

AESRP Meeting Minutes
October 1, 2009
Oregon Department of Education

Present: Art Anderson, Analicia Santos, Walt Blomberg, Amy McQueen, Linda Samek, Bob Rayborn, Laurie Glazener, Ken Peterson, Kelly Carlisle, Allen Bruner, Dee Hahn, Jim Conaghan, Kathy Hall, Linda Samek, Kehaulani Minzghor, Susan Iversen, Jana Iversen, Ralph Brown,

Visitors: Ron Smith

Facilitators: Tony Alpert, Barbara Wolfe

I. Welcome and Review of agenda

Tony called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

II. Approval of Minutes from June 3, 2009

The minutes were approved.

III. Review of Charter

Tony reviewed the group's charter and the list of accomplishments from the 2008-09 school year. He clarified that AESRP works in conjunction with the Diploma Implementation and Coordination Team and reports to the State Board of Education as recommendations are made.

Accomplishments for the 2008-09 Year and Future Needs:

- A. Criteria for local assessment options – web based toolkit; reading scoring guide
- B. Data Collection Recommendations – amend ADM collection to attach graduation and early leaver data including type of diploma (legislative bill for a new Extended Diploma). Need to address OAR and guidelines for Modified Diploma. Cohort graduation rate request in the works – plan to submit before January so we can use an extended rate to account for 5th year and beyond graduates. Amendment to move state tests and AYP designation to 11th grade is nearly ready to submit to USDOE for 2010-2011. Two tasks left – clarifying issues on storage and logistics for recording in various computer systems. Issues around interface between higher ed (through TSPC) and K12 data. Potential to create a preK-20 data base that can be accessed for research purposes.
- C. Phase in and timeline for Essential Skills
- D. Accomplished a significant amount and will present additional information today to include PSAT and SAT. How will new math standards affect this previous work? New national Common Core Standards – being developed. Oregon has agreed to be part of this in the future. At the same time, discussions about national assessments are also taking place. Assessment Item Sharing Collaborative discussion going on among states – Program for International Assessment also among the various forces currently impacting state assessments.

Finally, AESRP made a recommendation to the State Board that students who are proficient in the content/skills of reading and writing be allowed to demonstrate

proficiency for the purpose of the Essential Skills in languages other than English. AESRP also suggested that a requirement be in place for some specified level of proficiency in English. That recommendation has been discussed at several Board meetings and is scheduled again on the Oct 22 & 23 agenda.

IV. Review of State Board Actions and Expectations on Essential Skills

The State Board adopted the following timeline for phasing in the Essential Skill Proficiency Requirements. In addition, they moved Speaking to the list with other Essential Skills where the timeline has yet to be established.

- Class of 2012 – Reading
- Class of 2013 – Reading and Writing
- Class of 2014 – Reading, Writing, Math

State Board wants Essential Skills to be assessed for all students regardless of whether they are required for graduation for that class.

A distinction was made between Local Performance Assessments and Work Samples. Local Performance Assessments are required in some subject areas to assure that all students have opportunity to learn. Work samples are one of the options for students to show proficiency in Essential Skills. Students at grades 3-high school are required to complete work samples for writing, math, speaking and science. High school students may use work samples in writing and math as one option to demonstrate Essential Skill proficiency.

Currently, there is no Local Performance Assessment for Reading. However, Reading Work Samples will be one option for high school students to show proficiency in Reading if they don't meet the standard for OAKS or other assessments, assuming State Board approval at their Oct 23 meeting.

The intent of the Assessment of Essential Skills Toolkit, recommended by AESRP last year, is to help schools and districts plan how to implement a system to include OAKS and work samples. The work sample option should not feel like an add-on or another hoop to jump through. Instead, teachers and administrators need to see how all the components connect. Training for teachers is critical for the toolkit to be successful. (AESRP will review the current model of the Toolkit later in this meeting.)

V. PSAT and SAT Cut Score Recommendations

Last year, ODE was able to link ACT products using data from some large districts. We were also able to connect with Community Colleges for ACCESS and Compass. Based on that information, AESRP recommended cut scores which the State Board adopted.

Similar data on the PSAT and SAT were not as easily available. Therefore, AESRP decided to defer making a recommendation until we could get more data from the College Board.

A packet of material on SAT/PSAT scores was developed by Steve Slater and presented to the group. There is a strong correlation (.7 or higher) between SAT reading and OAKS reading and between SAT math and OAKS math.

Members also reviewed a probability distribution curve, looking for a 70% chance that a particular SAT score will match with the OAKS score. After reviewing these data and the chart showing College Course Readiness by Test Scores, the group made a recommendation to the State Board.

Motion: Laurie Glazener moved that AESRP recommend the scores of 440 for reading and 450 for math as the cut scores for using the SAT (44 and 45 on the PSAT) as a demonstration of proficiency for the Essential Skills. Kelly Carlisle seconded. The vote of 18 in favor was unanimous.

VI. Working Lunch Discussion

A discussion was held during lunch about the problems presented when members of the AESRP panel are repeatedly absent from meetings. There was no recommended policy decision, but the group expressed concern and emphasized the importance of members attending or resigning so that another representative can be appointed.

VII. Discussion of Mathematics Standards Timeline

A process was described whereby ODE aligning mathematics test items (about 700 per grade level) to the new content standards. A gap analysis was completed and new item writing took place during the summer of 2009. Over 2000 items were written by Oregon educators (mostly teachers) then reviewed by other teachers and the Sensitivity Panel. Approved items will be field tested beginning in January on OAKS. A scale score will be developed for each field tested item.

Additional math items from the Program for International Standards Assessment will also be included in the OAKS assessments for comparison purposes.

Ultimately, ODE will have new items that need to be benchmarked and new “cut scores” or achievement standards set.

At issue are questions such as, what is the fate of students who took the test and the cut score either “goes up or goes down” after their test completion? ODE will be seeking a response from AESRP around issues such as this and their effect on the Essential Skills proficiency for high school diplomas.

We must have achievement level descriptors for at least high school standards in January. These will be built out of the new content standards and informed by the existing achievement standards.

How will this affect college readiness concerns? OUS system has completed a survey of college instructors about the math level needed by college majors. A number of majors do not require as much math and the same is true of some of the apprentice programs.

Recommendations from AESRP will be needed as to what we benchmark against and how we use the data. Requirements for employment and business and industry are a consideration.

Work on Achievement Level Descriptors is scheduled to begin this month (Oct 2009). ODE will bring ALD's to this body for the purpose of looking at Essential Skills.

VIII. Reading Scoring Guide Review and Discussion

Barbara presented the information about the development and field-testing of the Reading Scoring Guide with the handouts in Packet C. Reviewed materials.

Considerable discussion followed about the use of the scoring guide to demonstrate proficiency in the Essential Skill. A number of panel members had concerns that the language of the scoring guide needed to be accessible to teachers in content areas as well as language arts teachers. They also endorsed the need for a student language version of the scoring guide.

- IX.** Adjournment until tomorrow.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. and will resume on Oct 2.

AESRP Meeting Minutes October 2, 2009 Oregon Department of Education

Present: Analicia Santos, Walt Blomberg, Amy McQueen, Bob Rayborn, Laurie Glazener, Ken Peterson, Kelly Carlisle, Allen Bruner, Dee Hahn, Jim Conaghan, Kathy Hall, Linda Samek, Kehaulani Minzghor, Susan Iversen, Ralph Brown, Theresa Levy,

Visitors: Ron Smith

Facilitators: Tony Alpert, Barbara Wolfe

I. Welcome and Review of agenda

Tony called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

II. Resume discussion on Reading Scoring Guide.

A small group was designated to work on the issues raised by the panel in yesterday's discussion about the Reading Scoring Guide while the larger group discussed other assessment issues.

III. Report from Reading Group

Reading Scoring Guide Sub-Committee reported that they recommend approval of the scoring guide and deemed the project "Ready to Go – Ready to Grow."

The subcommittee identified several "Ready to Grow" suggestions for continued improvement

1. Provide multiple opportunities to complete tasks. Implement revisions recommended for the scoring guide and conduct an equity review to assure access for all.
2. Recommend that districts may use one reviewer for work samples – two is good practice but not required.

3. Attention must be given to scorer training -- designing, monitoring and studying the training and determining levels of training required for accuracy. The subcommittee also recommended that ODE work toward developing on-line training.
4. The subcommittee endorses having a recognizable, universal language version of scoring guide – plain language version and/or student version.
5. The subcommittee recommended the standard for passing should be set at 24 for two tasks.
6. The subcommittee was open to degrees of compensatory scoring, but that may contain some necessary minimums – Can 5's compensate for 3's – based on technical adequacy?
7. In recommending a score of 24, the subcommittee assumed that students have an option for revision with feedback provided in scoring guide terms.
8. Student margin notes are seen as a plus as long as there is no penalty for not using them.
9. The subcommittee recommends that the highest score be considered the most accurate.
10. The subcommittee recommends that students be allowed to select the type of tasks completed so that two informative, two literary, or one of each would be acceptable. Should the choice be tied to student's individual education plan and career/education goals?
11. The subcommittee liked the number of prompts or questions per task. They recommend banking some secure tasks on line for district use.
12. The field test data was helpful – but issue arose about the number of false negatives; that may mean this was a harder test but definitely not easier; could be it is a different type of measurement; Experts believe this difference between OAKS and Reading Performance Assessment will narrow once students and teachers are more familiar with the type of task.

After hearing the report of the subcommittee, further discussion of the full group resulted in the following tentative agreements:

- Minimum Score: Any task must score no less than 12, with a minimum score of 4 in each trait. The combined scores must equal 24.
- Opportunity to revise with feedback limited to the scoring guide or official scoring form or the content standards
- What content is required: Any two tasks, at least one of which must be informational
- Recommendations should be devised for selecting prompts

IV. Report on progress of Web-based Toolkit

Barbara reported on the progress in creating an Assessment of Essential Skills Toolkit similar to the product created by the state of Rhode Island for their graduation portfolio.

The group viewed portions of the toolkit, but because of time constraints, were not able to conduct a thorough review at the meeting. The link to the toolkit will be sent out to AESRP members with requests for review and suggestions during October and November.

General discussion about the toolkit resulted in the following comments:

- Web based resources should include a parent section with information about how to challenge, practice, help your child, etc.
- Identify what other local performance assessments are available – how they are normed, what the state role is, etc.
- Make it more of a workspace where people can save and maintain plans, work samples, etc.
- Provide guidance on how to develop and score local assessments
- What training is available? Will there be secure assessments available as well as practice?
- Are there statewide standards for data collection and how will various schools be able to use their own systems to record data?
- Create a standard system for transfer of information from one district to another – The State's role would be in setting up infrastructure and systems.
- How would later skills be phased in? Would they fit into other content areas or would they be stand alone?
- The group recommended that the State Board not add additional essential skills and assessments yet.
- They also endorsed a priority be given to Reading – scoring guide, training, ELL issue, data collection and tracking of kids, issues of students with disabilities and modified diploma, communicating to parents about which type of diploma different students might be working toward, etc..
- The group is concerned about the need for more technical and legal oversight and making such a recommendation to the State Board.

Further discussion around related topics addressed issues listed below:

Writing – what other options might be out there for students as far as different assessments that might be available? What about allowing College Credit bearing courses in high school (i.e. proficiency based coursework —such as IB and AP scores)? Discussion about additional assessment options for writing should be on this year's work plan.

Additional Standardized Tests – What about other tests – those for reading and math such as Reading 180? Should this group review the most popular ones? Should AESRP endorse these or should we create criteria that allow districts to use these assessments as a local assessment option?

Remediation – What are the potential issues for remediation (especially for writing) and the needs for intervention? Make this a planning priority for AESRP.

V. Final Discussion of Reading Scoring Guide and Task Development

The group returned to the Reading Scoring Guide at the end of the day.

A discussion of Reading Task Development resulted in the following:

- ODE needs to develop some secure tasks (within the existing resource constraints)
- How can we assure that curriculum-embedded tasks align and maintain standards of rigor?
- What kinds of training will be available?

The group discussed several methods for screening reliability across the state. Most involve using standardized assessment data as a screening tool and then examining more closely where there are discrepancies to see whether the discrepancy is due to excellent interventions or due to a lack of rigor.

The group resumed the discussion of the score recommendations to present to the State Board.

Motion: Kathy Hall moved and Ralph Brown seconded that AESRP endorse the Reading Scoring Guide with the suggested revisions and endorse the suggestions from the sub-committee, including the option to revise the work sample. Students must earn a score of at least 12 with no trait earning a score lower than 3 on each task, and a student must complete 2 tasks, at least one of which must be informational.

Votes were 11 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention. The motion passed.

VI. Postponing of some Agenda Items

Agenda items on Status Reports on Essential Skills (Locus of Control) and Criteria for Local Assessments were tabled until the next meeting. In addition, final discussions about a work plan for AESRP for this school year were not completed. ODE staff will prepare some recommendations for the next meeting.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m. Next meeting is January 8, 2010 via WebEX.