training but in promoting fuller comprehension. Therefore, this assessment will focus on *comprehending* the argument rather than evaluating it or forming one's own opinion. While these last are important in civic life, testing them is fraught with quite possibly insurmountable difficulties.

# Assessment specifications

The weighting for the three subdomains in reading literacy to be assessed by PCAP 2023 is shown in Table 3.1.

Subdomain	Percentages		
Understanding texts	35–45%		
Interpreting texts	25-35%		
Responding to texts	25–35%		

# Table 3.1 Distribution of subdomains in PCAP Reading

# Sample texts and test items

An example of a PCAP reading unit can be found in the PCAP 2007 public report (CMEC, 2008, pp. 13–17). Sample questions accompanied by student responses show the types of knowledge and skills demonstrated by students at each level of performance as well as the explanations for the score. A more comprehensive set of sample items is available in issue 14 of *Assessment Matters! PCAP 2016: How is Grade 8 reading literacy assessed in PCAP*?<sup>9</sup>

Assessment Matters! is a series of articles and research notes available on the CMEC website, at https://cmec.ca/459/Overview.html

This chapter delineates the conceptual framework of the mathematics component of PCAP.

# Context for developing a mathematics assessment framework

The development of the PCAP mathematics assessment framework was informed by a literature review of mathematics assessments and test design (CMEC, 2005a) and common pan-Canadian curricular components.<sup>10</sup> In the preparation of this framework, several assumptions about the learning of mathematics were considered.

### **Domain assumptions**

- The learning of mathematics is a process in which students link and build on previously learned concepts and procedures so that their understanding and knowledge of mathematics become deeper and more refined, as does their ability to apply the mathematics they have learned.
- Students learn more complex concepts and procedures by connecting to existing knowledge through meaningful experiences.
- A well-articulated mathematics curriculum places concepts and procedures along a continuum. Student mastery of these concepts and procedures and the level of development of competencies in them will also be placed along this continuum.
- Although the domain is divided into separate subdomains (strands of the curriculum), the content of the subdomains is often interwoven and dependent, as are associated concepts and procedures. The evaluation of certain content and associated concepts and procedures cannot be done in isolation.

# Large-scale assessments in mathematics

The mathematics assessment framework is based on three major mathematics assessments, namely, the former School Achievement Indicators Program (SAIP), the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), and the Trends in Mathematics and Science Survey (TIMSS).

It is also closely aligned with provinces' and territories' own curricula, which generally have been guided by National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards as articulated in the *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics* (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 2000) and *Curriculum Focal Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics: A Quest for Coherence* (NCTM, 2006).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> For updated mathematics curricula, please visit the official websites of the provinces and territories.

### School Achievement Indicators Program (SAIP)

The SAIP mathematics content component was designed to evaluate levels attained by 13- and 16-year-old students in numbers and operations, algebra and functions, measurement and geometry, data management and statistics, and problem solving. SAIP reported on students' overall performance in mathematics (CMEC, 2002).

### **Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)**

PISA assesses 15-year-old students' performance in mathematical literacy. In 2003, it broadly defined mathematical literacy as "an individual's capacity to identify and understand the role that mathematics plays in the world, to make well-founded judgments, and to use and engage with mathematics in ways that meet the needs of that individual's life as a constructive, concerned, and reflective citizen" (OECD, 2003, p. 15). In its 2014 report, PISA's definition of mathematical literacy was refined into "(a)n individuals' capacity to formulate, employ, and interpret mathematics in a variety of contexts. It includes reasoning mathematically and using mathematical concepts, procedures, facts and tools to describe, explain and predict phenomena. It assists individuals in recognising the role that mathematics plays in the world and to make the well-founded judgements and decisions needed by constructive, engaged and reflective citizens" (OECD, 2014, p. 28). PISA reports on students' performance in mathematics overall, as well as producing separate scales for space and shape, change and relationships, quantity, and uncertainty and data.

In 2018, PISA was administered as a computer-based assessment in the 80 participating countries. Two reasons for having a computer-based mathematics assessment were described in the report on the 2012 PISA results:

First, computer-based items can be more interactive, authentic and engaging than paperbased items. They can be presented in new formats (e.g., drag-and-drop), include realworld data (such as a large, sortable data set), and use colour, graphics, and movement to aid comprehension. Students may be presented with a moving stimulus or representations of three-dimensional objects that can be rotated, or have more flexible access to relevant information. New item formats can expand response types beyond verbal and written, giving a more rounded picture of mathematical literacy (Stacey and Wiliam, 2013).

Second, computers have become essential tools for representing, visualizing, exploring, and experimenting with all kinds of mathematical objects, phenomena, and processes, not to mention for realizing all types of computations — at home, at school, and at work. In the workplace, mathematical literacy and the use of computer technology are inextricably linked (Hoyles et al., 2002).

The design of the computer-based assessment ensured that mathematical reasoning and processes take precedence over mastery of using the computer as a tool. Each computer-based item involves three aspects:

- the mathematical demand (as for paper-based items);
- the general knowledge and skills related to the information and communications technologies (ICT) that are required (e.g., using a keyboard and mouse and knowing

common conventions, such as arrows to move forward). These are intentionally kept to a minimum; and

• competencies related to the interaction of mathematics and ICT, such as making a pie chart from data using a simple "wizard," or planning and implementing a sorting strategy to locate and collect desired data in a spreadsheet. (OECD, 2014, p. 491)

### The PISA 2012 report also indicated that:

In general, there is a high degree of consistency in student performance on items delivered on paper and by computer. However, there are important exceptions.

In the field of mathematics, one participant (Shanghai-China) saw a large difference, of around 50 score points, in favour of the paper-based format. Three other countries and economies showed substantial differences in the same direction: Poland (28-point difference), Chinese Taipei (22-point difference), and Israel (20-point difference). Conversely, there are also countries for which computer delivery of the assessment appears to have been advantageous. The largest difference, of about 30 score points, was seen in Brazil. Colombia also saw a difference of about 20 points in the same direction. The United States, the Slovak Republic, and Italy also saw marked, albeit smaller, differences in favour of the computer delivery of the assessment. Across OECD countries, the performance advantage of the computer-based assessment is slightly higher for boys than for girls.

Further analyses are needed to explore the extent to which these differences are driven by the different nature of the tasks, by the differences in the mode of delivery, or by student familiarity with computers. (OECD, 2014, p. 491)

#### Trends in Mathematics and Science Survey (TIMSS)

The TIMSS mathematics assessment framework is structured around mathematical content and cognitive processes. Numbers, algebra, measurement, geometry, and data are the five subdomains covered by the assessment. The four cognitive processes identified are: knowing facts and procedures, using concepts, solving routine problems, and reasoning. These subdomains and cognitive processes assess a student's ability to draw upon relevant mathematical knowledge and efficient and accurate computational skills; link mathematical facts to make extensions beyond current knowledge; use mathematics to solve problems based on familiar settings; and apply logical and systematic thinking to unfamiliar situations. TIMSS reports on the students' performance overall in mathematics, as well as on each one of the subdomains and cognitive domains. In Canada, TIMSS assesses the performance of students in Grade 4 (9-year-olds) and Grade 8/Secondary II (13-year-olds) in mathematics and science.

#### National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards

NCTM presents 10 standards, five of which relate to content and five to process standards, in the *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics* (NCTM, 2000) and *Curriculum Focal Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics: A Quest for Coherence* (NCTM, 2006). The content standards are: numbers and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and data analysis; the five process standards relate to problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication,

connections, and representations. Each jurisdiction then defines mathematics to suit the needs of its population and ministerial or departmental philosophy.

All Canadian provinces and territories use the NCTM documents as a starting point or guide for the development of their mathematics programs. In the western provinces and territories, these documents form the basis for *The Common Curriculum Framework for K–9 Mathematics* as they do for the Atlantic provinces' *Foundation for the Atlantic Canada Mathematics Curriculum*. Ontario and Quebec also consult the NCTM documents when constructing and revising their mathematics curricula.

# Mathematics within the provinces and territories

Mathematics curricula within the various provinces and territories in Canada are structured around the NCTM content strands (referred to as subdomains in the PCAP mathematics assessment framework) and processes that specify the conceptual and procedural knowledge that students should acquire in school mathematics. They provide a comprehensive foundation for all students to reason and communicate mathematically and use mathematical knowledge and skills effectively in postsecondary education, the workplace, and daily life.

The content strands across provinces and territories are generally defined as: numbers and operations, patterns and relations, geometry and measurement, and data management and probability. Each province and territory defines a number of mathematical processes deemed to be essential to the effective study of mathematics. These generally include problem solving, reasoning, making connections within and outside the discipline, representing, and communicating. The processes reflect the manner through which students acquire and apply mathematical knowledge and skills and are interwoven throughout the content strands.

In recent years, much attention has been focused on 21<sup>st</sup>-century skills. These are usually described as those skills that individuals will have to master to succeed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They include creativity and innovation; critical thinking and problem solving; communication and collaboration; information literacy; media literacy; information and communications technology (ICT) literacy; flexibility and adaptability; initiative and self-direction; social and cross-cultural skills; productivity and accountability; and leadership and responsibility. They are seen as cross-curricular competencies that are present in mathematics, science, language arts, social studies, geography, and the arts.

# Working definition of mathematics

Mathematics can be defined in a variety of ways. *The Report of the Expert Panel on Student Success in Ontario* (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2004) states that mathematics "is a fundamental human endeavour that empowers individuals to describe, analyse, and understand the world we live in" (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2004, p. 9). Most dictionaries define mathematics as "the study of the measurement, properties, and relationships of quantities and sets, using numbers and symbols" (*The Free Dictionary*) or "the abstract science of number, quantity, and space studied in its own right or as applied to other disciplines such as physics, engineering, etc." (*Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, 1990). The publication *Everybody Counts* (National Research

Council, 1989) describes mathematics as "the science of pattern and order." This very simple definition of mathematics challenges a common view of mathematics as a discipline dominated by computation and rules without reasons and instead makes one think of mathematics as a science of things that have a pattern or regularity and logical order. Mathematics is finding and exploring this regularity or order and then making sense of it (Van de walle, 2004).

For the purpose of the PCAP assessment, mathematics is broadly defined as the study of patterns and relationships and as a discipline involving conceptual understanding, procedural knowledge, and processes.

The domain is divided into four strands or subdomains:

- 1. numbers and operations (properties, equivalent representations, and magnitude);
- 2. geometry and measurement (properties of 2-D figures and 3-D shapes, relative position, transformations, and measurement);
- 3. patterns and relationships (patterns, algebraic equations and expressions, and linear relations); and
- 4. data management and probability (data collection and analysis, experimental and theoretical probability)

The four subdomains incorporate several processes or 21st-century skills, such as:

- critical thinking and problem solving
- creativity and innovation
- communication and collaboration
- information and communications technology (ICT) literacy
- flexibility and adaptability
- initiative and self-direction

The limitations of a large-scale assessment reduce the number of processes or skills that can be reliably assessed. Therefore only five NCTM process standards, which are a subset of the 21<sup>st</sup>-century skills set described above, have been selected for this assessment. They are:

- problem solving
- reasoning and proof
- communication
- connections
- representation

The subdomains are traditional groupings of conceptual and procedural knowledge as outlined in this framework, and the processes are present in all subdomains. As illustrated in Figure 4.1, the concepts and procedures of the subdomains intersect, while the processes are interwoven through all subdomains.



#### Figure 4.1 PCAP mathematics assessment framework

#### **Assessment design**

The majority of the items in the PCAP mathematics assessment are presented in groups within simple and relevant scenarios. The scenarios are distributed across four versions to ensure each version is made up of items spanning all four subdomains and five processes.

The groups of items may contain selected-response and constructed-response items. The number of items per group may vary slightly, depending on the distribution of item types in the group. No group would contain only one type of item.

When mathematics is a minor domain, as in 2023, selected concepts and procedures in mathematics that cross over all strands — for example, proportionality — are chosen as the focus of the assessment. Anchor items are distributed across booklets to support accurate estimations of students' performance.

The assessment should be accessible to all participating students; therefore, the reading level and vocabulary used are consistent with what can be expected of Canadian Grade 8/Secondary II students. As well, information in the items is represented in a variety of modes (e.g., graphical, tabular, symbolical, written).

#### Specific considerations

- 1. *Use of calculators:* This assessment does not focus on students' ability to perform calculations but rather on their ability to choose the appropriate operation, demonstrate their understandings, and assess the relevance of their answer in a given situation. All students should, therefore, be allowed to use a calculator, preferably of the type they would normally use in their mathematics class. A calculator is also built into the online assessment. The decision to use or not to use a calculator should be the student's. Using or not using a calculator should have no effect on the student's performance on this assessment, and this is considered in item design.
- 2. *Use of manipulatives:* The use of manipulatives (concrete objects) as teaching tools is encouraged in all provinces and territories, and they should be found in all schools. They should help and support students in developing a better understanding of concepts as they go from concrete to abstract representations. The assessment will be designed so that manipulatives are not required to perform the assessment tasks, but they will be permitted if the student requests them. They will be limited to what is normally available to the students in their mathematics class.

# What the assessment measures

### Specific conceptual and procedural knowledge being assessed

### Numbers and operations

Students show evidence that they can:

- demonstrate an understanding of the inverse relationship between perfect squares and square roots, multiplication and division, and addition and subtraction;
- find the exact square root of numbers that are perfect squares and the approximate square root of numbers that are not perfect squares;
- demonstrate an understanding of and find factors for numbers less than 100;
- find prime factorization of composite numbers and use it to find least common multiples of numbers less than 100;
- order and compare positive fractions and positive and negative decimals;
- generate equivalent expressions for percentages, fractions, and decimals;
- represent rational numbers with diagrams and on a number line;
- explain and apply the order of operations for decimals, fractions, and integers;
- demonstrate an understanding of the four operations (+, -, ×, ÷) on positive fractions, negative and positive decimals (× and ÷ decimals limited to two-digit multipliers and onedigit divisors);

- demonstrate an understanding of the four operations with integers;
- select appropriate operations to solve problems involving rational numbers (except negative fractions) set in contextual situations;
- describe ways to estimate sums, differences, products, and quotients of positive fractions and decimals;
- apply the commutative, associative, and distributive properties, and order of operations to evaluate mathematical expressions;
- demonstrate an understanding of percentages greater than or equal to 0%;
- demonstrate understanding of proportional relationships using percent, ratio, and rate;
- use ratio and proportionality to solve problems involving percentages that arise from reallife contexts, such as discount, interest, taxes, tips, and percent increase and decrease;
- recognize a proportional relationship from context, table of values, and graph and use to solve contextual problems;
- solve problems using proportional reasoning in the different subdomains, e.g., numbers and operations, geometry, probability.

### Geometry and measurement

Students show evidence that they can:

- compare and classify 2-D geometric polygons using appropriate geometric vocabulary and properties, such as line symmetry, angles, and sides;
- apply the relationships for the sum of the angles of a triangle to find the measures of missing angles and solve other problems;
- demonstrate an understanding of congruence of polygons;
- draw and describe the image of a combination of translations, rotations, and/or reflections on a 2-D shape (not on coordinate plane);
- identify and plot points in the four quadrants of a Cartesian plane using integral ordered pairs;
- demonstrate an understanding of the relationships among radii, diameter, and circumference of circles and use these relationships to solve problems;
- calculate the measures of the circumference and area of a circle and use the calculations to solve contextual problems;
- calculate the perimeter and the area of triangles, rectangles, and parallelograms and use the calculations to solve contextual problems;

- calculate the surface area of right prisms and use the calculations to solve contextual problems;
- identify, use, and convert among SI units to measure, estimate, and solve problems that relate to length and area.

### Patterns and relationships

Students show evidence that they can:

- represent linear patterns and relationships using words, drawings, tables, graphs, algebraic expressions, and equations;
- make connections among various representations of linear relationships (words, drawings, tables, graphs, algebraic expressions, and equations);
- use different representations of linear patterns and relationships to make generalizations, predict unknown values, and solve problems;
- demonstrate an understanding of the different meanings and uses of variables as a place holder, in rules, in formulae, as changing quantities, and as dependent and independent variables;
- translate statements describing mathematical relationships into one or more algebraic expressions or equations in a variety of contexts;
- evaluate algebraic expressions given the value of the variable within the set of rational numbers (except negative fractions);
- show that two or more expressions are equivalent by using properties such as commutative, associative, distributive, and order of operations;
- show that two equations are equivalent by using properties of equality; order of operations; and commutative, associative, and distributive properties;
- distinguish between algebraic expressions and algebraic equations;
- solve linear equations using the most appropriate method (concrete, inspection, trial and error, and algebraic) involving a one-variable term,  $\frac{ax}{b} + c = d$ , where  $a = 1, b \neq 0$ , and c and d are rational numbers, for integral solutions and to verify solutions;
- use linear equations to solve problems involving proportion and measurement problems (area, perimeter, unknown angles of polygons).

#### Data management and probability

Students show evidence that they can:

• collect data:

- formulate questions for investigation
- select, justify, and use appropriate methods of collecting data (primary and secondary data; categorical, discrete, continuous data; sampling)
- organize and display data:
  - organize data into intervals
  - select, use, and justify an appropriate representation for displaying relationships among collected data (including circle, line, and bar graphs)
- analyze data:
  - make inferences and convincing arguments about a problem being investigated based on an interpretation and analysis of charts, tables, and graphs used to display given or collected data
  - evaluate data interpretations that are based on graphs, tables, and charts
- understand measures of central tendency:
  - describe a set of data and solve problems using mean and range
  - compare different populations using the mean and range
  - determine the effects of variation in data on measures of central tendency (outliers, gaps, clusters)
- understand probability concepts:
  - identify all possible outcomes of two independent events using tree diagrams, area models, tables, or lists
  - determine probability of a single or two independent events, and describe using fractions, decimals, or percentages
  - use the probability of a single or two independent events to make predictions about a population
  - compare theoretical and experimental probabilities of a single and two independent events in appropriate contexts

In addition, five processes — problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, connections, and representation — highlight ways of acquiring and using the content knowledge outlined in the above subdomains.

#### Problem solving

Students show evidence that they can:

- solve multi-step problems presented in context that require using and making connections among mathematical concepts, procedures, and processes;
- solve multi-step problems presented in context that show evidence of understanding the problem, making a plan, carrying out the plan, estimating, and evaluating the solution for reasonableness;
- explain the process used to solve a problem and verify the reasonableness of solutions by using numbers, words, pictures/diagrams, symbols and equations, or estimation;
- apply a variety of problem-solving strategies to solve problems, such as drawing a picture or diagram, looking for a pattern, using "guess and check," making a table, working a simpler problem, or working backwards.

# Reasoning and proof

Students show evidence that they can:

- analyze a problem, make and assess conjectures, justify conclusions, and plan and construct an organized mathematical argument by applying logical reasoning (inductive, deductive) and mathematical knowledge;
- make and test generalizations from patterns and relationships using logical reasoning;
- use counter-examples to evaluate conjectures;
- evaluate mathematical arguments;
- select and use appropriately various types of reasoning (algebraic, geometric, proportional, probabilistic, statistical, quantitative) to solve problems presented in context.

# **Communication**

Students show evidence that they can:

- communicate mathematical ideas and solutions clearly and precisely to others using appropriate everyday and mathematical language, units of measurement, and a variety of representations (written, graphical, numerical, and algebraic);
- formulate clear and complete arguments using a variety of representations (written, graphical, numerical, and algebraic) to justify conjectures and solutions to problem situations;
- use symbolic language of mathematics correctly.

# **Connections**

Students show evidence that they can:

• recognize and connect mathematical concepts and procedures to contexts outside

of mathematics, such as other curricular areas, personal life, current events, sports, technology, arts and culture, media;

• make connections between different representations (written, graphical, numerical, and algebraic) of mathematical ideas.

### **Representation**

Students show evidence that they can:

- create and use a variety of representations (written, graphical, numerical, and algebraic) to organize, record, and communicate mathematical ideas;
- connect, compare, and translate among different mathematical representations;
- select and apply the appropriate representations to solve problems.

# Cognitive levels

The cognitive demands were defined by the reasoning required by the student to correctly answer an item, thus referring to the complexity of mental processing that must occur to answer a question, perform a task, or generate a solution. The three categories of cognitive demands are identified as low, moderate, and high.

# Cognitive Level I (low)

The items at this level ask the student to:

- recall information (facts, procedures, definitions);
- identify properties;
- recognize an equivalent representation;
- perform a specific or routine procedure;
- solve a one-step (word) problem;
- retrieve information from a table or graph;
- identify a simple number or geometric pattern;
- draw or measure simple geometric figures;
- recognize an example of a concept;
- compute a sum/difference/product/quotient; and
- convert among different representations of a number (fraction, decimal, percent).

For this level of item, the student is required to solve problems that have been determined to have a relatively low cognitive demand. Typically, a student at this level is able to retrieve information from a graph or solve previously learned routine problems and solve problems that require mostly recall and recognition.

### Cognitive Level II (moderate)

The items at this level ask the student to:

- apply properties to evaluate an expression or find a measurement or solve a problem;
- represent a situation mathematically in more than one way;
- select, use, and interpret different representations depending on the situation;
- solve a contextual problem involving the use of more than one mathematical concept or procedure;
- retrieve information from a graph or table or geometric figure and use this information to solve a problem requiring multiple steps;
- extend a number or geometric pattern;
- formulate a routine problem given data and conditions;
- compare geometric figures or statements;
- compare two sets of data using the mean and range of each set;
- organize a set of data and construct an appropriate display;
- justify a solution to a problem with one solution; and
- interpret a simple argument.

# Cognitive Level III (high)

The items, at this level, ask the student to:

- analyze properties;
- describe how different representations can be used for different purposes;
- perform procedures having multiple steps and multiple decision points;
- solve an unfamiliar problem;
- generalize a pattern and write the rule algebraically;
- formulate an original problem given a situation;

- analyze a deductive argument;
- justify a solution to a problem with multiple solutions;
- analyze similarities and differences between procedures and concepts;
- describe, compare, and contrast solution methods;
- interpret data from a series of data displays;
- formulate a mathematical model for a complex situation; and
- analyze the assumptions made in a mathematical model.

#### Assessment specifications

The following tables describe the percentage distribution of items by subdomain and by cognitive demand. For a valid comparison over time, anchor items will be selected to adequately represent each of the subdomains.

### Table 4.1 Distribution of subdomains in PCAP Mathematics

Subdomain	Percentages
Numbers and operations	30–40%
Geometry and measurement	20–30%
Patterns and relationships	10–20%
Data management and probability	20–30%

#### Table 4.2 Distribution of cognitive demands in PCAP Mathematics

Level	Categories of cognitive demand	Percentages
1	Low cognitive demand	15–25%
II	Moderate cognitive demand	50–60%
Ш	High cognitive demand	15–25%

In addition to the PCAP student assessment, a series of contextual questionnaires collects comprehensive information about teaching and learning conditions in Canadian schools and resources in the school communities that contribute to student achievement and well-being. These questionnaires, which are administered to students, teachers, and principals, focus on several key areas, including educational attainment, health and well-being, student engagement, social-emotional learning, family factors, institutional resources, and community supports.

Previous versions of the PCAP contextual questionnaires were based on an inputs-processoutcomes model derived from Wang et al. (1993). That model consists of a linear and causal educational productivity approach in which desired educational outcomes (i.e., student achievement) were seen as a direct result of inputs and processes. While this model recognized the overall role of context in influencing inputs and processes, it did not fully consider the complexity of factors that shape students' educational attainment across a diversity of contexts (Laurie, 2020).

The revised version of the PCAP contextual questionnaires relies on the Educational Prosperity framework (EPF), which was first developed in Canada by Willms (2018). In that framework, educational prosperity is linked to family, institutional, and community factors that enable students to thrive by supporting the development of their academic, social, emotional, physical, and spiritual well-being. Willms' framework describes the most influential factors shaping a child's well-being across six developmental stages, which range from pre-natal to upper secondary. Each stage includes targeted outcomes, identified as "Prosperity Outcomes." These Prosperity Outcomes are widely considered to be universal, as they represent key developmental markers, essential for all children to thrive. Driving the Prosperity Outcomes at each stage of development is a set of family, institutional, and community factors, which Willms identifies as "Foundations for Success." These factors related to Foundations for Success are not inclusive of all the factors that may influence outcomes; however, they are based on evidence that documents a direct association to Prosperity Outcomes, and as such, "a large body of research confirms that they are necessary conditions for success at each stage of development" (Willms, 2018, p. 12).

With respect to PCAP, the focus is on the late elementary and lower secondary stage of development (ages 10–15) in the EPF, as it corresponds most closely to the age and grade level of the sampled students.

The Prosperity Outcomes at the late elementary and lower secondary stage involve educational attainment, academic achievement, health and well-being, and engagement (Willms, 2018). *Educational attainment* is conceptualized as completion of, and successful transition between, educational levels (e.g., from elementary to secondary). *Academic achievement* involves performance in core curricular subjects — in the context of PCAP, reading, mathematics, and science. *Health and well-being* include psychological, physical, social, cognitive, and material wellbeing. *Engagement* is broadly defined to include cognitive, behavioural, and affective domains. In consultation with representatives from across Canada, PCAP has modified the EPF to include a fifth outcome, *social-emotional learning* (SEL). The inclusion of SEL is based on the emphasis on

this outcome in Canadian schools and a recent OECD report that highlights the importance of SEL skills (OECD, 2021).

The Foundations for Success at the late elementary and lower secondary stage of development include family factors (parenting skills, intra-family relations, and family involvement), institutional (school) factors (safe and inclusive schools, quality instruction, learning time, and material resources), and community factors (social capital and community resources).

Overall, the EPF considers multiple social and biological factors that promote students' educational prosperity. It is also suggested that additional factors, such as nutrition in the early years, in combination with the Foundations for Success factors outlined in this document are cumulative. The framework includes four ways through which success develops over developmental stages: biological embedding, Foundations for Success, cumulative effects, and institutional selection. Additionally, by considering context and social factors, the framework acknowledges the effects of equity, equality, and access with respect to schooling and resources. The intention is to report results at a scale level to account for and more accurately reflect the interrelationships between contextual factors and the various outcomes under the EPF.

The revision of the PCAP questionnaires to incorporate the EPF is consistent with the OECD's integration of the framework in the Program for International Student Assessment for Development (PISA-D), a new measure designed to meet the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (OECD, 2018). There is a strong link between the EPF and United Nations SDGs, which focuses on promoting equity and equality in education. The integration of the EPF in the PCAP questionnaires provides valuable data that enables both cross-provincial and international comparisons as well as a direct emphasis on equity and sustainability.

# **Contextualization of the Educational Prosperity framework for PCAP**

The integration of the EPF in the PCAP questionnaires was based on a consultative process with representatives from across Canada to determine how PCAP could provide information relevant to educational prosperity. The PCAP questionnaires now address five Prosperity Outcomes and three Foundations for Success (see Figure 5.1). This section describes the Prosperity Outcomes and Foundations for Success represented in PCAP.





# **Prosperity Outcomes**

As noted above, the five Prosperity Outcomes outlined in the PCAP adaptation of the EPF are educational attainment, academic achievement, health and well-being, engagement, and SEL. These outcomes are measured through the PCAP questionnaires using Likert-style or frequency questions, with the exception of academic achievement, which is collected using the PCAP cognitive assessment.

1. Educational attainment

*Educational attainment* refers to the highest level of education a person has successfully completed (Statistics Canada, 2021). While provinces and territories collect general data pertaining to attainment, which provide insight into this outcome — for example, the percentage of students who transition from one grade to the next, as well as high school graduation rates — the PCAP questionnaires ask contextual questions related to transitioning from one grade to the next (e.g., percentage of students who need support to transition from Grade 8/Secondary II to Grade 9/Secondary III). PCAP uses objective data provided by provinces and territories as well as the questionnaires to provide a deeper understanding of educational attainment.

### 2. Academic achievement

*Academic achievement* refers to a broad range of educational outcome variables, including marks or grades on assignments and tests in various subjects and scores on standardized achievement tests (APA, n.d.). In the context of PCAP, academic achievement focuses on reading, mathematics, and science achievement as the primary academic outcome.

3. Health and well-being

PCAP draws on the long-standing definition of *health* from the World Health Organization (WHO, 1948): "Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." Additionally, PCAP is influenced by the framework developed by the OECD on health and well-being (Borgonovi & Pál, 2016). In the PCAP, the focus is on physical and psychological well-being. Psychological well-being is measured through general questions on life satisfaction as well as items on self-perception, motivation, and test anxiety. Physical health information is gathered through questions that ask students about their health status, physical exercise, and eating habits.

4. Engagement

*Engagement* is defined as "students' attitudes towards schooling and their participation in school activities" (OECD, 2018, p. 109). Drawing on a review of academic literature (Chapman, 2003; Sinatra et al., 2015), PCAP focuses on three areas of engagement: cognitive, behavioural, and affective. The effort, strategies, and methods students use to learn new material relate to cognitive engagement. The level of responsiveness and preparedness for class and learning is considered behavioural engagement. The enjoyment students gain through being in school and engaging in learning relates to affective engagement.

5. Social-emotional learning

SEL includes both intrapersonal skills (e.g., understanding and regulating one's own emotions) and interpersonal skills (e.g., understanding others' emotions, the ability to maintain relationships with others, and decision-making skills) (Gresham et al., 2020). Within the pan-Canadian context, the PCAP student questionnaire explores interpersonal skills by specifically asking students items about responsible decision-making, social awareness, and relationship skills.

# Foundations for Success

The three Foundations for Success included in the EPF are family factors, institutional factors, and community factors. The selection of these key factors involved three criteria: the factors had to be potent, pervasive, and proximal in relation to the Prosperity Outcomes. A *potent factor* "has a strong correlation with an outcome, and prior research supports claims that it has a causal relationship with the outcome" (Willms, 2018, p. 12). *Pervasive factors* have a strong positive relationship with multiple outcomes. *Proximal factors* have a strong direct correlation with a single outcome.

It's important to note that indirect factors such as teacher professional development (PD) do not meet these criteria, as outcome effects are mediated through several other factors. For example,

a teacher who attends a PD session may change their instructional practice, which, in turn, may influence student outcomes, but the effect of PD on educational prosperity cannot be measured directly. As a result, factors such as PD do not meet the inclusion criteria of the EPF. However, given the importance of PD to provinces, territories, and school districts, questions about PD are asked on the teacher questionnaire. Similarly, while socioeconomic status (SES) is an important element that underpins the EPF, it is not explicitly identified in that framework. However, a separate section in the student survey is devoted to gathering SES information. In the PCAP contextual questionnaires, the various Foundations for Success factors are measured using Likertstyle or frequency questions.

### Family factors

Family factors play a central role in children's educational attainment. Moreover, a growing body of literature also shows the importance of family factors in promoting student academic achievement. Specifically, the association of family background, SES, and parental educational level with children's educational outcomes has been well documented (Haveman et al., 2004; Crosnoe et al., 2002; Korupp et al., 2002; Melby et al., 2008). The EPF identifies three types of family factors that have associations with Prosperity Outcomes: parenting skills, intra-family relations, and family involvement. Each of these is further subdivided, as discussed below. In developing items related to family factors, consideration has been given to the diversity of Canadian family structures that exist.

### 1. Parenting skills

Within the PCAP questionnaires, parental skills are measured in three different ways: with reference to behaviour, the learning environment, and educational expectations. Questions relating to behaviour describe the learning activities that families participate in outside of school time. The issue of learning environment is addressed in questions on what resources parents/guardians have at home to support their children's learning. Lastly, questions are asked about the extent to which parents/guardians talk to their children about expectations regarding achievement, graduation, and higher learning.

#### 2. Intra-family relations

The term *intra-family* relations refers to family dynamics and supports, including those beyond those associated with the child's parent(s) or guardian(s). These may include siblings, extended family or other relatives, and/or family friends. It is important to note that the effects of intra-family relations are cumulative, and that strong intra-family relations in the early development stage (ages 0–2) and pre-elementary stage (ages 3–5) are of critical importance to later development. Each family structure in Canada is unique. The PCAP surveys are not intended to document variations in family structures or to make judgments about which structure best contributes to Prosperity Outcomes. However, understanding whether immediate and extended family dynamics are supportive is essential if schools are to provide comprehensive and effective education. The PCAP student questionnaire includes a set of questions that ask about whether the student has trusted people at home, or elsewhere in their extended family, with whom they can openly talk about school and other issues, and whether there is someone in their family or extended family from whom they can seek advice.

### 3. Family involvement

Family involvement is known to impact academic as well as other outcomes. Research suggests that family involvement — particularly parental/guardian involvement — improves academic achievement and social outcomes for children of all ages (Hattie, 2009; Lara & Saracostti, 2019; Jeynes, 2005). The PCAP questionnaires ask questions related to family involvement at school and at home in support of student learning. Questions about family involvement in school relate to engagement and participation of parents/guardians and other family members in school activities. Questions about family involvement at home relate to meaningful engagement in the home with respect to student learning.

### Institutional factors

Research on school effectiveness has a long history of measuring factors that contribute to institutional quality. The EPF breaks down institutional factors into four categories: safe and inclusive schools, quality instruction, learning time, and resources.

1. Safe and inclusive schools

Safe and inclusive schools are subdivided into three sections: the surveys ask questions on physical safety and inclusion, psychological safety and inclusion, and social safety and inclusion. Physical safety and inclusion questions gather information on schools that promote safe, barrier-free buildings that are accessible to all. Questions on psychological safety and inclusion address learning environments that are emotionally supportive and treat everyone with dignity and respect. Social safety and inclusion questions gather data on environments that are characterized by cognitive and physical diversity as well as gender, sexual, and ethnic diversity.

2. Quality instruction

In alignment with international surveys on quality instruction, PCAP used Anderson's (2004) conceptual framework of teacher effectiveness to organize questions on quality instruction. The PCAP questionnaires have questions devoted to curriculum, teaching practice, and interactions in the classroom. Questions related to curriculum focus on educators' level of understanding of and ability to implement the curriculum. Teaching practice questions relate to lesson delivery. The classroom questions address interactions between students and teachers.

3. Learning time

Gathering information on learning time has long been a focus of PCAP and other international surveys of schools. In an attempt to expand on standard questions with respect to the length and frequency of learning time (i.e., hours/days of instruction), the PCAP questionnaires also ask about where and how students spend their time learning. The expansion of the learning-time questions will provide more context for how learning happens in schools (e.g., online or in person).

#### 4. Resources

Similar to learning time, questions about material resources have been asked on previous versions of PCAP and other international surveys of schools. The questionnaires ask teachers and schools to report on the types of resources that they have within their classrooms/ schools, as well as the use and level of maintenance of these resources. Additionally, the school questionnaire has been updated to include more specific questions on human resources.

#### Community factors

Community factors are the third Foundation for Success in the EPF. They are strongly associated with all the EPF outcomes. Specifically, several studies have found that educational attainment is linked with family characteristics, SES, and community attributes (e.g., access to resources, social capital, concentration of poverty, neighbourhood crime and violence, etc.) (Martens et al., 2014; Carpiano et al., 2009; Lapointe et al., 2007). In alignment with the EPF, the two community factors examined in PCAP are social capital and community resources.

1. Social capital

Social capital generally involves relationships, connections between people, or group membership. Various activities (e.g., camping, going to community events, reading) that students participate in when they are with their families, peers, and on their own are associated with educational achievement and attainment outcomes. For instance, the more connections a child's family has, the greater the opportunities for enriching learning experiences. Social capital in this sense has been associated with child development, physical and mental health, and literacy and numeracy skills (Harpham, 2003). The PCAP student questionnaire asks questions related to social capital that are designed to identify the types of social networks students belong to and their level of activity within those networks.

2. Community resources

Living in a safe community where there is access to green space and various healthy activities is an important factor in growth and development. The PCAP surveys ask questions about three community resource domains: proximity to community recreational amenities (e.g., parks, community centres, sports or fitness facilities, public libraries); neighbourhood safety (e.g., how safe oneself feels in their community); and the physical condition of the community (e.g., physical conditions and maintenance of buildings).

# **Elements of the EPF in the PCAP questionnaires**

The PCAP contextual questionnaires gather information from students, teachers, and principals of schools. Some elements of the EPF lend themselves better to one participant group than another. As a collection, the three questionnaires provide a greater level of insight into educational prosperity overall, rather than collecting information solely from one group. Table 5.1 identifies the extent to which the questionnaires provide information about the EPF Prosperity Outcomes and Foundations for Success as well as three additional factors: demographics, SES, and professional development.

	Student	Teacher	School
Prosperity Outcomes			
Educational attainment	2%	1%	1%
Academic achievement			
Health & well-being – physical	10%		
Health & well-being – psychological	5%		4%
Engagement – cognitive	6%		
Engagement – behavioural	2%		
Engagement – affective	4%		
Social-emotional learning – interpersonal	6%		
Foundations for Success			
Family factors – parenting skills	4%	1%	1%
Family factors – intra-family relations	4%		
Family factors – family involvement	5%	5%	10%
Institutional factors – safe and inclusive schools	7%	15%	16%
Institutional factors – quality instruction		19%	5%
Institutional factors – learning time	10%	9%	19%
Institutional factors – resources		19%	40%
Community factors – social capital	8%		
Community factors – community resources	3%		1%
Additional			
Demographics	17%	10%	3%
Socioeconomic status	9%		
Professional development		22%	

#### Table 5.1 Distribution of EPF-related questions in the PCAP questionnaires

# Data on equality and equity

The EPF is a useful organizer for the education research knowledge base and the collection of comprehensive data related to educational prosperity and attainment. When the EPF is used as a foundation for the PCAP questionnaires, the data obtained from a Canada-wide sample provide important information to inform educational systems. In particular, our understanding of equality or inequality can be enhanced by investigating the relationship between various demographic variables (e.g., gender identity, home language, SES) and Prosperity Outcomes (Willms, 2018). When there are significant differences in the educational, academic, health and well-being, engagement, and SEL outcomes of various subpopulations, then there is evidence of inequality, and further investigation of specific marginalized groups may be warranted. A greater understanding of equity or inequity can also be garnered through the relative strength of the association between demographic groupings and the Foundations for Success. When there are significant differences in subpopulations with respect to the various Foundations for Success,<sup>11</sup> then further investigation and possible intervention might be needed at the school, family, and/or community levels (see Figure 5.2). Overall, the integration of the EPF into the PCAP questionnaires has the potential to provide schools, school boards/districts, and provinces/

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Note that the concept of access is subsumed under "resources" in the EPF Foundations for Success.

territories with valuable information that can inform educational programming and policies across Canada.





### **Overview**

As noted in previous chapters, PCAP is based on common curriculum outcomes across Canada. The assessment is not tied to the curriculum of a particular province or territory but is instead a fair measurement of students' abilities to use their learning skills to solve real-life situations. It measures how well students are doing; it does not attempt to assess approaches to learning.

Provinces and territories work to ensure that the unique qualities of our country's education systems are taken into account. Factors such as linguistic differences, rural and urban school locations, and cultural influences are all considered in both the assessment itself and related context questionnaires. In addition, the common curricular framework for each subject incorporates an agreed-upon perspective for all provinces and territories that is based upon the latest pedagogical research.

One of the strengths of PCAP is its measurement over time of trends in student achievement in the three core subjects. The PCAP achievement scales provide a common metric on which provinces and territories can compare students' progress at the Grade 8/Secondary II level in the three core subjects from assessment to assessment. The scale midpoint of 500 is equal to the national average for each subject in the baseline year, i.e., the first year in which it was the primary domain (2007 for reading, 2010 for mathematics, and 2013 for science). Items that were administered in the baseline years will provide the basis for linking the assessment results. This will enable provinces and territories to have comparable achievement data from 2007, 2010, 2013, 2016, 2019, and 2023, and to plot changes in performance over this sixteen-year period.

In addition to achievement scales for the three domains overall, PCAP 2023 will report relative student performance in relation to the performance-level descriptors defined in the science assessment framework.

PCAP does *not* address individual student performance, nor does it involve comparisons between students, schools, or school boards/districts. PCAP results are not made available to teachers, school boards/districts, regions, or ministries/departments of education to assess students' school performance.

# PCAP 2023 assessment design

For the PCAP 2023 assessment, groups of assessment units were distributed within four versions of the assessment. The versions were designed so that students need approximately 90 minutes to complete all of the items in any one version (approximately 60 minutes to be spent on primary-domain items and 30 minutes on minor-domain items). The four versions were randomly and equally distributed to students within a single class. This approach minimizes the assessment burden on any one student, as each student is presented with only a sample of the items.

Following data collection, student responses are placed on common mathematics, science, and reading scales to provide an overall picture of the assessment results in each province and by language and gender. In addition, pairs of booklets containing sets or units of anchor items allow for comparative measurements of student performance from one booklet to another.

Each assessment unit presents a passage or context followed by a series of related items. The contexts chosen for assessment units are intended to captivate the interests of Canadian Grade 8/ Secondary II students and thereby increase their motivation to write the assessment. Contexts are introduced with an opening situation that could be in the form of a brief narrative and could include fiction or non-fiction reading passages, tables, charts, graphs, or diagrams. A series of reviews ensured that the contexts were developmentally appropriate, free of bias, and not culturally or geographically dependent.

Each version of the assessment is composed of sufficient units that together span each of the assessment specifications for the three domains. Upon completion of the assessment units, students complete a student questionnaire.

Texts and questions were developed in both official languages and cross-translated. Items were reviewed by curriculum experts and teachers from different regions in Canada in both French and English to ensure equivalency in meaning and difficulty. Following field testing, differential item functioning (DIF) analysis was conducted to ensure that items selected for the main administration were fair and equitable in both languages.

# **Characteristics of the items**

In measuring any complex and integrated set of skills, it is usually best to include a variety of item types, both to allow all students to respond in the manner that best demonstrates their skill attainment and to measure a greater range of the complex skills involved.

In general, the assessment uses contexts that are complete in themselves, that are short enough to allow a range of text types currently read by the target age group both in and out of class, and that allow for a range of reading demands in a 90-minute time period. A balance of constructed-response and selected-response items allows for an efficient use of student testing time. The percentage of selected-response items is between 70 and 80 percent, and the percentage of constructed responses is between 20 and 30 percent. Each selected-response item is worth one score point. Constructed-response items generally are worth one, two, or three score points, depending on the nature of the task and the skills required to complete it. In developing assessment items, the choice of item format depends on the competency or subdomain being assessed and the format that best enables the student to demonstrate their proficiency.

# Selected-response characteristics

The traditional *multiple-choice* format comprises a stem statement and four choices, one of which is correct, while the other three function as distractors. This is the format most familiar to teachers and students. Each item focuses on a single subdomain. Scoring is dichotomous.

*True-or-false/yes-or-no/agree-or-disagree* items involve a series of statements about which students are asked to draw conclusions and specify whether each is true or false. Scoring is dichotomous.

#### **Constructed-response characteristics**

Constructed-response items require students to produce the response. Responses can range from short phrases or two to three sentences to several paragraphs in the case of extended constructed-response items. Constructed-response items may also ask the student to create tables or graphs, sketch diagrams, or design experiments. PCAP includes constructed-response items that are open-ended and measure higher-order cognitive skills and content knowledge.

The inclusion of constructed-response items also reflects good assessment practice in that different assessment formats are required, depending on what students are expected to demonstrate. Constructed-response items allow for partial credit, an important factor when assessing process skills or for items requiring multiple steps.

### **Releasing material to the public**

PCAP 2023 is the sixth in a series of regular three-year studies providing data on trends in science, reading, and mathematics achievement over the sixteen-year period from 2007 to 2023. Since the outset of PCAP, a small selection of items has been released to describe the performance scales. Comprehensive sets of sample items for reading, mathematics, and science have been released as part of the publication series *Assessment Matters!*, a series of articles available on the CMEC website. The measurement of trends over time requires that a substantial proportion of the items remain secure; however, as items are released, new items will be developed to take their place.

#### **Contextual questionnaires**

In addition to the PCAP student assessment, a series of contextual questionnaires collects comprehensive information about teaching and learning conditions in Canadian schools and resources in the schools' communities that contribute to student achievement and well-being. These questionnaires, which are administered to students, teachers, and principals, focus on several key areas, including educational attainment, health and well-being, student engagement, SEL, family factors, institutional resources, and community supports. These questionnaires require about 30 minutes to complete.

#### **Further research**

PCAP's design provides for a research phase that follows the release of the public and contextual reports. A series of research articles on more specific topics will follow to provide a broader picture of the interplay between achievement and contextual variables. Wherever possible, comparisons will be made to other large-scale assessment projects in which the provinces and territories participate in order to develop a broader view of education across grades in Canada.

# **REFERENCE GLOSSARY FOR PCAP**

This glossary provides quick definitions of key terms used in this framework document. Please note that the summarized definitions reflect the Educational Prosperity framework; for more detailed definitions please see Willms, 2018.

**Academic achievement:** A broad range of educational outcome variables. Typically measured via scores from large-scale assessments.

Access: The availability of education and educational opportunities for all learners.

**Biological embedding:** The link between children's early development (prenatal, ages 0–2) and maternal health and environmental factors.

**Causal relationship:** An association between at least two variables where one necessarily precedes the other temporally.

**Cumulative effects:** Additive effects of factors, as in the development of prosperity as a cumulative process (e.g., early language development is a prerequisite for future skills).

**Educational attainment:** The completion of and transition from one level of schooling to the next.

**Engagement:** The cognitive, behavioural, and affective levels of responsiveness towards school and learning.

**Equality:** The achievement of comparable Prosperity Outcomes for all students.

Equity: The achievement of comparable Foundations for Success for all students.

**Foundations for Success:** Research-based factors that have direct associations to Prosperity Outcomes, including family factors, institutional factors and community factors.

**Health and well-being:** The term used to represent the psychological, physical, social, cognitive, and material well-being of an individual.

**Institutional selection:** Selection for programs as a result of success at a stage of child development.

Pervasive factors: Factors known to have a strong correlation with multiple Prosperity Outcomes.

**Potent factors:** Factors known to have a strong correlation with at least one Prosperity Outcome and a causal relationship with that outcome.

**Prosperity Outcomes:** Universal set of markers of child development that represent thriving. Prosperity Outcomes specific to PCAP include educational attainment, academic achievement, health and well-being, engagement, and social-emotional learning.

**Proximal factors:** Factors known to have a strong correlation with one Prosperity Outcome.

Social capital: Social networks or connections of individuals through group membership.

**Social-emotional learning (SEL):** The intrapersonal and interpersonal skills that support learning.

- American Psychological Association (APA). (n.d.). *APA dictionary of psychology*. Retrieved December 13, 2021, from https://dictionary.apa.org/academic-achievement
- Anderson, L.W. (2004). Increasing teacher effectiveness (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Anderson, R. C. (1984). Role of the reader's schema in comprehension, learning, and memory. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), *Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and content texts* (pp. 243–258). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). (2012). *The Australian curriculum: Science*. Australia: Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority.
- Biemiller, A. (2006). Vocabulary development and instruction: A prerequisite for school learning. In D. K. Dickinson & S. B. Neuman (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (Vol. 2), (pp. 41–51). New York: Guilford Press.
- Biemiller, A., & Slonim, N. (2001) Estimating root word vocabulary growth in normative and advantaged populations: Evidence for a common sequence of vocabulary acquisition. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, 498–520.
- Binkley, M., & Linnakylä, P. (1997). Teaching reading in the United States and Finland. In M. Binkley, K. Rust, and T. Williams (Eds.), *Reading literacy in an international perspective*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education.
- Blachowicz, C. L. Z., Fisher, P. J. L., Ogle, D., & Watts-Taffe, S. (2013). Teaching academic vocabulary, K-8: Effective practices across the curriculum. New York: Guilford Press.
- Blades, D. (2019). Science Education in British Columbia: A New Curriculum for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. In C.D. Tippett & T.M. Milford (Eds.), *Science Education in Canada: Consistencies, Commonalities, and Distinctions* (pp. 13–36). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-06191-3\_2
- Borgonovi, F., & Pál, J. (2016). A framework for the analysis of student well-being in the PISA 2015 study: Being 15 in 2015. (OECD Education Working Papers, No. 140). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5jlpszwghvvb-en
- Bruffée, K. A. (1986). Social construction, language and the authority of knowledge. *College English*, 48(8), 773–790.
- Bruner, J. (1990). Acts of meaning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bybee, R. (1997). Achieving scientific literacy. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bybee, R., McCrae, B., & Laurie, R. (2009). PISA 2006: An assessment of scientific literacy. *Journal* of Research in Science Teaching, 48(8), 865–883.
- Carpiano, R.M., Lloyd, J.E.V., & Hertzman, C. (2009). Concentrated affluence, concentrated disadvantage, and children's readiness for school: A population-based, multi-level investigation. *Social Science and Medicine*, 69(3), 420–432.
- Carroll, J. (1963). A model of school learning. The Teachers College Record, 64(8), 723-733.

- Chapman, E. (2003). Alternative approaches to assessing student engagement rates. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 8*(13), 1–10.
- Church, E., & Bereiter, C. (1983). Reading for style. Language Arts, 60, 470-476.
- Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. (1990). (8th ed.) Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (1996). SAIP Science. Toronto: Author.
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (1997). Common framework of science learning outcomes K to 12. Toronto: Author.
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (2000). SAIP 1999: Report on Science II assessment. Retrieved from http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/ Attachments/136/saip1999.science2.en.pdf
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (2002). School achievement indicators program (SAIP): Report on Mathematics III assessment. Toronto: Author.
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (2005a). *Pan-Canadian assessment program: Literature review of mathematics assessment and test design*. Toronto: Author.
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (2005b). SAIP 2004: Report on Science III assessment. Retrieved from http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/62/ SAIP-Science2004.en.pdf
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (2005c). The pan-Canadian assessment program: Literature review of science assessment and test design. Toronto: Author (unpublished report).
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (2008). PCAP-13 2007: Report on the assessment of 13-year-olds in reading, mathematics, and science. Toronto: Author.
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (2011). PCAP-2010: Report on the pan-Canadian assessment of mathematics, science, and reading. Toronto: Author.
- Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (2020). Pan-Canadian Systems-Level Framework on Global Competencies. Toronto: Author.
- Crocker, R. (2005). The Pan-Canadian Assessment Program. A Concept Paper, Draft 2. Unpublished manuscript.
- Crosnoe, R., Mistry, R., & Elder, G. (2002). Economic disadvantage, family dynamics, and adolescent enrollment in higher education. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(3), 690–702.
- Earl, L. M. (2003). Assessment as learning. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Emerson, C. (1983). Outer word and inner speech: Bakhtin, Vygotsky, and the internalization of language. *Critical Inquiry*, *10*, 245–264.
- Fensham, P. (2000). Providing suitable content in the "science for all" curriculum. In R. Millar, J. Leach, & J. Osbourne (Eds.), *Improving science education: The contribution of research*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Fensham, P., & Harlen, W. (1999). School science and public understanding of science. *International Journal of Science Education*, 21(7), 755–763.

Forte, I., & Schurr, S. (1993). The definitive middle school guide. Nashville: Incentive Publications.

Gee, J. (1996). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Falmer Press.

- Gray, W. S. (1960). The major aspects of reading. In H. Robinson (Ed.), Sequential development of reading abilities. *Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 90* (pp. 8–24). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gresham, F., Elliott, S., Metallo, S., Byrd, S., Wilson, E., Erickson, M., Cassidy, K., & Altman, R. (2020). Psychometric fundamentals of the social skills improvement system: Social-emotional learning edition rating forms. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 45(3), 194–209.
- Harpham, T. (2003). *Measuring the social capital of children*. (Young Lives Working Papers, No. 4). South Bank University.
- Harrison, C. (2004). Understanding reading development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.
- Haveman, R., Sandefur, G., Wolfe, B., & Voyer, A. (2004). Trends in children's attainments and their determinants as family income inequality has increased. In K. Neckerman (Ed.), *Social inequality* (pp. 149–88). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heinsen, L. (2011). Why scientific literacy must be a focus of science education: An argument for the literate citizen. *Alberta Science Education Journal*, *42*(1), 28–32.
- Hidi, S., & Berndorff, D. (1998). Situational interest and learning. In L. Hoffmann, A. Krapp, K. A. Renniger, & J. Baumert (Eds.), *Interest and Learning*. Kiel, Germany: Institute for Science Education at the University of Kiel.
- Hodson, D. (2002). Some thoughts on scientific literacy: Motives, meanings, and curriculum implications. *Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching*, 3(1). Retrieved from http:// www.ied.edu.hk/apfslt/
- Hodson, D. (2006). Why we should prioritize learning about science. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education.* 6(3), 293–311.
- Hoyles, C., Wolf, A., Molyneux-Hodgson, S., & Kent, P. (2002). Mathematical skills in the workplace: Final report to the Science, Technology and Mathematics Council. London: Institute of Education, University of London; Science, Technology and Mathematics Council.
- Jeynes, W.H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 40(3), 237–269.
- Johnston, P., & Costello, P. (2005). Principles for literacy assessment. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40(2), 256–267.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: A construction-integration model. *Psychological Review*, 95, 163–182.
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Korupp, S., Ganzeboom, H., & Van Der Lippe, T. (2002). Do mothers matter? A comparison of models of the influence of mothers' and fathers' educational and occupational status on children's educational attainment. *Quality & Quantity, 36*, 17–42.
- Lapointe, V.R., Ford, L., & Zumbo, B.D. (2007). Examining the relationship between neighbourhood environment and school readiness for kindergarten children. *Early Educational Development*, 18(3), 473–495.
- Lara, L., & Saracostti, M. (2019). Effect of parental involvement on children's academic achievement in Chile. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01464
- Laurie, R. (2020). *Modernizing the PCAP conceptual questionnaires framework: From educational productivity to educational prosperity*. REL Consultants Inc.
- Legros, D., & Crinon, J. (2002). Psychologie des apprentissages et multimedia. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Lewis, D. M., Mitzel, H. C., Mercado, R. L, & Schultz, E. M. (2012). The bookmark standard setting procedure. In G. J. Cizek (Ed.), *Setting performance standards: Foundations, methods, and innovations* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). (pp. 225–254). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Martens, P. J., Chateau, D. G., Burland, E. M., Finlayson, G. S., Smith, M. J., Taylor, C. R., Brownell, M. D., Nickel, N. C., Katz, A., Bolton, J. M., & PATHS Equity Team (2014). The effects of neighborhood socioeconomic status on educational and health outcomes for children in social housing. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(11), 2103–2113.
- Melby, J.N., Conger, R.D., Fang, S.-A., Wickrama, K.A.S., & Conger, K.J. (2008). Adolescent family experiences and educational attainment during early adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(6), 1519–1536.
- Minsky, M. (1975). A framework for representing knowledge. In P. H. Winston (Ed.), *The psychology of computer vision* (pp. 211–277). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mullis, I., Martin, M., Kennedy, A. M., Trong, K., & Sainsbury, M. (2009). *PIRLS 2011 assessment framework*. Boston: TIMMS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2000). *Principles and standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2006). *Curriculum focal points for prekindergarten through Grade 8 mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Research Council. (1989). *Everybody counts: A report to the nation on the future of mathematics education*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- National Research Council. (2012). A *framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- O'Grady, K., & Houme, K. (2014). PCAP 2013 report on the Pan-Canadian assessment of science, reading, and mathematics. Toronto: Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. Retrieved from: http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/337/PCAP-2013-Public-Report-EN.pdf
- Olson, L. (2002, May 22). Up close and personal. *Education Week* online. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2002/05/22/37assess.h21. html?qs=%22up+close+and+personal%22
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2004). Leading math success, mathematical literacy Grades 7–12: The report of the expert panel on student success in Ontario. Toronto: Author.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2003). *PISA 2003 assessment framework: Mathematics, reading, science and problem solving knowledge and skills,* 2003. Paris: Author.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2006a). *Evolution of student interest in science and technology studies policy report*. Retrieved from https://web-archive.oecd.org/2012-06-15/144030-36645825.pdf
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2006b). Assessing scientific, reading and mathematical literacy: A framework for PISA 2006. Paris: Author.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2006c, May). *Contextual framework for PISA 2006*. Preliminary version. Paris: Author. Retrieved from https://www.acer.edu.au/files/pisa2006\_context\_framework.pdf
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2013). *PISA 2012 assessment and analytical framework: Mathematics, reading, science, problem solving and financial literacy.* Paris: Author.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2014, February). *PISA* 2012 results: What students know and can do — Student performance in mathematics, reading and science (Volume I, Revised ed.). Paris: Author.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2018). PISA for Development assessment and analytical framework: Reading, mathematics and science. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264305274-en
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2021). *Beyond academic learning: First results from the Survey of Social and Emotional Skills*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/92a11084-en
- Osborne, J. (2007). Science education for the twenty-first century. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics,* Science & Technology Education, 3(3), 173–184.
- Osborne, J., Simon, S., & Collins, S. (2003). Attitudes towards science: A review of the literature and its implications. *International Journal of Science Education*, *25*, 1049–1079.
- Paris, S. G. (2005). Reinterpreting the development of reading skills. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 40(2), 184–202.
- Peskin, J. (1998). Constructing meaning when reading poetry: An expert-novice study. *Cognition and Instruction*, *16*, 235–263.
- Rayner, K., & Reichle, E. D. (2010). Models of the reading process. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, *1*, 787–799.
- Roberts, D. (2007). Scientific literacy/science literacy. In S. Abell, and L. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 729–780). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Roberts, D. (2011). Competing visions of scientific literacy: The influence of a science curriculum policy image. In C. Linder, L. Östmaan, D. Roberts, P-O. Wickman, G. Erickson, and A. MacKinnon (Eds.), *Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy* (pp. 11–27). New York: Routledge.

Rosenblatt, L. (1980). What facts does this poem teach you? Language Arts, 57, 386–394.

- Ruddell, R. B., & Unrau, N. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Newark, DE: International Literacy Association.
- Scarborough, H. S. (2002). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory and practice. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (pp. 97–110). New York: Guilford Press.
- Schallert, D. L. (1982). The significance of knowledge: A synthesis of research related to schema theory. In W. Otto & S. White (Eds.), *Reading expository material* (pp. 13–48). New York: Academic Press.
- Schallert, D. L. (1991). The contribution of psychology to the teaching of the language arts. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts*. New York: Macmillan.
- Schank, R.C. (1982). Dynamic memory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. (1977). Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Scheerens, J., & Bosker, R. J. (1997). The foundations of educational effectiveness. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Science Council of Canada. (1984). Science for every student: Educating Canadians for tomorrow's world. Report 36. Ottawa: Author.
- Simon, M., & Forgette-Giroux, R. (2002, October 20). Senior school board officials: Perceptions of a national achievement assessment program. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(46). Retrieved from http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent. cgi?article=1407&context=coedu\_pub
- Sinatra, G.M., Heddy, B.C., & Lombardi, D. (2015). The challenges of defining and measuring student engagement in science. *Educational Psychologist*, 50(1), 1–13.
- Sjöström, J., & Eilks, I. (2018). Reconsidering different visions of scientific literacy and science education based on the concept of Bildung. In Y. J. Dori, Z. R. Mevarech, & D. R. Baker (Eds.), *Cognition, metacognition, and culture in STEM education* (pp. 65–88). Springer.
- Smith, M. C., Mikulecky, L., Kibby, M. W., & Dreher, M. J. (2000). What will be the demands of literacy in the workplace in the next millennium? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(3), 378–383.
- Snowling, M. J., & Hulme, C. (Eds.). (2005). *The science of reading: A handbook*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Stacey, K., & Wiliam, D. (2013). Technology and assessment in mathematics. In *Third international handbook of mathematics education* (pp. 721–751). New York: Springer.
- Stanovich, K. E., & West, R. F. (2000). Individual differences in reasoning: Implications for the rationality debate. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23, 645–665.
- Statistics Canada. (2021). *Educational attainment of a person*. https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/ p3Var.pl?Function=DEC&Id=85134
- Stiggins, R. (2002, June 6). Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment FOR learning. *Phi* Delta Kappa International On-line, 83(10). Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/ doi/10.1177/003172170208301010

- Storch, S. A., & Whitehurst, G. J. (2002). Oral language and code-related precursors to reading: Evidence from a longitudinal structural model. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 934–947.
- Tan, P. (2016). Science Education: Defining the Scientifically Literate Person. SFU Educational Review, 9. https://doi.org/10.21810/sfuer.v9i.307
- "The Free Dictionary." Retrieved from www.thefreedictionary.com/mathematics
- Tippett, C. D., Milford, T. M., & Yore, L. D. (2019). Epilogue: The Current Context of Canadian Science Education and Issues for Further Consideration. In C. D. Tippett & T. M. Milford (Eds.), Science Education in Canada: Consistencies, Commonalities, and Distinctions (pp. 311– 337). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-06191-3\_15
- UNESCO. (2011). Creating and sustaining literate environments. Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ ark:/48223/pf0000214653?posInSet=1&queryId=1567e18d-9a71-48c5-889e-c6063c83ff4d
- Valladares, L. (2021). Scientific Literacy and Social Transformation: Critical Perspectives About Science Participation and Emancipation. *Science & Education*, 30(3), 557–587. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11191-021-00205-2
- Van de walle, J.A. (2004). *Elementary and middle school mathematics: Teaching developmentally* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallace, C. (1992). Reading. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(3), 249–294.
- Willms, J.D. (2018). Learning divides: Using data to inform educational policy. (Information Papers, No. 54). UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- World Health Organization (WHO). (1948). Constitution of the World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/about/governance/constitution
- Yore, L. D. (2012). Science Literacy for All: More than a Slogan, Logo, or Rally Flag! In K. Tan & M. Kim (Eds.), *Issues and Challenges in Science Education Research: Moving Forward* (pp. 5-23). Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-3980-2\_2

## PCAP 2023 Assessment Framework

cmec.ca