

AESRP Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2009
Via Web-ex

Present: Walt Blomberg, Amy McQueen, Linda Samek, Art Anderson, Bob Rayborn, Dee Hahn, Jackie Burr, Jim Conaghan, Kathy Hall, Linda Samek, Kehaulani Minzghor, Michelle Zundel, Susan Iverson, Jana Iverson, Helen Maguire, Ralph Brown,

Visitors: Bill Stewart

Facilitators: Tony Alpert, Barbara Wolfe, Doug Kosty

I. Welcome and Review of agenda

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

II. Approval of Minutes from January 28

The minutes were approved as corrected.

III. Discussion of Hybrid Responsibilities for Performance Assessment Activities

Tony introduced a discussion about the shared responsibilities among the state, ESD's, and local districts/schools for the implementation of the local performance assessments using a chart "Locus of Responsibilities." (See Appendix A of these minutes)

Concerns were expressed about the capacity of districts to create tasks that are at the appropriate rigor for diploma. Part of SIP. Support available from various ESD's.

Anchor papers may need to be realigned to the expectations for the Essential Skills Diploma work. Standards (anchor papers) will have to be set for the Reading Scoring Guide.

There will be additional options (ACT, PSAT, etc.) for reading and math. This type of test is less likely for writing and definitely will not be available for speaking.

**IV. Report on Web Resource (Rhode Island) project
Plans for development work**

Barbara reported that a work group is being formed to help in creating an Oregon web resource similar to the one developed by the state of Rhode Island (http://www.ride.ri.gov/highschoolreform/dslat/portfolio/por_intr.shtml). Volunteers are welcome to help with this important work.

V. Moving OAKS Test to Grade 11 for Accountability

Tony reported that there is some support for making the change from grade 10 to grade 11 for accountability for the OAKS assessments. This change would be submitted in

the workbook sent to the USDOE in June. Although the big picture seems straightforward, the workbook will have to address issues such as inclusion rules, cell size, etc.

Oregon would continue with grade 10 for the 2009-10 school year. In 2010-2011 there would be a change to grade 11 and the workbook would explain the transition plan.

VI. Brief Report on Reading

Barbara gave a brief report on the continuing work on the Reading Performance Assessment Scoring Guide. The guide itself is ready for pilot review and teachers on the steering committee are working to develop and pilot tasks which could be used in a late-April/early May field test.

VII. Update on change to Implementation of Essential Skills for Diploma

The State Board has not made a decision about delaying any of the 4 required essential skills for the class of 2012. However, at the February meeting, they seem to be leaning toward delaying only Applying Mathematics and continuing forward with Reading, Writing and Speaking. If any delay is approved, the OAR will have to be amended. It would likely be done as an emergency amendment in order to take effect right away.

Temporary Adjournment

The meeting resumed at 1:08 p.m.

Present: Art Anderson, Steve Slater, Susan Iversen, Walt Blomberg, Dee Hahn, Bob Rayborn, Kathy Hall, Kehulani Minzghor, Michelle Zundel, Laurie Glazener, Jim Conaghan, Helen Maguire,

Visitor: Bill Stewart

VIII. Discussion about LEP proposal

The group discussed the issues in the earlier proposal for ELL/LEP students to allow them to demonstrate proficiency in the Essential Skills in their home language.

Key Questions:

Where is the best place for this student to gain proficiency in English?

Where is the best place for this student to continue in academic content?

What does the diploma represent?

Sub-group will meet again to plan Board agenda: Tony will introduce the topic; Winston will talk to civil rights issues (both denial and delay of property right); Tony will outline a strategy and ask sub-group members to talk about the benefits of the options for students.

National Test Information

Board is interested in Work Keys, but there are not sufficient numbers of students to do a solid equivalency study. Tony met with CCWD and reviewed information from ACT about Work Keys.

ACT compared to OAKS – about 2000 matched test scores high correlation around .7 to .8 for both reading and math. It would put the “cut score” at about 18 for reading and about 19 for math.

PSAT – about 9,000 records to compare. Steve Slater recommended further study, including trying to triangulate using PSAT, SAT and OAKS data to arrive at a reasonable score.

Discussion about Work Keys and the need to keep rigor at 236 level. Level 5 on Work Keys is consistent with the low end of post-secondary cut.

Motion: Michelle Zundel moved that OAKS 236 is the standard of rigor and that we maintain that standard as AESRP recommends other assessments and that the committee recommend Work Keys at level 5. Bob Roth seconded.

- Motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Laurie Glazener moved to recommend adoption of ACT at 18 for reading and 19 for mathematics. Bob Roth seconded.

- Motion passed unanimously.

IX. Plans for Next Meeting

The next meeting will be April 9-10 in Salem.

Support for a face to face meeting and for inviting a couple of more ESD people to the meeting.

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Appendix A Locus of Responsibilities for Performance Assessments of Essential Skills

General Assumptions:

- Local flexibility in task development and administration is necessary for integration with district curriculum, instruction and local creativity/engagement
- Statewide consistency in scoring is necessary for validity, reliability, and fairness
- Districts are responsible for awarding diplomas and must maintain control of the means for implementing the Oregon Diploma

Activity	System Level			
	School	District	ESD	
Definition of Essential Skill domains				Produce domain each Essential assessment de ODE cost appro 5 days specialis committee mee posting, etc. pe
Scoring guide development (simultaneous effort with initial task development)	Teachers participate in development of state scoring guides, selection of exemplars and development of training materials ¹ (ODE pays substitute or temporary pay for development and scoring activities.)	Provide in-kind resources for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - state scoring guide development, piloting and revision - pilot and initial field test activities are district responsibilities 		Define traits me performance de level ² ODE cost appro 5 days specialis committee mee posting, etc. pe Refine scoring g trials and prelim student work ODE cost 2 to 4 \$10,000 to \$20,

¹ Development of state scoring guides and related materials is a central component of continuing professional development. Participants receive CE credits required for re-certification and salary scale increments. Teacher preparation programs are integral to this effort.

² The main state responsibility is to define the “ends” of K-12 learning as exemplified in the Essential Skills and associated scoring guides. Districts are responsible for providing the “means” by which students learn, through locally-controlled decisions around curriculum, instruction and assessment.

				<p>Publish exemplars with commentary approximately \$ [redacted] exemplars per [redacted]</p> <p>ODE cost for [redacted] approximately \$ [redacted] for 2 days.</p>
Standard setting	Provide release time for teachers to participate in standard-setting activities	Provide in-kind resources (teacher participation and student exemplars)	Provide in-kind resources	<p>Set or verify performance standards (cutpoints)</p> <p>Write performance standards</p>

Professional Development	Participate in district and ESD trainings and use learning communities to assure on-going quality and validity of tasks and reliability of scoring	Conduct trainings in school and district sessions and use learning communities to assure on-going quality and validity of tasks and reliability of scoring	Collaborate in development and provide leadership and support for regional trainers and training sessions.	Develop materials for scorer training and scorer training materials, trainer of trainer materials, ODE cost approach, 8 days specialist committee meeting, posting, etc. per
Task development/selection (Simultaneous with initial scoring guide development)	Groups of teachers cooperatively develop performance assessment tasks that align with ES domain specifications Teachers select tasks from juried task bank that match instructional needs	Provide training and support for task development and/or selection Establish policies and responsibilities for school-level activities related to task development/selection	Provide coordination, training and support for task development and/or selection Organize regional task development and evaluation workshops Submit juried tasks to statewide task bank (including annotated student work and score rationale)	Publish task development materials based on ES domain specifications Develop guides Develop electronic infrastructure Publish exemplars through a jury process Conduct trainer of trainer task development instruction ODE cost approach 6 days specialist training materials developing materials Essential Skill
Performance assessment administration	Teachers administer performance assessment tasks aligned jointly with local curriculum and state essential skills ³	Establish local policies related to task administration		Provide statewide - secure - integrated - scaffolded feedback

³ By allowing wide choice of tasks, assessment can be more seamlessly and creatively integrated with instruction (which is not feasible with an external “drop-from-above” test). Security issues also are largely solved by using a broad range of tasks.

Scoring student responses	Teachers join “scoring cooperatives” to score student work according to state scoring guides. ⁴ Teachers are paid for scoring time outside of normal workday	Establish policies for scoring of local performance assessments Form “scoring cooperatives” within the district or across districts Establish policies for teacher pay when participating in scoring activities	Host and organize regional scoring sessions	Establish expectations for consistency and monitoring Provide guidelines for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rater training - monitoring reliability - social norms of scoring <p>ODE cost approximately 5 days specialist Rater meetings etc. per Essential</p>
Recordkeeping	Enter scores in standard templates	Establish policies for recordkeeping, provide training		Develop system for electronic data performance assessment
Evaluation of comparability		Supply scored student records		Study comparability performance assessment measures; publish
Policy development		Establish local policies within the framework of OARs and state guidelines		Develop OARs requirements re performance assessment ODE estimated Small amendment More Comprehensive \$750 New amendment

⁴ Some scoring may be done in the classroom (e.g., speaking), while those involving student products may be done in a variety of settings internal or external to the school.

Appendix B

Discussion of LEP/ELL Policy Issues

Community Colleges have programs for ESOL students that allow growth in English so they can get in to academic content courses. Some have a program that targets high school students. Pre-requisite: pass Reading 90, writing 90 and math 90. Students can then go to GED program or to Early College program where they earn joint credit.

Both high schools and community colleges can provide these services. Often school districts and community colleges work together on getting a student to earn a diploma.

Best place may be dependent on the individual student. Is the GED being devalued at the federal level? Maybe we need to be more up-front about what we are working toward for ELL students.

Need a flexible policy that allows for students who might benefit from remaining in high school for 5 years and those who would benefit from moving on to a community college where the academic content might be more challenging.

We may be able to provide help to students in some languages (i.e. Spanish, Russian) but what about kids from other language bases. Do we have the capacity to address all students' needs.

It would likely be a local district assessment and what the district can provide. Because of economy, likely it will have to be up to local districts.

Can a student get a modified diploma if their only problem is English? No, the district team has to determine that the student has a physical, cognitive or emotional disability to qualify for the modified diploma.

Three classifications of students – Community Colleges, Universities, and students who end their academic career at high school.

We could restrict the district waiver process so that students have a sufficient level of English proficiency (ie. Functional English) rather than full proficiency.

Another option is to restrict the waiver so that it applies only to students who have been enrolled in the US for 3 years or less.

An additional option is to use the ELPA as a means to establish a level of proficiency – but it might be better to use ELPA or another test that the district uses such as Woodcock/Munoz. For an example, students could be required to reach a 3 or 4 level on the ELPA (or other instrument) to be eligible for the diploma.

What about restricting the waiver to students who demonstrate that they have sufficient English to succeed after high school in further education or work?