

Assessment of Essential Skills Review Panel

Meeting Minutes
June 7, 2018

Thursday, June 7, 2018

Panel Members Present: Doug Nelson, Ellen Irish, Garrett Apland, Jill Sumerlin, John Bouchard, , Larry Susuki, Laurie Ross, Lori Cullen Brown, Marie Shimer, Marilyn Williams, Melissa Glover, Michelle Cummings, Ralph Brown, Robin DeLoach, Sarah Cunningham, Shaun Gross, Jay Mathison, Krista Nieraeth

Panel Members Absent:

Facilitating: Bryan Toller, Tony Bertrand,
ODE Attendance: Dan Farley, Steve Slater, and Josh Rew

Welcome and Agenda Overview

Bryan Toller called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and reviewed the agenda.

- I. **9:00 - 9:05 Public Comments**
-Tony: bringing up in Fall meeting: we want more public participations
- II. **9:05 - 9:10 Review of Minutes**
-Doug Nelson has approved the first motion, Krista Nieraeth has approved the second motion
-11 out of 18 AESRP members approved and the 7 that are not in attendance are abstained
- III. **9:05 - 9:15 Updates**
-Ben: there was several surveys from EL staff, and students (HS, and current) that survey closes tomorrow – findings: (preliminary findings) most students would benefit from pursuing Essential Skills in a language other than English, and they still stated that they were more likely to want to learn English if they were able to show ES in EL, and would have a lower likelihood of dropout
- IV. **9:15 – 10:00 AESRP Discussion**
 - a. **GED Recommendation**
-Bryan Toller shared with AESRP members the content alignment with GED and the targeted requirements
-Garrett: did the data only about the linking study, with the content alignment and the linking to the GED to SB?
-Bryan: Josh and Steve will go deeper into the explanation of that.
-Garrett: Will it be exclusively be machine scored test?
-Bryan: Yes, it is. But there is
-Ralph: page 8 of linking, was it a misprint with the data about all students, or was it just missing something?

-Josh: Good question. We ran our model for specific student groups. It's essentially the average of the two.

-Ralph: What does the (0.475) mean?

-Josh: the more students you include, the smaller the number in the parenthesis shrinks, we are using all students in the data set

-Steve: the notion behind the GED as an option is to provide students to reentering the HS diploma system

-Josh: There was a small linkage of students that have taken both the GED and the SB showing that they are on their way back into the school system indeed

-John: Going back to the math study, in Bend we have some practical experience with GED students that return to HS and graduated and we have some breakdowns with how they have met the ES

-Garett: I was looking through the documents and I didn't see anything in there with the RLA/Math accessibility with language accommodations?

-Bryan: There is a list of supports you can get, but our data was just looking at if the GED meet the ES requirements, but in the future we will help to incorporate accessibility features

-John: consider 150 for scoring

-Doug: score on GED of 156, how does that correlate with the SB score? Is it a 2? Does the 156 line up somewhere?

-Josh: GED 156 cuts close to a level 2 on the SB test

Motion: (Discussion questions, for cut score)

-Doug: first motion - "I would move that AESRP adopting the MR for use, using the 156 mark for scoring

-John: I second the motion, leaving the cut score up for discussion, I would like to see the cut score at this time I would put it at 150

-Jay: I second John's motion for a cut score of 150

-Ralph: Do we have some range with the 156? If we go to a 150, does that change the original mission piece?

-Josh: The estimate that we produced is from the data that we HAVE, we see nice symmetry between SB and GED in both directions, we could do further analysis for the 150 for GED and SB scoring

-Raph: I thought that was taboo to go off the pattern that has been established, but it does all make sense to me

-Josh: We may wait and expand it, we may see something different. It was based on the data on what we could match with the data that we have. Things could be different if we enlarge it

-Dan: We can't really make a recommendation to the State Board without really being confident, we really need more data and maybe down the road we can revisit this

-Ralph: I second the motion for the 156 – I trust the team and the info they give us throughout the years

-Ralph: I make a motion: "I recommend ... ES using 156, which is linked to the SB..."

-Bryan: All in favor of score of 156 please raise your hand –

Motion (results):

Approved –12

Opposed – 2

Abstained – 4 (due to attendance)

b. Local Assessment Option guidance for the Essential Skills Manual

-**Steve**: the deadline for the revised version is August 1st, so open to suggestions for edits

-**Jay**: Not necessarily a test, so would this possibly nullify other skills if we just boil it down to one assessment test

-**Bryan**: Objectively scored, and the other realm of portfolios and that all just doesn't fit in this with vendors for ES assessments

-**Steve**: we can add that narrative, to show that this will be a narrow scope

-**Laurie**: Motion to approve this approach to Local Assessment Option in the manual

-**Marilyn**: I will second the motion to approve

-**Garrett**: the language for the introduction, being explicit about what this assessment isn't so the viewer knows what they can do with this test and so they can make note on other options as well

Motion (to approve this approach to Local Assessment Option guidance) results:

Approved – 12

Opposed – 1

Abstained – 5 (due to attendance)

a. Modified Diploma: Process for setting Modified Achievement Standard on Smarter Balanced

-**Marilyn**: first motion to approve this process

-**Laurie**: Second motion

Motion (results):

Approved – 14

Opposed – 0

Abstained – 4 (due to attendance)

c. 10:00 Fall Meeting Dates and Adjourn