

HB 2680 WORK GROUP MEETING

June 10, 2016

Facilitator's Summary

Facilitated by DS Consulting

The following facilitator's summary is intended to capture basic discussion, decisions and actions, as well as point out future actions or issues that may need further discussion at upcoming meetings. These notes are not intended to be the "record" of the meeting, only a reminder for work group participants.

Work Group members present for all or part of the meeting: Todd Bloomquist (Grants Pass SD), Parasa Chanramy (Stand for Children), Lisa Damold (ODE), Laurie Dougherty (Seaside SD), Lisa Kane (OEA), Michael Lindbald (Linfield), Diane Mattison-Nottage (OEA-Springfield Public Schools), Susan McLain (Legislature), Colleen Mileham (OEA), Jim Popham (UCLA), Chad Putnam (Coos Bay SD), Mark Redmond (Malheur ESD), Collin Robinson (PTA), Andrea Shunk (OEA), Chuck Tomac (State Improvement NETWORK), and Maureen Wolf (Tigard-Tualatin SD).

ODE Staff and other partners present for all or part of the meeting: Rachel Aazzerah (ODE-OAA), Sandra Anderson (Medford SD), Hella Bel-Hadj Amour (Education NW), Derek Brown (ODE-OAA), Holly Carter (ODE-OAA), Isis Contreras (Medford SD), Mark Endsley (Education NW), Renée LeDoux (ODE-OAA), Brad Lenhardt (ODE-OSS), Vicki Nishioka (Education NW), Ranae Quiring (Salem SD), Josh Rew (ODE-OAA), Angela Roccograndi (Education NW), Susie Strangfield (OIT), Steve Slater (ODE-OAA), Bryan Toller (ODE-OAA), and Bridget Wheldon (Salem SD).

Participants on the phone for all or part of the time: Pat Burk (Portland State University), Jay Mathisen (Bend La Pine SD), Sandi McClary (Instructional Coach), Dev Sinha (Education NW), and Dave Vanloo (Bend La Pine SD).

Facilitation Team: Facilitator: Donna Silverberg, Facilitation Support: Emily Plummer; DS Consulting

Opening Remarks and Introductions

DS Consulting Facilitator, Donna Silverberg, welcomed the work group to the third House Bill 2680 Work Group meeting. Donna noted that DS Consulting is a private mediation and facilitation firm who was brought in to help facilitate the work group's discussions and to draft recommendations. She welcomed State Representative McLain from House District 29 to the meeting and went around the room for introductions.

To recap the group's progress, Donna walked through the work group's efforts up to this point, noting that at the January 15th meeting they explored technical evidence regarding Match to Standards; discussed the case study concept; and laid the ground work for future evaluations and recommendations. At the March 18th meeting, the work group revisited the technical evidence, examined student learning gaps, looked at how the districts are using assessment data in decision-making, and reviewed the case study methodology.

Donna reviewed the day's agenda: the purpose of the day's session was to develop shared understanding of the purpose of the statewide summative assessments, evaluate results of the 2014-2015 summative assessments and discuss what the results suggest regarding student learning gaps, discuss findings from the descriptive study and begin to draw connections in preparation for forming recommendations. The June 27th meeting will be focused on finalizing conclusions and recommendations to be included in the final report to the Legislature.

Recap of House Bill 2680 Charge and Process

Holly Carter, Oregon Department of Education, provided a recap of the HB 2680 charge, process and work group's progress. She noted that the work group is comprised of a variety of stakeholders representing Oregon's education system and a wide blend of perspectives. Holly reviewed the work group's charge, noting the progress that they've made, as well as what is still needed:

Charge 1: Evaluate whether the assessment accurately measures student learning:

- a) The work group has discussed the alignment between the summative assessments and the adopted standards and the Common Core, including how the assessments cover the depth and breadth of the Common Core. Additionally, the work group has discussed what features or qualities of the summative assessments have been employed to maximize accuracy of results for all students.

Charge 2: Analyze student learning gaps:

- b) The work group defined gaps in learning for both groups of students, as well as achievement gaps between student groups. The work group still needs to explore how summative assessment can be used to: evaluate both types of learning gaps; evaluate the statewide 2014-2015 assessment results in regards to learning gaps between student groups; and discuss the results of the descriptive study and how schools look at gaps in learning for groups of students.

Charge 3: Identify adjustments in instruction necessary to address student learning gaps.

- c) The work group needs to explore the extent to which summative assessment data can and should be used to identify adjustments in instruction to address student learning gaps. Also, the group will review the results of the descriptive study and discuss how schools identify instructional adjustments to address student learning gaps.

Exploring the Purpose of Oregon's Statewide Summative Assessment

Mary Anderson, Oregon Department of Education, shared the purpose of the statewide summative assessment. She reviewed the three types of assessments: formative, interim, and summative. She explained that the State is trying to implement a balanced assessment system with formative assessments used to support learning while the student is involved in instruction; interim assessments to periodically determine how groups of students are progressing; and summative assessments to determine knowledge and skills acquired by groups of students over time.

Mary asked the work group to discuss the following:

- 1) What types of assessment will most effectively identify gaps in learning for groups of students?
- 2) What types of assessments will most effectively identify achievement gaps between student groups?
- 3) How does your school/district use different types of assessment data to identify learning gaps (both for groups of students and between student groups)?

The work group discussed the questions in small groups and shared the highlights of their conversations back with the larger group:

- We need common understanding and definition for the criteria and purposes for the three types of assessments, rather than assuming that everyone uses the same criteria. The criteria, purposes, and user groups for each assessment need to be clear. We also need progress monitors.
- How do we define 'group' at the project and state-wide level? Who does this definition serve?
- Forensic work needs to be done with the data to get at why the gaps exist.

- We need to make sure that this is a learning process around the test by encouraging interaction with the class and collaboration.
- This needs to be a balanced assessment system with formative tools and internal diagnostics.
- The Smarter Balance package is more than just the test. Right now we are taking a macro look at the test, however, as other tools are implemented, more information will be available in terms of achievement standards. It could be helpful to use the entire Smarter Balance package at a micro level to inform what to do.

Evaluating Student Learning Gaps

Josh Rew, Oregon Department of Education, provided a brief look into the 2014-2015 English/ Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematic assessment results. The objective of Josh's presentation was to evaluate the 2014-2015 statewide results and to identify what the results illustrate about student learning gaps and gaps between student groups. Josh provided a historical view of assessing achievement gaps, noting that the first study of achievement gaps was conducted 50 years ago and assessed achievement in several areas across groups. The original assessment stemmed from the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Since then, there have been numerous reports and studies on the results. He noted that between 1965 and the early 1980's the gaps between student groups were decreasing; however, in the early 1980's the gaps began increasing again.

Josh noted that the 2014-2015 data he presented was not standardized data, thus it shows differences in the means. He advised caution in interpreting the data due to low participation rates for 11th grade, those identifying as black/African American, as well as those with disabilities:

ELA results show an increasing trend in meeting the standards as student grade levels increase. However, math results show a different trend with 41-45% of early grades meeting the standards, 38-43% of middle schoolers meeting the standards, and only 31% of 11th graders meeting standards. Again, Josh noted that, for a variety of reasons, 11th grade participation rates were low, thus impacting the results.

Josh presented data broken out by a variety of groups including economically disadvantaged, ethnic and racial background. He suggested caution when looking at this kind of achievement gap, noting that the data should be used as an indicator of a gap, instead of measuring the magnitude of the gap. He noted that for ELA, 54% of all students met standards, whereas 41% of economically disadvantaged students met the standard. For math 41% of all students met the standards, versus 29% of the economically disadvantaged students. The average ELA scores are increasing across student-years for all racial/ethnic groups, however, the magnitude of the gaps widen as grades increase. This is the same trend for math scores.

He pointed to the gaps between black/African American, Hispanic and white students, noting that the gaps are significant and as the students increase in grade, the gap between black and Hispanic groups starts to increase with Hispanic students starting to improve more significantly than black students. Josh said that one reason for this could be that ESL students are catching up as a result of added support in early years.

The work group members shared the following thoughts and questions:

- Q: Was there a large opt-out group during this timeframe?
 - A: Josh noted that the opt-out estimate for 2014-2015 was 10%.
- It was pointed out that the 2014-25 test was new which may have had an impact on the results.
 - A: Josh agreed, noting that it was a new assessment, with new administrators. All grades were tested at their grade level, and the difference is in who is testing and when, which could have contributed to the results. Josh continued that there are a number of factors at

play which made him urge caution to the group when reviewing and making determinations about the results.

- Q: How do these gaps compare to the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS)?
 - A: Josh explained that the results look similar to what you would see in OAKS and other assessments. He noted that past gaps had an increasing trend in gaps across the years.
- Q: Do the differences in achievement or achievement gap correlate with the performance task versus computer adapted tests? This is a new era and we need to understand the differences in how the two test results pan out.
 - A: Josh explained that they did not tease the results from the two tests apart. He could, but doing so may not be representative of the achievement.
 - It was suggested that, for validity, it would be helpful to probe deeper into the sub-group trends between the ‘performance on task’ versus computer adaptive tests; this may provide insights on how to respond through instructional adjustments.
 - It was suggested that the work group should look at how different groups did on the particular strands to see if there are trends for groups. If there is a trend of student groups struggling, adjustments could be made to help bring them along.
 - It also was suggested that schools need to be familiar with the tools; for instance, when using computers for tests schools need to teach third graders how to persist through the test on the computer before they actually take the test or the wrong thing is being tested.
- When looking at the ELA versus math results, it is important to ask: is every student given the opportunity to learn or are there systematic limitations impacting the opportunity to learn in specific areas?
- Motivation and relevance also need to be explained to the older students. Students know that if they have met the standards they need to meet by their junior year, then there is low motivation to sit through a test if they do not need to. The test needs to be relevant to the student, and the students need to be motivated.
 - Students have to find relevance for themselves and teachers need to adapt so the test is meaningful to the student. Teachers need to think about factors such as the learning style, readiness to learn, and willingness to learn. The work group needs to think about how to give the students and teachers the opportunities they need in order to make this relevant, connect it to the purpose, the teachers and students. We need to implement changes that impact the way that students are learning.
 - In order to identify the needed adjustments in the assessments, there needs to be a deeper dive into what the data can teach us, not just the final summative results.
- Q: When you looked at past data were there any ‘ah-ha’ moments, any big changes, or were the trends consistent?
 - A: Josh explained that he and his team saw patterns and looked at the distribution to see where there was a gap and then looked at that. For example, with OAKS, 8th grade math had the largest gap with highest performers, and smaller gap with the lowest performers and trends could be seen related to economically versus non-economically disadvantaged. However, this was for data gathered before the Community Eligibility Program and so we don’t have it anymore.
 - Q: Can we not get poverty data anymore from these tests?
 - A: Josh explained that with this current program they cannot access the poverty data and they may need to consider other ways to get at poverty data.
- The Smarter Balance assessment is measuring new standards. Prior to 2014/2015, standards were used that were not predicated on college readiness. With the new standards, the student’s

performance levels took a nose-dive. This suggests there may need to be a deeper look at the system.

- Q: Was the Smarter Balance assessment designed to rate how the state, district, schools, classroom, or subgroup were performing? What was the target for Smarter Balance? To whom does it apply? and where is it the most effective?
 - A: Josh responded that the systems can be defined in many ways –school, district, state. The Smarter Balanced test was designed to be a part of a system of assessments. However, Oregon does not have the full system at this point. Some districts have implemented a more complete assessment system and have filled the gaps. However, there is not consistency across the state.
 - It was added that the Smarter Balanced assessment was built by assessment experts and the thought was to cover the Common Core state standards. Content coverage dominated the thinking during development.
- The Smarter Balance is evaluating a target, and so it does not provide a picture of the individual and their understanding. At the group level, the aggregate gives an idea of how the group is performing at that target.
- What is the definition of college readiness? When talking about career and college readiness, it is important to think about the purpose of the tests – the students may not have an understanding of ‘career and college readiness’ and thus the use and value of these tests may be less effective. This needs to be clarified to get student buy-in on the need for taking the test and taking it seriously.

Exploring the Descriptive Study Results

Derek Brown and Steve Slater, ODE, reviewed the purpose and methodology of the descriptive study. The purpose of the study was to provide evidence to support identification of local conditions and best practices that can contribute to improved outcomes for all students. The study included schools from around the state that represented Oregon’s diversity and focused on communities that ‘beat the odds’ for all students in their school, as measured by the 2014-2015 statewide assessments. The results of the study were intended to support the work group’s final recommendations by providing first-hand information from educators.

The answers to the Work Group’s 2nd and 3rd charge, at the state level, are difficult to make at this time. The study was designed to provide information at the more localized level and to collect information from practitioners to better understand the factors contributing to the local progress and success. For the study, Education Northwest reached out to schools and districts throughout the state to find out what Smarter Balanced meant to them and to get information on how they used the test results once they received it.

Steve explained what it means for a school to be ‘beating the odds’, noting that, since 1991 they have been assessing schools that are disproportionately disadvantaged, however, some are doing well on the tests. Department of Human Services data was used to identify these schools since they knew that ODE’s Community Eligibility Program was, in a sense, masking the data. To select the sites for the study, a computer program was developed that predicts a school’s achievement and then compares it to their actual achievement. The program identifies schools that have higher scores than would be predicted from demographic factors alone, taking into account the geographic location and size of school. Some factors included:

- Percent of students economically disadvantaged;
- Percent of students who are English learners;
- Percent of students chronically absent;
- Percent of students mobile within the school year; and
- Percent of students in underserved racial/ethnic groups.

Hella Bel-Hadj Amour, Education Northwest, shared that the Northwest Comprehensive Center helped design the study, which used mixed-method design. The three initial study questions are provided below, and the actual cover letter and survey questions were provided to the work group prior to the session and was in their session packets:

1. What are the characteristics of the six ‘beating the odds’ schools in Oregon?
2. What are the local conditions present in these schools with regards to instruction, leadership, assessment, professional learning, collaboration, and school conditions for learning?
3. What are the perceived benefits and challenges encountered by the study schools? How do the schools address identified challenges?

The descriptive study included four elementary, middle and high schools that met the criteria under the ‘beat the odds’ framework. There was a range in size and location of the schools. All teachers were provided the survey, which were mostly distributed at staff meetings. They did not choose any schools with ‘low participation’ rates, only schools above the 95% participation rate. In total, there was an 88% response rate from the middle Schools (n = 50), and 75% response rate from the high Schools (n = 32).

The preliminary results of the study were provided to the work group; however, it only included data from the middle and high schools, since the elementary School data had not yet been compiled. Hella stressed that the data was preliminary and from a small sample size. However, she noted interesting trends in the data presented. The work group broke into small groups to look at the data and discussed:

- 1) What do you notice in the data?
- 2) What patterns do you see in the data?
- 3) What implications could this have for your charge?

Following the small group conversations, work group members reconvened in the large group and reflected on the following:

- High performing schools tend to use the assessment data correctly to drive school based discussions.
- When looking at possible implications of the results, it is difficult to go far with the analysis without contrasting the results to those of low-performing schools.
- The grade-level or content related discussions were frequent and effective, however, cultural content was low both in frequency and efficacy.
 - These schools had ‘beat the odds’, but culturally related practices were low. This begs the question of whether the cultural-related practices are even lower in schools that are not beating the odds?
- Some of the concepts need to be better defined to get at the action.
- There is change in the perceived quality of teaching versus teaching practices.
- Some of the feedback could inform further development of the survey. For example, teachers report that they discuss student achievement in teacher meetings; however, this does not get at how and what is discussed. It would be good to use this as a step to refine the tool in order to get more accurate and valid information in the future.
- There are differences between middle and high schools suggesting that students are coming from two different worlds, with two different support systems. How do we make this a successful transition?
- Consider supervision and achievement connections. In high school, there are more teachers who are operating in subjects that are not tested. They may be disconnected from the test’s goals and how it applies to them as teachers. The survey did not ask teachers to clarify what subject they taught.

- It would be interesting to know when each participant started teaching to the Common Core. This information may be easily gathered by calling the study schools.
- We should consider deliberate faculty training on equity, similar to the program in Alaska which builds it into competency standards and encourages schools and teachers to build it in.

Hella handed out draft sections of the descriptive study report, containing information derived from teacher (mostly ELA and math teachers) and administrator focus groups. She asked the work group to review the sections with the following guiding questions in mind:

- 1) What data, especially from different kinds of assessments, do schools use to identify learning and achievement?
- 2) How do they use this information to inform and differentiate instruction and address gaps?
- 3) What are the implications for our work?

Work group members reviewed the draft report and preliminary data and discussed in small groups.

Panel Discussion

Staff from two of the schools that participated in the ‘beat the odds’ descriptive study joined the work group for the afternoon. Principal Isis Contreras and third grade teacher Sandra Anderson, were present from the Medford School District; and principal Bridget Wheldon and instructional coach Ranae Quiring, were present from the Salem-Keizer School District.

Isis shared that their school is small and a Title One school. They have 678 students, of which 16% are in special education, 40% are ESL, 26% identify as Latino, the mobility rate is 24% and there are six different languages spoken. Bridgette shared that their school is also a Title One school and has about 50% of the students on free or reduced lunch. There are 15 different language spoken at the school. On the 2014 state assessments, they performed 14% higher in ELA and 16% higher in math, when compared to other schools with similar demographics.

Work group members had the opportunity to ask the panel questions regarding their experience with summative assessments and Smarter Balanced. The following questions and responses were posed during the panel discussion:

Oregon has transitioned to the Common Core state standards and a new statewide summative assessment, have these changes had an impact on your approach to instruction? If so, how?

- We look at the differences in the standards and assessments and focus on communicating how to do the work. Some teachers are fairly confident, however, the standards are deeper, more rigorous, and the language is vague. We help the teachers determine what the standards mean and model how to communicate them to the students. Additionally, we work with teachers to determine how to best assess the new standards as they implement them.
- The new assessments have profoundly changed the way we look at data and how we use data to instruct. We look carefully at the standards and deconstruct them to make sure we understand what needs to be taught, the objectives, and then make sure there are clear learning targets for students.
- As a teacher, the new assessments caused me to take a step back: I do not look to the curriculum anymore, and instead, I look at the gaps and figure out how to fill the gaps. The curriculum does not address all the standards. We do actually do that a lot at our school: teachers do this on our PLC days. I have a student teacher this year that did not learn about the Common Core in college, so I forced her to sit down with me with every lesson and say ‘where are we addressing a

standard or standards?’ Now she is more prepared to step in and teach where there is not curriculum. This is something that we have really focused on at our school.

- We work on communication skills and making thinking visible - we need to teach kids how to make their thinking visible, through writing, purposeful speaking and listening. Making thinking visible is a theme that comes out across all of the standards. We reflect on the meta-cognition, how we got the answer, not just the answer. We teach students to communicate how they solved the problem – this is how they will transfer knowledge. It was a stretch for a lot of teachers to learn how to have effective ‘think alouds’ for teachers and students.

What is the role of the PLC? How are the PLCs functioning as a larger team, for example, across grades? How do your PLCs look?

- Teachers are engaged in meetings both before and after school. We have department and school-wide PLCs, however, not specifically grade level PLCs. We have school-wide PLCs for special education and AVID, and site councils. We also do PD’s together; we meet together for a minimum of one hour per month. We’ve created a feedback loop – things go out to the team and then come back to the whole. As principal, I am in classrooms watching how strategies are implemented, and after a while, the strategy implementation is tied to the teacher’s performance evaluation. We want the things that we are learning about to become part of the teacher’s routine.
- We get together in one room to collaborate on the PLCs and include the specialists in those conversations. We are trying to improve the work that we do through the PLCs, focusing on the critical questions: What do you want students to know? What are they learning and what do we want them to learn? What are you going to do? We also do an audit to make sure we are implementing. We have school wide PLCs on how to address the gaps, then we assess the plan. We now have three data-review days and instructional adjustment days. Also, as principal, I participate alongside the teachers in a ‘math studio’ workshop for one day out of the month because so few teachers felt confident teaching math.
- We are a small school, so collaboration is built in. Also, many of our staff members have been at the school for years, and it is not uncommon to check-in with others on how the individual students are doing and what needs to be done to help them.
- We have a PLC ‘meeting note template’ that asks the four questions. At first we noticed that the notes were coming back not responding to the questions, so we then had strategic conversations and provided suggestions to help the teams amp up the notes and get more from the process. This new thinking has been practiced for the last semester; however, we want to make this a best practice routine.
- As a leader, I make sure to close the communication loop. When I get notes from the meetings, I respond to them and ask what they need from me. This follow-through and communication is very important. Also, leadership has to protect and advocate for more PLC time, as long as they are engaging in high-leverage practices. We also work to build in efficiencies in the process.

How do you approach the Smarter Balanced mindset?

- We had a target growth goal from the administration that was communicated to the principals. We engaged the parents in the learning process by having a ‘take your parents to school day’. The parents came in to learn about Smarter Balanced, and even did a math lesson and looked at the test questions.
- We start the Smarter Balanced at Kindergarten by getting them used to the process and language. We teach them to explain their work and tell them that they need to be able to explain their work

to someone else on a test—you need to show them what you know. This is about showing what you know. We embrace a positive growth mindset and perseverance.

- Last year was about positive growth mindset. We went school-wide, did a couple of school lessons and they were not-test taking strategies. It was all about growth mindset and how professionals in the real world have to have a positive growth mindset. We provided test taking tips to all of the parents.
- We had all teachers and administration take the test last year.
- The testing window is grueling; it takes a lot of group effort to get the kids through all four tests.

How are you using the Smarter Balanced results in your school? Your district?

- We have such high poverty; we celebrate everything first. It was the first year doing it so and it was very different data than OAKS. Because kids got the results immediately, they wanted to know how they did - did you do your best? Yes. - Then you did good. For the 3rd graders it was a little different because it's more of a baseline score for them because they've had no real testing experience.
- We hold 'data carousels' every quarter, where we share data and targets. We did not communicate the results to the parents because they didn't have conferences the last few years; however, we will have conferences next year and scheduled so that we can share scores with parents.
- We looked at the growth versus achievement. We compared OAKS and SPEC results for individual kids. We had high academic growth and had an assembly with the kids to show them how they grew. We did not show the scores. We tell staff and students to 'keep taking it to the +1', keep growing, this is the expectation and message that we give students and teachers.
- Individually, teachers create student learning goals that are tied to criteria. We work on 'what does communicating learning mean for math?' 'What does this look like?' These questions are addressed at the school and classroom level. The results are A data point, not THE data point.
- We put CSIP as a big focus and then our expectation is that each PLC writes an action plan that supports us achieving our vision as outlined.

What do you expect the response of the staff would be if you said that next year they will not be expected to meet in the PLC teams, and that administration was no longer setting aside time for it?

- They would not likely be supportive; if anything, they would like more time for PLCs. We use that time wisely.
- The ones that are using the data and seeing the value of the data would push back. Others are still learning the value of it.
- We would likely do it anyway; we'd find other time and not submit notes. We've been working across the grades forever; it just wasn't called PLCs.
- Teachers feel the weight and responsibility of using the data to help their students. This is not about the teachers; it is about what they can do for their students. When you establish those kinds of accountability and expectations that the PLC can, teachers come together as a group to take that on. PLC is a valuable way for them to share the weight of responsibility for the kids. Although the collaboration can be complicated sometimes.

How are common formative assessments done in your schools? Did you do PD around the concept of formative assessments?

- We try to carry the standards through from the beginning of the year and bring the data back to the PLCs. We bring data back to the PLCs and develop formative assessments together.

- We work with coaches to determine how to create good formative assessments. This is an area where we are in transition and learning. We also do some district-wide assessments.
- The formative assessment sometimes comes from the curriculum, but mostly from teacher's experiences and where kids are as a whole in our classes. We do some district ones as well.
- There needs to be a balance of assessments – some district, some teacher led. We need to be explicit about the exit slip, what a common formative assessment is, and start using the terms more commonly.
- Some staff know the jargon, and some don't; however, the thinking around the work is not that different, it is the 'how' and 'why' that is different. We clarify what the concepts mean and what they are called now in order to create a common language to move forward in the 'growth mindset'.

Is having common language important?

- Adult learners are different: some need to hear that they are not going to be asked to do something different than they are already doing; others want to learn more systematically. Depending on the learner, we need to help them access the information differently. We are teaching them a new way to talk, so that we know what we are talking about and it saves time.
- We've had 'math studio' in the school for years. Math Studio teaches good instructional practices, for instance how to explain and prove your work. We are now applying this to all subjects, not just math. It gives the kids responsibility for the learning. They are used to this language and it helps them help each other. And I think that we're a standard-based school. We have relied on the standards for years. We'll sometimes jump on the acronym bandwagon, but I think most of us know the language that continues to be in education throughout the years. And we've always wanted to know how you get that answer, and we ask each other that.

When identifying gaps between learning and the learning standards or achievement gap, how do you plan and implement instructional assessment? What's that process?

- We are moving away from only using DIBLES and now using other data as well. When talking about instructional assessments, we are looking at formative assessments in the classroom.
- We use last year's test scores and have a Title I support staff that provides help.
- We also know the kids and where they are.
- There are not a lot of Tier 2 interventions in our school. Teachers in the classroom know the kids best, and the teachers work together to review the data, eventually overtime the gaps will close. We use classroom level intervention and could use more teachers in the room. We encourage teachers to take the time to close the gaps now, so that it may prevent more gaps developing in the future.
- We have a very structured intervention block, so it doesn't matter if you need intervention or not: we have 40-minutes intervention during our schedules in addition to the 90-minutes reading and the 70-minutes math. Everyone gets some sort of extra dose of support through the day.

The panel closed by sharing their final thoughts with the work group. They noted that there is not a 'one-size-fits-all' approach; However, developing relationships with the students and parents IS important. Also important, is embracing the 'growth mindset' and working together to create classroom community so that if something is not working, a solution can be tailored. Students need to be supported and know that it is safe to enter into learning and if they don't understand, it is safe to say so. When goals are clear and the path to get there is clear, it becomes harder not to meet the goal. Cultivating a caring culture, focused on best practices and consistency are also important.

Drawing Connections

Donna asked the work group to begin reflecting on the evidence presented, with the intention of using it to inform the work group's three charges. She suggested that the work group start reflecting on the information now, so that during the next session, they can determine what will go into the report. Donna noted that she will be putting together a draft report for the work group to review and provide edits on.

Donna also provided a proposed 'draft outline' for report:

1. Background
 - a. Brief description of HB 2689
 - b. Brief history of assessment and Smarter Balanced in Oregon
2. Work Group Process
 - a. Members, sessions, what was reviewed/discussed
 - b. Data/evidence/info presented (listed and included in the appendix)
3. Responses to Charge from Legislature
 - a. Evaluate whether the assessment accurately measures student learning;
 - b. Analyze student learning gaps; and,
 - c. Identify adjustments in instruction necessary to address student learning gaps.
4. Final Conclusions/findings of work group

The work group discussed in small groups whether or not they have the information they need to formulate their response to the three charges, and if not, what else is needed. Some felt comfortable and ready to respond to the charges, whereas, some expressed uncertainty, noting that it is impossible to respond to charges 2 and 3 without responding first to charge 1—and answering charge 1 is too soon in the life of the assessment.

One group stressed that the work group should consider the 'three tiers of assessment' as they respond to the charges. Another group reported on their reflections of the lessons learned, noting that the descriptive study illustrated the importance of data, time for collaboration, clear expectations of *meaningful* collaboration, and how to translate these conversations into instruction. It was also noted that there is no 'one-size fits all' approach, and that there are multiple ways to address the learning gaps.

The work group pointed to the limitations of the information that they have and agreed that one year of summative assessment is not enough for them to make conclusions. One group pointed to the word 'instruction' in charge 3, noting that this word should be changed to 'systems', as 'instruction' refers to teachers; if anything, they need to identify changes to the broader systems in order to address the gaps. This point was echoed by many in the room and noted as important to clarify in the final report. Additionally, the role of the summative assessment was noted as needing to be included in the report – the assessment is one tool, however, not the only tool that needs to be utilized to address the issues at hand.

Representative McLain noted that, from her perspective as a legislator, it is okay for the work group to communicate uncertainty in the report. She noted that identifying the limitations and needs is helpful for the Legislature. Representative McLain explained that HB 2680 was intended to recognize that the first year of the assessment was a test and that the program needed to be evaluated. When asked about including a recommendation for additional funding in the report, Representative McLain shared that it would be appropriate to note that additional resources are needed and why they are needed. She also asked that the work group bear in mind that resources are limited and there is interest in getting the available resources back to the districts and schools at a local level. Following the Representative's guidance, the work group expressed greater comfort in their readiness to respond to the charges.

Next Steps

The DS Consulting facilitation team will provide a summary of the session to the work group. Additionally, they will provide a preliminary draft report to the work group prior to the next session. The work group will review the preliminary draft report and be prepared to craft recommendations for the report during the June 27th session. After the June 27th session, DS Consulting will provide a full report to the work group, to which they can then recommend refinements. These refinements will be provided to DS Consulting and incorporated prior to a final work group review and consensus check. The consensus check will be via email. If a work group member is not present at the June 27th they can still provide comments and edits to the draft report. Furthermore, if there are serious concerns brought up by the work group, Donna, Holly and Derek will work with members to resolve the issues. Colleen Mileham, OEA, encouraged the work group to approach the report as an opportunity to provide recommendations on a system of assessment, not just one piece of the system. She offered that the response to charge 1 does not have to be 'yes' or 'no', instead, the work group could help move forward work that is happening and make recommendations on what is needed. This is an educational opportunity. The work group appreciated this framing and all present agreed that they are ready to move the forward with the next steps.

→ **CONSENSUS:** The work group reached strong consensus on the proposal to move forward with the preliminary draft report, input and editing process, and concept of framing the report as a learning opportunity that helps move the work forward (all 1's and 2's).

The work group provided input on the effectiveness of the day's session via a written evaluation (results will be made available to the work group). And with that, the meeting was adjourned.

This meeting summary was drafted and submitted by the impartial facilitation team from DS Consulting. Questions, concerns or suggested improvements may be sent to tory@dsconsult.co.