

AESRP Meeting Minutes
January 28, 2009
Via Web-ex

Present: Javier Ayala, Allan Bruner, Amy McQueen, Bob Reeves, Dee Hahn, Kathy Hall, Walt Blomberg, Ralph Brown, Helen Maguire, Jackie Barr, Jana Iverson, Jim Conaghan, Linda Samek, Bob Rayborn, Susan Iversen, Theresa Levy, Winston Cornwall, Ken Peterson, Steve Slater.

Visitor: Meghan Kim from Clackamas ESD

Facilitators: Tony Alpert, Barbara Wolfe, Doug Kosty

I. Welcome and Review of agenda

II. Approval of Minutes from Dec 8 & 9

The minutes were approved with no corrections or additions.

III. Report on State Board actions/reactions

Tony gave an overview of Board's stance on topics from previous AESRP recommendations presented at their January meeting.

a. Delay of Essential Skills Assessment Implementation

The Board was not inclined to delay several Essential Skills beyond the 2012 diploma requirement, but indicated a willingness to consider delaying Apply Mathematics until 2014 because of the current economic crisis and lack of resources. This will also align accountability for the Applying Math Essential Skill with the requirement for 3 credits at Algebra 1 and higher. The Board requested a survey which was completed. 81% of those surveyed, representing 50% of Oregon school districts, were in favor. Implementing the delay will require a rewrite of OAR's.

b. Recommendation to change testing from grade 10 to 11

The Board appeared to lean favorably toward moving the required testing grade for AYP and Report Card to grade 11 rather than grade 10. OAIS staff will return to the Board with a specific plan for implementation, which will require a year to put all the appropriate changes in place, and will apply to the US Department of Education for approval to make this change.

c. Recommendation on LEP policy and survey

While the State Board did not give a substantive response to the proposal when it was presented earlier, the January meeting yielded a mix of reactions. The Board requested broader input. A meeting with Title III directors will be held Feb. 6 and their input will be sought. In addition, Tony recommended that some members from the AESRP committee be present to assist in explaining the stance and its implications at the next Board meeting, Feb 19-20 in Salem. This will be a full policy discussion, so a web-ex meeting and e-

mail exchanges will be used to flesh out the issues. Volunteers to assist with this project were Winston Cornwall, Walt Blomberg, Bob Reeves, Kathy Hall, and Ralph Brown. The group will consider inviting some students to present once they have a chance to deliberate on the direction of the presentation. (See Appendix A for additional discussion points.)

d. Report on status of national test review

Tony and Doug reported to the Board that we have received information from vendors of 6 national tests which could be used as alternates for the OAKS assessment – ACT, PLAN, COMPASS, and Work Keys by Educational Testing Systems and SAT and PSAT by the College Board. However, the Board was very clear about the need to move forward quickly with setting a cut score for those tests in order to keep faith with the commitment to have other options for students to demonstrate proficiency.

Staff is working to get information from Beaverton SD that would help in setting cut scores on ACT and PLAN, and with Community College representatives to set scores on COMPASS and Work Keys/Career Readiness Certificate. Efforts will be made to provide recommendations on at least some of these tests by the Board's February meeting.

Work is also underway with College Board to conduct studies using Oregon student data from the recently administered PSAT and graduates of the classes of 2007 and 2008 who took the SAT. Those results are targeted to be presented to the State Board in March.

A sub-group of volunteers will work on how to present the information to the Board. Those working on this committee will be Linda Samek, Javier Ayala, Allan Bruner, and Bob Rayborn. Steve Slater will facilitate the work.

(See Appendix A for additional discussion points)

IV. Local Performance Assessments:

There are two critical decision points that need clarity from AESRP – task development and scoring procedures. The group reviewed the tables showing various levels of ODE, ESD, and district ownership of the processes.

V. Recess

Tony recessed the meeting at 11:05 a.m.

VI. Call to Order

Tony called the meeting back to order at 2:07 p.m.

Present: Dee Hahn, Allan Bruner, Susan Iverson, Bob Reeves Kehaulani Minzghor, Jana Iverson, Jackie Burr, Jim Conaghan, Michelle Zundel, Linda Samek, Steve Slater, Walt Blomberg, Kathy Hall, Bob Rayborn, Theresa Levy, Ken Peterson.

Visitor: Meghan Kim from Clackamas ESD

Facilitators: Tony Alpert, Barbara Wolfe, Doug Kosty

VII. Resumption of discussion about task development and scoring strategies

Discussion of issues around task development and scoring resumed.

- There is a balance needed between the values of consistency and local ownership.
- Strategies may vary based on the essential skill. Speaking is more local; math could be more statewide.
- Each Essential Skill will have to be dealt with separately.
- Speaking requires local control in scoring, but could have a prompt bank.

The group recommended creating a “hybrid” between categories 4 & 5 for Speaking and then doing a broad fiscal impact. Add in some logistics for clarity.

Do the same for Writing. Have some resources available such as prompt banks etc. as part of the planned web-based toolkit.

Most important things to do:

- Create Exemplars of tasks
- Create Task Banks
- Provide professional development in Scoring tasks

(See Appendix A for additional discussion points.)

VIII. Plans for Feb 26 Web-ex meeting

Important agenda items will be as follows:

- Hybrid of 4 & 5
- Report of LEP Issue and State Board response
- Additional information on National Tests
- Progress on Web Resource for Implementation of Local Performance Assessments
- Career and Technical Education Team addition

IX. Adjournment

Tony adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Appendix A – Additional discussion points

Additional discussion on ELL

General concerns from the Board included the issue of allowing students to spend more time in high school. Authority Eugene Garcia out of Arizona State suggests there are fewer concerns about 11th graders than about 8th graders. Concerns about LEP label on the diploma. Need more clarity and present what implementation might look like.

AESRP is concerned about confusion (in business community also) about what is tested in reading and writing. The perception is that reading, writing, and speaking focus on “functional literacy.” But it seems that the tests are more on “general verbal” skills. Businesses want adequate communication in English with a potential employee.

It is important to point out that we are not talking about all ELL students. This is a waiver for highly educated students who are not yet fluent in English. What kind of data would you expect to have to support the position – are there some numbers that would help inform the Board. The Board might also benefit from some interpersonal engagement with representative students. Need a very neutral survey that targets business and post-high school and k-12 about this issue.

Concerns about Civil Rights – disabilities need to provide accommodations. In the past an individual had the burden of proof to show why person needed accommodation.

Another question surrounds students who are currently responding to the state writing test in Spanish and may receive a score indicating success, so they will believe that they have met the Essential Skill requirement for the diploma. Current situation is unclear. We need to provide clear information and direction to districts. There is an urgency now that may not be understood by Board. If they are requiring the literacy essential skills, but have not yet developed a policy for ELL students, we will soon have a crisis.

Additional Discussion on National Tests

ODE asked basic questions of vendors College Board and ACT. ODE reported that “cut score” analysis could be completed by May. State Board wants decisions in February or March. The Board would like to use existing cut scores for Community Colleges and Higher Ed.

Should we just adopt the Community College scores for Writing 121 and Math 111 or take the most common or highest among the Community Colleges? The Board wants an expedited solution that has some basis in other venues.

Steps initiated since State Board meeting – SAT, ACT, PSAT, PLAN, Compass and Work Keys (Career Readiness). Looking for an equivalent to 236 on SAT, ACT, PSAT, PLAN but based on small samples. These scores can be refined later.

AESRP should go on record as saying that we are setting the appropriate studies aside if the Board wants us to move quickly on this. However, demonstrating that student is prepared for the next level of education might be a compromise solution that allows us to focus on bigger picture rather than on the smaller parts of the Essential Skills.

Additional Discussion on Criteria for Task Development and Scoring Procedures

Group agreed that consistency was probably not the highest value based on current Board direction. Need more infrastructure than the Local Option provides because funds for staff development are drying up.

Higher Ed is more interested in Consistency. Superintendents are more supportive of Consistency. Curriculum Directors were interested in local ownership. Many district people want more consistency from state; they don't have time to do all the work required for task development.

Another option would be ODE gives more direction in scoring guides and local ownership comes with designing tasks. This option would provide local ownership and consistency. Need to provide more leadership from state.

There are some issues around state monitoring of districts results with local performance options that will need further discussion.

Tony has a report prepared by an intern on potential legal issues. Two most important findings were that advance notification and clear requirements are the bases under which courts supported states. Get Winston and Holly together before next meeting.

With decades of work, Writing teachers have become normed (calibrated) with the state. But there is also a regression to the mean.

High stakes decision making -- .7 correlation is not generally judged to be adequate for a high stakes decision. Pressure will increase as the time for awarding diplomas approaches.

Address district liability issues through an OAR.