

Pros and Cons of Separate Versus Embedded Assessments

<i>Separate Assessment</i>		<i>Embedded Assessment</i>	
<i>Pros</i>	<i>Cons</i>	<i>Pros</i>	<i>Cons</i>
Lower cost.	Technology is seen as a separate area.	Highlights the need for technology to be integrated across the curriculum.	Higher cost.
Easier to revise test items based on relevance of standards (i.e. based on changes in technology over time).	It is harder to get separate assessment processes accepted/adopted.	More authentic.	Need to update core standards regularly to keep up with change in technology applications and tools
Shorter tests.	Creates the possibility that computers will be moved out of classrooms into a “monster classroom” for testing only.	Tests are not a separate time commitment.	Longer tests.
Validation process can be more focused and timely initially.		Testing sites/mechanisms are already in place.	Lack of comprehensiveness of the standards—technology literacy standards need to be fully represented in core curriculum standards.
Workable transitional strategy (i.e. in order to get to an embedded assessment, doing a separate assessment might be a good idea).		Embedded standards can be accepted without being viewed as outside the normal assessment process.	Development takes a lot more resources (human, financial, time) to coordinate and develop integrated tests.
Helps maintain a focus on the importance of using technology effectively to enhance instruction.		Students would see the connection between technology literacy and the core curriculum.	Getting buy-in from core content supporters can be a difficult process.
		Requires a great deal of buy-in from all stakeholders.	Must develop items that work for both curriculum and technology literacy.
			Determining which areas of the curriculum should be assessed.
			May lead to lack of focus on the initial goal of determining technology proficiency to meet the goals of NCLB.