

Assessment of Essential Skills Review Panel

Meeting Minutes
January 13, 2017

Friday, January 13, 2017

Panel Members Present: Daniel Ayala, Doug Nelson, Ellen Irish, Laurie Ross, Jill Sumerlin, John Bouchard, Krista Nieraeth, Lori Cullen Brown, Marilyn Williams, Melissa Glover, Ralph Brown, Robin DeLoach

Facilitating: Cristen McLean, Holly Carter, Josh Rew, Steve Slater, Desiree Keisel

Welcome and Agenda Overview

Cristen McLean called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and reviewed the agenda.

I. Review of Minutes

Krista Nieraeth motioned to approve the minutes from August 26, 2017. Ralph Brown seconded the motion. Majority were in favor. None were opposed. Motion passed.

II. Writing Scoring Guide Adoption

Desiree Keisel provided a review of the Writing scoring guide transition, explaining that in 2016-2017 either the Current Official Writing Scoring Guide or the Revised Official Writing Scoring Guide may be used for scoring Essential Skills Work Samples, then in 2017-2018 the Revised Official Writing Scoring Guide becomes the only Official State Scoring Guide and the Current Official Writing Scoring Guide sunsets and may no longer be used. To support this transition, Desiree described the work to update the Writing Scoring Guide Feedback Form. She first showed the changes made to match to the Revised Official Writing Scoring Guides then invited panelists to volunteer to do a more in depth review and provide feedback prior to posting the final versions. More than half of the panelists volunteered to review.

III. Essential Skills for English Learners

Holly Carter reviewed OAR 581-022-0617: Essential Skills for English Language Learners and provided a timeline of actions related to the policy. In addition, she drew from State Board docket and other historical documents to provide context related to the Certificate of Initial Mastery and how OAR 581-022-0617 was adopted following OAR 581-022-0615 in order to: (a) address the equity gap with the intention to maintain the rigor of the diploma while allowing students flexibility to demonstrate their proficiency, (b) ensure that the policy was limited to those students who have not yet had sufficient time to fully master academic English but who have gained sufficient English skills to pursue their next steps, and (c) apply to only a small population of students to avoid creating a significant implementation burden on districts. She then explained that there have been several subsequent considerations, including the adoption of the Oregon Equity Lens and the transition from ELPA to ELPA21. During the 2015-16 academic year the English proficiency requirement was suspended for seniors due to the ELPA to ELPA 21 transition. Holly then presented two options for the panel's consideration given that the English proficiency requirement cannot be met now that the ELPA is no longer operational: option A: Suspend English proficiency criterion (again) to provide more time for consideration of the final policy, or option B: Retain the English proficiency policy by setting an

achievement standard on ELPA21. Josh Rew explained the methods by which an achievement standard could be identified on ELPA21 that is linked to the ELPA achievement standard that was adopted. The considerations raised include that the ELPA achievement standard was set based on a composite score but ELPA21 does not report a composite score. Josh Rew explained that the Progressing category could be used as it includes all of the domains, but showed graphs comparing ELPA and ELPA 21. This illustrated there may be differences in the proportion of students who meet the Progressing achievement standard as compared to Level 3, which had been the ELPA achievement standard. Josh Rew also explained that a latent composite score from ELPA21 domains could be created to link to the ELPA achievement standard but that this was not currently available, would be complex to use, and would be a measure schools and districts are not familiar with. Cristen McLean shared information about when ELPA 21 results would be available to students and the potential of a two-year suspension to provide more time to determine the long term policy plan. Panelists discussed these options and the pros and cons of suspending the requirement or setting an ELPA21 achievement standard and using ELPA21 scores in the current school year. Panelists discussed that two years would be a better timeframe than the one-year suspension in 2015-16 and that many perspectives would need to be engaged in planning for the final policy. Some panelists stated a concern about not having an English proficiency measure in place for another year. A panelist shared about the experience with ELPA21 as compared to ELPA. Panelists expressed concerns about the complexity and possible confusion if new ELPA21 reports were added for a latent composite score. Panelists discussed previous assessment transitions. A panelist described that AESRP recommendations about new achievement standards have erred on the cautious side when there is a potential risk that the achievement standard would be raised during a transition. Ralph Brown motioned to recommend amending OAR 581-022-0617 to add the following clause. (5) For students seeking a diploma in 2016-2017 or 2017-18, the criteria described in Section 3(c) does not apply. Section 5 will sunset as of August 31, 2018. Michelle Zundel seconded. 11 were in favor. 1 opposed. Motion passed.

IV. Psychometrician Update

Josh Rew provided an update about the proposed GED to Smarter Balanced linking study and explained the proposed methodology and the typical concerns with this methodology. Panelists discussed this information briefly.

VI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned just before 11:00 am due to technical difficulties with the webinar connection. The remaining content was sent by email for participants to read independently in preparation for the spring meeting.