AESRP Meeting
Thursday, April 9, 2009
9:00 – 11:30 a.m. & 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. PDT
Meeting Minutes

Present: Amy McQueen, Bob Reeves, Deanna Hahn, Helen Maguire, Jackie Burr, Jana Iverson, Jim Conaghan, Kathy Hall, Ken Peterson, Laurie Glazener, Linda Samek, Michelle Zundel, Ralph Brown, Steve Slater, Susan Iversen, Theresa Levy, Walt Blomberg. Visitors: Ron Smith, Bill Stewart, Lori Cullen

Facilitators: Tony Alpert, Barbara Wolfe,

I. Welcome and Review of agenda  Tony Alpert reviewed the agenda with changes from the earlier draft that was sent out.

II. Approval of Minutes: The minutes from the February 26, 2009 meeting were approved.

III. Update on Reading Performance Assessment: Barbara gave a short update on plans for the Reading Performance Assessment Field Test. A number of volunteers have responded and tasks are nearly complete. The field test plan calls for 6 tasks (3 literary and 3 informative tasks) to be sampled with approximately 300 responses per task.

IV. Discussion of “Cut Score Recommendations for National Tests

- Tony explained the current recommendations and shared the Board docket item and a set of scales that show the scores on “thermometers.”
- Steve and Tony explained how the scores were derived using various strategies to align as much as possible with the OAKS standard of 236

Discussion followed:
The group wanted to be sure that the State Board understands that the scores being recommended will not necessarily help more students attain diploma standards because the recommended scores are in line with scores on the OAKS assessments.

The group then reviewed each national test and the recommended scores for Reading.

- Michelle Zundel moved and Helen Maguire seconded that the recommended Reading Score for PLAN be set at 18 to align with the ACT score of 18. The motion passed unanimously.
- Kathy Hall moved and Ralph Brown seconded that the ASSET and COMPASS tests scores for Reading be recommended to be set at 81 (ASSET) and 42 (COMPASS). The motion passed unanimously.
Discussion followed on methods of determining cut scores using “functional data” – that is data based on college course requirements because we do not have adequate data to do equating studies. However, the PSAT/SAT are not widely used by community colleges, so we don’t have “functional data.” Therefore the group reviewed the vendor’s college readiness benchmark of 590 for reading and 610 for mathematics. Tony and Steve explained a method of using 60% of a standard deviation to align PSAT/SAT with scores on PLAN/ACT.

The group decided to table the SAT and PSAT scores recommendations until May, when better data might be available. For COMPASS and ASSET, the group would like more functional data for math course placement from community colleges.

The group also recommended that ODE plan on a follow-up analysis of cut scores in 2013 asking districts to share data.

V. Tony adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m. for a lunch break. The meeting will resume again at 1:00 p.m.

VI. The meeting reconvened 1:00 p.m.


VII. Web-Based Resource on Assessment of Essential Skills
Barbara presented information on plans for a web portal to assist districts in assessing the essential skills. It will describe best practices and provide links to resources for districts. A work team has been identified and development is beginning. The system will include information about local procedures and routines for evaluation.

The group expressed concern about variability of tasks, variability of scoring, and inconsistency of expectations. They recommended the portal include an access area for pre-service teachers.

Progress updates will be provided to AESRP with opportunities to make recommendations and mid-course corrections.

VIII. ELL Assessment of Essential Skills Board Item
Tony updated the group on plans for the presentation at the April Board meeting and shared the docket item. The group strongly recommended that the essential skill for Speaking be put back in this board item. Walt will present information to the Board about the impact on districts of requiring students who are not yet proficient in English to demonstrate essential skills in English.
IX. Discussion of Hybrid Responsibilities for Performance Assessment Activities

Barbara shared a document that targets the essential skill of Writing, using the AESRP’s earlier discussion of responsibilities for local performance assessments. The purpose of the document is to identify areas of work that are fairly complete and where gaps need to be filled.

The group discussed the document and requested that it be sent out for review when it is more complete. They also raised issues such as whether requirements should be set for the number of raters needed to certify a task to meet diploma requirements or a minimum number of opportunities to take a performance assessment and a maximum. Discussion led to the recommendation that information should be made available about best practices, recognizing that districts may vary from those practices for financial reasons.

The group recommended some questions to be used to assess needs in the field:
What are the key questions we need to ask our colleagues?
1. What is the financial impact of the mandate to determine proficiency in essential skills for all diploma recipients?
2. What would it take to implement the local assessments in writing, reading, math and speaking?
3. What support do we need from ESD and ODE to make this happen with rigor and reliability?

X. The meeting was adjourned by Tony at 3:30 p.m.