Assessment of Essential Skills Review Panel

Meeting Minutes October 21, 2011

Friday, October 21, 2011

Panel Members Present: Melissa Goff, Ralph Brown, Allan Bruner, Kelly Carlisle, Tami Volz, Kathryn Hall, Susan Iversen, Amy McQueen, Brenda Morton, Robert Rayborn, Analicia Santos, Michelle Zundel, Charlie Bauer, Cindy Dickerson, Marilyn Williams, Sloan Presidio, Tim Rupp, Vicki Van Buren, John Bouchard, Lori Cullen

Facilitating: Derek Brown, Barbara Wolfe, Steve Slater

I. Introductions, Review of Agenda and Housekeeping:

Derek Brown called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and introduced all the members, where they are from and what their job title is. He mentioned that Tony Alpert has left to go to the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC).

II. Review of Minutes

No questions. Ralph Brown moved to approve the minutes. Kathy Hall seconded. The vote was positive to approve the minutes.

Vicki asked Derek to explain the Report Shell for Essential Skills. Derek said that he will get to that later in the agenda because there are so many new members that need to understand reporting concerns.

III. Accuplacer alignment

Last spring, AERSP endorsed that this study be done. Last spring, 9 or 10 schools around the state were selected to give students Accuplacer assessments. Then the scores were matched with the OAKS score. Last fall, analysis was done on these scores. Derek requested feedback on how to move forward.

<u>Accuplacer Reading Test</u> -- Four different content areas are covered. 276 student scores were collected from the pilot last spring. The correlation between Accuplacer and OAKS scale scores is 0.682. The panel discussed various issues including the level of courses students would be entering with various Accuplacer scores. Lane Community College requires a score of 88 to place in Reading 115, while Linn-Benton Community College requires 84.

Susan Iversen said that RD115 is not an English credit, but an elective credit and is considered remedial.

Derek showed the group the College Course Readiness by Test Scores table from prior years. Barbara explained the layout and how the document worked. She explained that this chart has helped to arrive at previous decisions. The State Board doesn't want alternatives created that are essentially a back-door. That is why AESRP has previously recommended the scores be a little higher.

Steve Slater cautioned the group that the Accuplacer test is short, only 20 computer adaptive items, and is used more for placement.

Bob Rayborn agreed that Accuplacer is a placement test. Because the correlation between Accuplacer and OAKS is fairly low, its use is problematic. The shortness of the Accuplacer test makes it unreliable. OAKS is reliable, so replacing it with the unreliable Accuplacer test is a problem. We may want to err on the side of caution. Amy McQueen mentioned that we had the same issue with the Work Keys test so we had to go a little higher based on that same issue.

Melissa Goff asked why would we approve Accuplacer in the first place if it is unreliable, and if we do approve it, why wouldn't we set it as close to OAKS as possible?

Derek explained that AESRP can decide not to recommend Accuplacer or recommend a cut score to the Board. There is a concern with creating unintentional back doors.

Kathy Hall commented that the community college people have great insight. From the math side, math is a real barrier for students. If you can't read at the college level, it creates problems for all the other subjects. Susan indicated that she does not feel comfortable with a score that places student in courses below 100 level.

Cindy Dickerson expressed concern that Accuplacer may not be an accurate and reliable way to measure proficiency. Kelly Carlisle countered that with a small sample, you have to err on the side of caution, but this assessment shows college readiness.

Michelle Zundel moved to recommend an Accuplacer reading score of 76. The motion was seconded by Vicki. Further discussion continued. The panel asked that the minutes reflect that because of the weak correlation, we were unable to calibrate precisely to a 236.

In Favor	Opposed	<u>Abstain</u>
Analicia	Allan	
Brenda	Amy	
Charlie	Cindy	
Tim	Kelly	
Michelle	Lori	
Tami	Ralph	
Melissa	Sloan	
Bob	Susan	
Michelle	Kathryn	
Marilyn		
Vicki		
John		

Because the meeting was held via WebEx and votes were both oral and messaged to different members, it appeared at the time that the motion had failed. This was announced and the panel planned to resume discussion at the January meeting, which will be done.

Accuplacer Math Test -- Derek explained the placement scores for the Accuplacer test.

Several members pointed out the very short nature of the Accuplacer Elementary Algebra Test (12 items). Kathy Hall moved and Cindy Dickerson seconded not to pursue the Accuplacer Elementary Algebra test.

After some discussion, Michelle Zundel moved to table the motion with a second from Charlie Bauer. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Accuplacer Writing Test</u> – After reviewing the data, the group agreed that there is no compelling evidence to proceed with this assessment.

Kathy suggested tabling this discussion as well, but general consensus was that the correlation is so poor that it is not worth further discussion.

Ralph Brown moved and Bob Rayborn moved to discontinue pursuing Writing Accuplacer. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. ACT Writing Alignment

Derek explained the document showing the alignment between the construct of the two tests. After further discussion the group agreed that ODE should move forward with an analysis of test scores.

V. OAR Revision

For any student that does not have an enrollment record for grade 9, the first school year in which they are enrolled in grade 10, 11, or 12 will be applied as the cohort year, and the Essential Skills graduation requirements would be applied accordingly, consistent with 5(a)-(c). "Cohort year" means the first school year in which the student first attended high school grade in the United States or elsewhere. For most students this is their first year in grade 9.

Derek explained the background of the OAR and that the language would be added to the OAR if approved. Discussion followed. A small group will meet with Derek via WebEx to discuss the language changes further and come back to the group with recommendations in January.

VI. State-to-state reciprocity on statewide assessments

Derek explained the difficulties in establishing accurate cut scores for various state tests. Following discussion, the group agreed that Derek should move forward in informing the field that other state tests will not be approved for Essential Skills proficiency.

VII. Professional Development activities

Derek showed everyone how to use the "go" link on the ODE home page and some of the resources available on the website.

Barbara explained the trainer of trainers WebEx's that are being conducted. She explained the materials that are given to the trainers, the calendar and PD documents on the web.

Derek said that about 40 to 50 districts have attended the training sessions with about an average of 20 people per session.

VIII. Final thoughts, questions, wrap-up

Derek thanked everyone for their attention. He asked if anyone has any extra questions.

A question arose about options for 12th graders that don't pass the state writing assessment. Discussion followed. The group endorsed the idea of having a second OAKS writing opportunity for 12th graders and asked Derek to pursue this issue with ODE management and the State Board.

Derek explained that the decision to limit OAKS Writing Assessment was a Legislative Budget Note. The panel asked him to craft some language and share it electronically so that the topic can move forward in a timely way for January.

Another question was asked about the plans for the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). Derek will send the SBAC Quarterly report to the members and the draft minutes.

VIIII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.