

House Bill 2680 Work Group Report and Findings

August 2016

Report to the State Board of Education

and

Interim Legislative Committees on Education



House Bill 2680 Work Group Members

<i>Morgan Allen</i> , Oregon School Boards Association	<i>Candace Pelt</i> , Newberg School District
<i>Mary Anderson</i> , Portland Public Schools	<i>Jim Popham</i> , University of California Los Angeles
<i>Todd Bloomquist</i> , Grants Pass School District	<i>Chad Putnam</i> , Coos Bay School District
<i>Pat Burk</i> , Portland State University	<i>David Putnam</i> , Tigard-Tualatin School District
<i>Parasa Chanramy</i> , Stand for Children	<i>Mark Redmond</i> , Malheur ESD
<i>Debbie Connolly</i> , Southern Oregon ESD	<i>Bill Rhoades</i> , West Linn-Wilsonville School District
<i>Laurie Dougherty</i> , Seaside School District	<i>Collin Robinson</i> , Oregon Parent Teachers Association
<i>Colt Gill</i> , Bethel School District	<i>Mary Alice Russell</i> , McMinnville School District
<i>Lisa Kane</i> , Portland Public Schools	<i>Andrea Shunk</i> , Oregon Education Association
<i>LeeAnn Larsen</i> , Beaverton School District	<i>Dev Sinha</i> , University of Oregon
<i>Michael Lindblad</i> , Gresham School District	<i>Susanna Steeg</i> , George Fox University
<i>Diane Mattison-Nottage</i> , Springfield Public Schools	<i>Chuck Tomac</i> , Oregon Continuous Improvement Network
<i>Sandi McLary</i> , Oregon Continuous Improvement Network	<i>Dave Vanloo</i> , Bend LaPine School District
<i>Susan McLain</i> , Oregon State Legislature	<i>Mariko Walsh</i> , St. Paul School District
<i>Colleen Mileham</i> , Oregon Education Association	<i>David Williams</i> , Beaverton School District
<i>Jane Osborne</i> , Hood River School District	<i>Maureen Wolf</i> , Tigard-Tualatin School District

This document was formally adopted by the House Bill 2680 work group on August 24, 2016 and is available for download from the Oregon Department of Education's Web site at <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=5572>.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Background	1
Work Group Process	2
Recap of House Bill 2680 Charge and Process	3
Recommendations/Responses to Questions from 78 th Legislative Assembly	4
Conclusions/Findings of Work Group	10
Recommendations to the Interim Legislative Committees on Education and State Board of Education ..	11
Evidence Reviewed by Work Group.....	13

HB 2680 Work Group Report and Findings

Introduction

The 2015 Oregon Legislature directed the Superintendent of Public Instruction to convene a work group to determine how to implement the results of the statewide summative assessment developed by a multi-state consortium. The work group, comprised of stakeholders interested in education, met four times to review evidence provided by the Oregon Department of Education, draw connections from that evidence, and make recommendations to the Interim Legislative Committees on Education and State Board of Education. This report details the group's process, findings, and recommendations. The report was drafted by the impartial facilitation team from DS Consulting on behalf of the House Bill (HB) 2680 Work Group.

Background

Oregon, like many other states around the country, has been conducting statewide summative assessments of students and reporting on the information to schools and the public for decades. During the 2014-15 school year, the Oregon Department of Education switched the test it was using to a new assessment, Smarter Balanced, developed by a multi-state consortium of experts, which included ODE staff as well as Oregon teachers, higher education faculty and administrators in the field of educational assessments. During that same year, the legislature passed HB 2680 which stated as follows:

- Section 1. (1) The results of a statewide summative assessment developed by a multi-state consortium and administered during the 2014-15 school year may not be used to establish summative ratings of schools or to make summative evaluations of teachers or administrators.
- (2) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall convene a work group to determine how to implement the results of a statewide summative assessment developed by a multi-state consortium. The work group shall:
- (a) Review the results of the assessment administered during the 2014-15 school year; and:
 - (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.
 - (b) Issue findings and make recommendations for legislation in a report submitted to the State Board of Education and to the interim committees of the Legislative Assembly related to education.

As directed, the Superintendent of Public Instruction convened a work group of interested and expert individuals and provided the work group with information, reports and additional study to answer the questions posed by legislators. In addition, an impartial, professional facilitator was brought in to help the work group discuss and draw conclusions. The facilitator also provided summaries of the second through fourth work group sessions (see Exhibit numbers 10a, 12a and 13a).

This report is the summary of that entire effort, drafted by the facilitator with significant input by and approval of the Work Group.

Work Group Process

To achieve its task, ODE convened a group of stakeholders, representing the perspectives of the following roles and organizations:

- Classroom teachers
- Instructional coaches
- School and district administrators
- Higher education faculty and administrators
- Oregon Continuous Improvement Network
- Oregon School Boards Association
- Oregon Education Association
- Oregon Parent Teacher Association
- Stand for Children
- Oregon Legislature

The Work Group met four times in 2016: January 15th, March 18th, June 10th and June 27th to learn about, discuss, and then make recommendations about the following topics:

- The purpose and design of the Smarter Balanced summative assessment;
- Oregon's involvement with and on the Smarter Balanced multi-state consortium;
- How Smarter Balanced assesses academic standards in math and English language arts (ELA), in this case, the Common Core State Standards;
- How the assessment was administered to students, including different accessibility features available for students with disabilities, English Learners, and students with other individualized needs to meaningfully access and engage with the summative tests (this component was referred to as "match to students");
- How the use of the summative assessments could be enhanced via a balanced assessment system;
- How the assessment results are analyzed, discussed, and used by educators at the school and district level;
- What the 2014-15 statewide Smarter Balanced summative assessment results "might say" about student learning gaps; and
- With the assistance of Education Northwest, what a specific panel of principals and teachers from schools participating in a descriptive study had to say about the local

conditions present in their schools with regards to instruction, leadership, assessment, professional learning, collaboration, and teaching and learning conditions that contributed to higher than expected levels of student achievement on the 2014-15 summative assessments. Moreover, the Work Group also reviewed teacher survey results from participating schools.

Recap of House Bill 2680 Charge and Process

As noted above, the Work Group was comprised of a variety of stakeholders representing Oregon's education system and a wide blend of perspectives. Below are the Work Group's charges and a summary of what work group members achieved at each meeting related to that charge:

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

At Meeting 1, the Work Group discussed the alignment between the summative assessments and the Oregon Common Core State Standards, including how the assessments cover the depth and breadth of the Common Core ("match to standards").

At Meeting 2, the Work Group learned about and discussed what features or qualities of the summative assessments have been employed to maximize accuracy of results for each student ("match to students").

Charge 2: Analyze student learning gaps:

At Meeting 2, the Work Group discussed student learning gaps and defined these as both gaps in learning for groups of students, as well as achievement gaps between student groups.

At Meeting 3, the Work Group explored how the summative assessment results could be used to:

- identify both types of learning gaps;
- evaluate the statewide 2014-2015 assessment results in regards to learning gaps between student groups;

The work group also discussed the available results of the descriptive study to see what it told the group about how schools view and work to address gaps in learning for groups of students.

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

- At Meeting 3 the Work Group reviewed available results of the descriptive study conducted by Education Northwest and discussed what it told them about how six Oregon schools use types of assessment data—formative, interim, and

summative—to improve student outcomes along with additional information to identify adjustments in instruction to address student learning gaps.

- At Meeting 4, the Work Group continued to reflect on the information presented at Meetings 1, 2, and 3 to explore the extent to which summative assessment data can and should be used to identify adjustments in instruction to address student learning gaps.

In preparation for meetings, the Work Group reviewed sixty-one documents or reports as evidence to support their discussions and responses (see pages 14-16 of this report for the list of evidence they reviewed). The actual documents, more than 1000 pages of exhibits, are available for review by interested members of the State Board, Legislature, and public. They may be accessed at <http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=5572>.

Recommendations/Responses to Questions from 78th Legislative Assembly

1. Does the statewide summative assessment accurately measure student learning?

When used in conjunction with other data points, the Smarter Balanced summative assessments have the potential to accurately measure proficiency of student groups in the areas tested. The Smarter Balanced assessments help measure depth of knowledge on math and English language arts Common Core State Standards in a way that previous summative assessments have not. Features or qualities of the summative assessments that maximize accuracy of results for all students include accessibility and accountability improvements; for example, the Smarter Balanced summative assessments have adaptive tests that can be matched to each student's individual needs.

In addition, the Work Group members believe that the Smarter Balanced Assessments could accurately measure student proficiency in grade level standards when the following conditions are in place:

- 1) technology: equal connectivity, hardware, level playing field, familiarity, and well-developed application;
- 2) test administration: accessible and on a level playing field; all test administrators proficient in the test administration manual; all students given equitable access to accessibility supports and accommodations; and
- 3) acknowledgement of limitations: uncontrollable variables, such as student social/emotional well-being, absences, school schedules, etc., should be acknowledged and accounted for as best possible in decision processes.

However, the Work Group felt strongly that one year of data is not enough for the group, or the state, to draw any clear conclusions. In addition, because the assessment is administered on computers, many felt that some students, especially younger students, need time to learn the

mechanics of HOW to take the test before making a determination about the accuracy of what is measured. Further, the effectiveness of the Smarter Balanced accessibility resources, and the extent to which teachers use these tools to address student access needs, requires additional study.

With that caveat, the Work Group did believe that the Smarter Balanced summative assessments of ELA and math appear to align well with the Common Core State Standards and can provide one piece of data to help determine students' knowledge of the standards. When classroom instruction is aligned specifically to the standards, then the assessment appears to be an accurate measure of knowledge related to those standards. However, because we do not have data or evidence to show that all classroom instruction is aligned to the standards, the Work Group felt that it could not definitively say that the Smarter Balanced summative assessments, on their own, accurately measure all of student learning.

- The Work Group believes that when used in conjunction with other data points, the Smarter Balanced assessment has the potential to accurately measure grade-level proficiency of student groups in the areas tested (English Language Arts and Math).

2. Are there gaps in student learning?

At meeting 2, the Work Group defined gaps in student learning as:

- 1) gaps in learning for groups of students; and
- 2) achievement gaps between student groups.

The first definition refers to gaps relative to grade level learning (standards); in other words, the test is telling us something about where students are in their learning relative to grade level standards. The second definition reflects the more traditional achievement gap perspective, comparing gaps in learning between student groups. The Work Group believes that the statewide summative assessment provides the opportunity to identify and analyze both gaps in learning for groups of students and achievement gaps between student groups. They agreed that a good summative assessment, including Smarter Balanced, can identify achievement gaps between student groups. Gaps in student learning relative to grade level standards, as well as a difference between distinctive student groups (i.e. traditional achievement gaps and opportunity gaps) should be further analyzed. The group felt that more analysis should be done to assess gaps between student groups such as females and males, race/ethnicity, English Learners (EL) and non-EL, low and high socio-economic status, and special education and non-special education.

The Work Group also believes that a balanced assessment system should pair the summative assessment with additional diagnostic tools to identify gaps in learning for individual students. Formative and interim assessments (see below for more information on these two types of assessments) chosen, designed and implemented at the local district level, that are aligned to

the standards and the statewide summative assessment, are tools needed to support a balanced system of assessments in Oregon.

- The Work Group believes the Smarter Balanced summative assessments have the potential to help identify system, program, and resource shifts needed to address gaps for student groups. However, given the limited data set from one year of administration of the Smarter Balanced summative assessment, the Work Group believes that the 2014-15 state assessment results do NOT provide enough information to make specific recommendations about ‘gaps in student learning’ with enough certainty at this time. Along with data from at least one more year, additional diagnostic tools are needed (and suggested below).

Also, for future exploration, which is outside of the scope of HB 2680, the Work Group felt that a review of the gap in standards implementation would be an important next step for the State to take and the legislature to fund.

3. If there are identified gaps in student learning, what adjustments in instruction are needed?

The Work Group is unable to answer this question because they believe the Smarter Balanced summative assessment is insufficient for making judgments that would support adjustments to instruction during the academic school year. As a summative assessment, the Smarter Balanced assessment is designed to be administered only after students have received a certain threshold of instruction. Since the Smarter Balanced assessment is administered in the spring and the results of the Smarter Balanced assessment are therefore not available until later in the year, it makes it difficult for teachers to use that information to adjust their instruction for individual students during that school year; however, the results from the Smarter Balanced assessment can—for example—help inform instructional shifts and planning (e.g. developing instructional plans for a group of students who may need additional support over the summer in catching up on 3rd grade reading skills before entering 4th grade), professional learning, curriculum selection and modification of instruction for the following school year. The Smarter Balanced summative assessments are a tool. Taking the test does not reduce gaps, and the test does not identify gaps at the instructional level. The Work Group heard evidence from schools and districts that the results of the Smarter Balanced summative test can be a useful tool for resource allocation, enhancing professional learning, aligning standards and curriculum, and helping educators better understand information gleaned through interim and formative assessment tools. The results from the Smarter Balanced test can serve as a useful point of departure to investigate how to improve system level adjustments in teaching and learning conditions. To do so, the Work Group believes, it must be used in conjunction with other pieces of data.

There are many additional factors that make the Smarter Balanced summative assessment unable to support adjustments to instruction for individual students during the school year,

such as margins of error and differences in infrastructure to support the administration of the assessment. Additionally, the Smarter Balanced summative assessments do not provide detailed information about student proficiency on specific standards; instead, they provide information on overall claims and targets that include several standards.

Smarter Balanced Assessment Claims

The Smarter Balanced Assessment is comprised of claims and targets that together can be used to make statements about student achievement.

The claim is a broad statement that outlines the outcomes achieved with mastery of the standards within it. Within each claim are a variety of assessment targets that further clarify the knowledge and specific skills that cross over a cluster of standards.

English Language Arts

Claim #1- Reading

Students can read closely and analytically to comprehend a range of increasingly complex literary and informational texts.

Claim #2- Writing

Students can produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.

Claim #3- Speaking and Listening

Students can employ effective speaking and listening skills for a range of purposes and audiences.

Claim #4- Research

Students can engage in research /inquiry to investigate topics and to analyze, integrate, and present information.

Mathematics

Claim #1- Concepts and Procedures

Students can explain and apply mathematical concepts and interpret and carry out mathematical procedures with precision and fluency.

Claim #2- Problem Solving

Students can solve a range of complex well-posed problems in pure and applied mathematics, making productive use of knowledge and problem solving strategies.

Claim #3- Communicating Reasoning

Students can clearly and precisely construct viable arguments to support their own reasoning and to critique the reasoning of others.

Claim #4- Modeling and Data Analysis

Students can analyze complex, real-world scenarios and can construct and use mathematical models to interpret and solve problems.

At the group level, the aggregate data provided to a school gives an idea of how student groups within that school are performing at a claim level. However, while being an assessment generally credited for being well-designed, especially compared with OAKS, as a standardized test at the end of the year it is limited in how it can inform instruction, especially for individual students.

The Smarter Balanced summative test was designed to be a part of a balanced system of assessments. The Council of Chief State School Officers has stated:

A balanced assessment system helps answer the questions of:

- What happened?
- Strengths & weaknesses?
- Why?
- How can it be improved?

A balanced assessment system provides information at the following levels:

- State/National
- School District
- School
- Classroom/Individual

A balanced assessment system includes:

- Summative tests
- Interim assessment measures
- Formative assessment process

Oregon does not have a coordinated, balanced assessment system at this point and, instead, leaves interim and formative assessment completely to districts to manage individually. While some districts have implemented a more complete system of assessment which includes summative, interim, and formative assessments that are aligned to the standards, implementation is not consistent across the state. For example, some districts have interim and formative assessments that are aligned to the learning standards, and some do not. Using formative and interim assessments that are not aligned to the standards makes it challenging to accurately assess whether or not students have met specific learning standards—thus making it challenging to make necessary adjustments to instruction over the course of the year that will help students achieve the learning standards during the school year.

The Smarter Balanced assessment was built by assessment experts who sought to cover the Common Core State Standards. Assessing the full range of student actions described by the standards, and in particular greater depth of knowledge, was the primary focus of development, and this may not necessarily correlate to or inform specific adjustments in instruction. The statewide summative assessments, by design, measure a number of quite broad curricular aims, and report students' mastery of those aims at a large grain-size; that is, at a level so general as to often preclude targeted instruction. The report students, families, and educators receive on individual students does not provide specific enough information about what standards students are meeting, exceeding, or struggling with to inform specific instructional strategies to assist individual students. The Smarter Balanced assessment results cannot provide detailed enough, nor timely enough, information to teachers and students to inform instruction, because the test does not provide information at the standard level, only the claim or target level. As such, the Work Group believes it is important for legislators, educators, and the public to understand that one test alone cannot meet all of the purposes

that many may currently attach to their thinking about the Smarter Balanced summative assessment.

In addition, given that the Smarter Balanced summative assessment is looking at gaps in learning across student groups, the Work Group believes that adjustments should be made at the system level (e.g. the school, district and statewide levels) in order to have an impact on the individual level of instruction. Many members of the Work Group believe that Oregon students deserve a balanced assessment system that includes the following elements: 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 that can inform instruction; and summative assessments to determine knowledge and skills acquired by groups of students over time. See below for recommendations that the Work Group believes could help to answer this question.

Work Group members also expressed that it will be important for the education system (from state to district to school to classroom) to increase assessment literacy at all levels so that educators may begin to integrate the information provided by the Smarter Balanced assessments and, over time, address changes to instruction. They felt there is a need for teacher professional development on using assessment information to inform instruction and systems to support teacher training. Teachers should have more meaningful roles in the assessment process; all teachers across the career continuum—from pre-service through late career—need ongoing education and professional learning in how to use assessment information appropriately and how to select, design, and use high quality assessments to inform instruction and promote student learning and growth.

In addition to educators, parents and community members also need easy-to-understand information about the different assessments, how to interpret results from different assessments, and how to use data from different assessments to inform their partnership with teachers and schools in helping more children succeed.

If Oregon is hoping to improve instruction to support meaningful student learning, the Work Group believes there should be a review of the alignment of standards, curriculum, instruction and assessment, and the quality of teaching and learning in the state. Effective assessment provides teachers and other educators with specific information about student learning and growth in order to make necessary adjustments to instruction. Summative assessments should play a role, in addition to more points of data and tools that are needed for instructional adjustments to happen in the classroom. Some additional tools that work group members suggested include: high-quality performance tasks at the local level; assessment professional learning opportunities for educators on the guiding principles of quality assessment, analyzing data, and using data to inform teaching; strengthening teacher preparation, induction and ongoing, deep professional learning; lessons learned from schools that increased student achievement; educator leadership opportunities for classroom teachers; using formative and

interim assessments aligned to standards and the summative assessment; and providing professional learning opportunities on appropriate use of assessment tools, and the assessment accessibility supports for students. Another need Work Group members highlighted is investment in technology infrastructure so that administration barriers do not artificially influence the Smarter Balanced statewide assessment results.

The Work Group believes that ODE and the State Board of Education should consider the time and cost benefits of preparing for and administering the statewide summative assessments based on the comprehensive nature of the assessments. Looking at Smarter Balanced, what are the benefits it offers for measuring system performance compared to the time it takes away from classroom instruction in order to complete the assessment and how could those benefits be increased? What are the costs, and how might they be minimized?

In addition, ODE and the State Board of Education should give thoughtful consideration to the full number and type of assessments given to Oregon students at the state and local level in addition to the summative assessment.

Conclusions/Findings of Work Group

While the statewide summative assessment provides useful information, it is only one piece of the puzzle needed for analyzing student learning, performance, and the relationship to instruction. As noted above, “assessment” is often divided into three categories and each category plays a vital role for making overall judgments about how well students, teachers, and the system are doing.

- **Formative Assessments** (assessment *for* learning): Processes applied during teaching and include tools a teacher may use to collect feedback about a student to help guide and improve that student's learning, such as observation, homework, and quizzes.
- **Interim or Benchmark Assessments** : Provide mid-point or periodic evidence of performance and are used to identify gaps in student learning, evaluate programs, and predict success on summative tests.
- **Summative Assessment** (assessments *of* learning): Assessment given at the end of instruction to gather and report evidence of what was learned, evaluate student performance against specific content standards, and, in some cases, assign grades. These tests are designed to provide information regarding the level of student, school, or program success at an end point in time, and include end-of-unit and end-of-year state tests.

As a result of the Work Group's review of the evidence, the group feels strongly that quality interpretation of assessment results must be done using more than one single summative assessment tool. They agreed that Oregon's school districts need a balanced assessment system that includes not only the statewide summative assessment, but also other assessment

tools, such as formative and interim assessments, at the local level. Currently there is no consensus about the needed balance, but widespread practice is to try to develop all three, especially strong formative assessment. Clarity of purpose of each type of assessment should be emphasized and understood if Oregon is truly committed to a balanced system of assessment that supports the learning of each and every student.

The Work Group remarked that the full Smarter Balanced package is more than just the summative assessment: right now the Work Group, on behalf of the State, is only taking a statewide look at the summative assessment. However, as other tools are implemented in Oregon and elsewhere, more information would be available that would help Oregon meet its achievement standards and goals.

The Work Group believes it would be necessary to use a comprehensive suite of assessment tools to answer the breadth of questions posed by the Legislature regarding changes at the classroom and student level. Only with information derived from a balanced system of assessment can reliable judgments be made that will help to inform needed adjustments in instruction. It is important to note that the Work Group is not suggesting that the only solution is for Oregon to invest in additional components of the Smarter Balance tools. The Work Group does feel there are other ideas and processes that might help achieve desired achievement goals, and warrant further exploration.

Recommendations to the Interim Legislative Committees on Education and State Board of Education

In light of the information above, the Work Group makes the following recommendations:

1. This report should be seen as an opportunity to communicate a complete message about the Smarter Balanced assessment and what it can and cannot do. This information should be shared with policymakers, educators, staff, students, parents and families, and legislators as part of a concerted effort to enhance assessment literacy in our State.
2. Policy makers, the State Board of Education, and a broader group of education, community, and parent stakeholders (especially stakeholders representing communities of color and communities impacted by poverty) should be informed about what the Smarter Balanced assessment was designed to assess and its role in our state and local systems. The test was designed to measure student proficiency in English Language Arts and math, and, while it does provide some information about proficiency at the individual student level, it was primarily designed to do so with a high degree of certainty only in the aggregate (for groups of students). The Smarter Balanced summative test was not designed to evaluate teacher effectiveness. As such, the HB

2680 Work Group recommends that the Interim Legislative Committees on Education and State Board of Education a) continue researching what best measures teacher performance, and b) review the recommendations being released by Oregon's Every Student Succeeds Act Educator Effectiveness Workgroup.

3. The state should devote resources to statewide, cross-community, high-quality professional learning focused on data and assessment literacy.
4. The Legislature should appropriate funds to facilitate an objective evaluation (with districts large and small) of formative and interim assessments and their alignment with the learning standards and deeper teaching practices. Actionable findings from this evaluation should then be shared statewide with districts and educators, and families and community members. This process can be modeled from ODE's current curriculum evaluation process.
5. The Legislature should fund a group to identify and report on the efficiencies in assessment systems in order to explore a balanced and more streamlined approach. The group should also explore and report on what other states are doing with regards to auditing different State required tests (summative, interim, and formative), test length, and testing calendar windows.
6. The Legislature should fund ODE to provide resources which support equitable technology access and skills for students statewide, so students can successfully access the state assessment. This should include information about accessibility support tools available to accommodate students and the variety of their needs.
7. ODE should find ways to encourage continued project and local level review, and exploration, of new ways to assess students which is contextualized and aligns well with instruction and the standards.

This report was drafted by the impartial facilitation team from DS Consulting on behalf of the HB 2680 Work Group. All Work Group members had an opportunity to review and refine the report until all members felt it is an accurate representation of their findings and recommendations. Consensus on the report (meaning that all members agreed that they could actively support or at least live with the recommendations in the report) was reached on August 2nd, 2016. The report was formally approved by the Work Group members on August 24th at their final meeting, which was a public GoTo meeting/conference call.

Respectfully submitted to the Oregon Department of Education by lead facilitator, Donna Silverberg this 24th of August, 2016.

Evidence Reviewed by Work Group

January 15th Meeting

Pre-reading Materials

- Exhibit 1a.... Enrolled House Bill 2680
- Exhibit 1b.... The Right Trajectory – State Teachers of the Year Compare Former and New State Assessments (NNSTOY 2015)
- Exhibit 1c.... End of Grant Report – June 2015

Handouts: Materials

- Exhibit 2a.... Accurate Measurement Matrix
- Exhibit 2b.... Match to CCSS Matrix
- Exhibit 2c.... Match to Student Matrix
- Exhibit 2d.... HB 2680 Work Group: Key Terms
- Exhibit 2e.... HB 2680 Case Study Proposal

Handouts: Math Participant Handouts

- Exhibit 3a.... Coherence Activity Map
- Exhibit 3b.... Grade 3 Mathematics Item Specification C1 TA
- Exhibit 3c.... Oregon Common Core State Standards for Mathematics – Grade 4
- Exhibit 3d.... Progress to Algebra in Grades K-8 (Publishers Criteria)
- Exhibit 3e.... Mathematics Summative Assessment Blueprint (as of 02/09/2015)
- Exhibit 3f.... Mathematics Claim #1 – Concepts and Procedures

Handouts: ELA Participant Handouts

- Exhibit 4a.... Oregon Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts – Grade 8
- Exhibit 4b.... ELA/Literacy Summative Assessment Blueprint (as of 2/9/2015)
- Exhibit 4c.... Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium: English/Language Arts Practice Test Scoring Guide – Grade 8 Performance Task
- Exhibit 4d.... English Language Arts Specification: Grade 4 Claim 1 Target 11

Presentations

- Exhibit 5a.... HB 2680 Work Group – History & Context
- Exhibit 5b.... Introduction to the Technical Evidence
- Exhibit 5c.... Exploring the Evidence of Mathematics
- Exhibit 5d.... Exploring the Evidence for ELA

March 18th Meeting

Pre-reading Materials: Exploratory Case Study

- Exhibit 6a.... Teachers matter. Yes. Schools matter. Yes. Districts matter – really? (Chenoweth 2015)
- Exhibit 6b.... The Long Beach Miracle, how the working-class California city saved its schools (The Atlantic, February 2016)
- Exhibit 6c.... Odds-Beating Schools in the Common Core Era (Wilcox 2015)

Pre-reading Materials: Match to Standards

- Exhibit 6d.... Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation Assessments (Fordham 2016)
- Exhibit 6e.... Evaluating the Content and Quality of Next Generation High School Assessments (HumRRO 2016)
- Exhibit 6f.... Rater Requirements: Measurement Incorporated
- Exhibit 6g.... Smarter Balanced Hand-Scoring Rules
- Exhibit 6h.... ELA Summative Assessment Design: Prioritization

Pre-reading Materials: Match to Students

- Exhibit 6i.... Better Tests, Fewer Barriers (Center for American Progress 2016)
- Exhibit 6j.... Smarter Balanced Elementary NAEP Study
- Exhibit 6k.... Technology Skills Embedded in the Common Core Standards
- Exhibit 6l.... ADA Requirements: Testing Accommodations

Handouts

- Exhibit 7a... Mathematics Quality Criteria: Bias and Sensitivity
- Exhibit 7b.... Quality Criteria Checklist: Bias and Sensitivity – ELA
- Exhibit 7c.... Data Review Summary Reference Sheet
- Exhibit 7d.... UAA Framework and Categories
- Exhibit 7e.... Continuous Improvement Plan: Examining the Data: Making Course Corrections (Bloomquist, 2016)
- Exhibit 7f.... Descriptive Examples of Six “Beating the Odds” Schools in Oregon – An Exploratory Study (Gutierrez 2014, ODE 2013)
- Exhibit 7g.... Framework
- Exhibit 7h.... Teacher Survey

Presentations

- Exhibit 8a.... HB 2680 Work Group March 18 Meeting
- Exhibit 8b.... Math Priority and Supporting Content
- Exhibit 8c.... Item Match to Student
- Exhibit 8d.... Oregon’s Assessment Accessibility Supports
- Exhibit 8e.... Data Analysis Protocol: An Example
- Exhibit 8f.... Descriptive Study of Beating the Odds Schools

June 10th Meeting

Pre-reading Materials

- Exhibit 9a.... Descriptive Study Survey Questions
- Exhibit 9b.... Descriptive Study Focus Group Interview Questions

Handouts

- Exhibit 10a.... HB 2680 Work Group Meeting Summary – March 18, 2016
- Exhibit 10b.... Using Consensus
- Exhibit 10c.... Guiding Questions
- Exhibit 10d.... Collaboration
- Exhibit 10e.... Instruction
- Exhibit 10f.... Assessment

Presentations

- Exhibit 11a.... HB 2680 Work Group June 10 Meeting

June 27th Meeting

Pre-Reading Materials

- Exhibit 12a.... HB 2680 Work Group Meeting Summary – June 10th, 2016
- Exhibit 12b.... Draft HB 2680 Work Group Report v1 (from Facilitator)

Presentations

- Exhibit 13a.... HB 2680 Work Group June 27 Meeting

Post-Session Materials

- Exhibit 14a.... HB 2680 Work Group Meeting Summary – June 27th, 2016