



Iowa Assessment Task Force

Tuesday, November 4, 2014, 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
ICN Room, 2nd Floor, Iowa Department of Education, Des Moines, IA

Meeting Notes

Notes submitted by Circe Stumbo

ATTENDEES:

Task Force Members:

Dave Tilly (Chair), Ruth Allison, Catherine Blando, Shelly Bosovich, Kathy Brenny, Martha Bruckner, Joe DeHart, Lowell Ernst, Diana Gonzalez, Harry Heiligenthal, Tina L. Hoffman, Mark Lane, JoEllen Latham, Jane Lindaman, Jon W. McKenzie, Angela Olson, Elliot Smith, Denise Wall, Tammy Wawro, Melanie Wirtz, and Karen Woltman

Facilitator:

Circe Stumbo

DE Staff Observers:

Colleen Anderson; Dianne Chadwick; Tom Deeter; Connor Hood; Director Buck and other staff attended portions of the meeting

Members of the public including ITP, DRC, Pearson, and ACT also were in attendance, as well as a representative of the State Board of Education

NOTES:

The November 2014 meeting of the Iowa Assessment Task Force convened at 10:00 am.

Agenda Item: Welcome, introductions, review and approve agenda

There were no changes to the proposed agenda.

Agenda Item: Review groundrules and decision rules

The Task Force reviewed the decision rule they adopted, which is that every effort will be made to achieve consensus; in the absence of consensus, a $\frac{3}{4}$ majority rule will be required for a motion to pass. The Task Force further reviewed what the levels in the "fist-to-five" voting procedure refer to:

- Fist Do not support the motion/recommendation, but may support it with changes
- 2. Need to raise concerns before feeling comfortable in supporting the motion/recommendation
- 3. Would support the motion/recommendation
- 4. Enthusiastically support the motion/recommendation
- 5. Love it and will be a champion

Agenda Item: Discuss the role of DRC in deliberations

Chair Tilly clarified that deliberations about the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium include the delivery of the Smarter Balanced Assessments by DRC. Therefore, when DRC added value to the assessment presentation, such as their ability to augment the assessments with additional information included in the Iowa Core, that is legitimate to include in the deliberation.

Agenda Item: Discuss and vote on recommendations

Each Task Force member was given an opportunity to speak about the most critical decision making points that they are considering as they are preparing to vote on recommendations. Each member spoke.

The Task Force brainstormed recommendations and conducted a series of straw polls in order to narrow the language of the recommendations. Draft recommendations that were NOT approved by the Task Force included:

The Task Force recommends the Smarter Balanced assessment with guidance around challenges related to change.

The Task Force recommends the Smarter Balanced assessment if support is provided.

The Task Force recommends the Smarter Balanced assessment provided these conditions are met: accommodations, professional development, ____.

The Task Force recommends the Smarter Balanced assessment as a statewide assessment of student progress on a set of core academic indicators in mathematics and reading with conditions (TBD).

After deliberation and straw polls, Wirtz moved and McKenzie seconded the recommendation: “The Task Force recommends the Smarter Balanced assessment as a statewide assessment of student progress on a set of core academic indicators in mathematics and reading.” The motion was approved with seventeen members voting at a level “5,” two members (Tilly and Smith) voting at a level “4,” one member (Gonzales) voting at a level “2,” and one member (Woltman) voting with a level “1.” Gonzales later clarified that her vote of a “2” should be interpreted as, “I still have concerns about SBAC, but I am voting in favor of adopting SBAC (this would be counted as aye).” Thus, the final tally on the first proposed recommendation is twenty in favor and one opposed.

The next recommendation was moved by Woltman and seconded by Lane: “The Task Force recommends the legislature create a work group to study technology readiness, including technology required for accommodations, and create a plan for moving to statewide online administration of assessments.” The motion passed unanimously, with nineteen votes at a level 5, one vote at a level 4 (Wawro), and one vote at a level 3 (DeHart).

The next recommendation was moved by Wawro and seconded by Brenny: “The Task Force recommends that appropriations be available to ensure professional development is provided to support the administration of the new assessments, use of new assessment data, and other related needs; professional development resources are available for use by any providers, teacher leaders, and users; and time is provided for educators to take part in professional development.” The motion passed unanimously with fourteen votes at a level 5, six votes at a level 4 (Bruckner, Heiligenthal, Lindaman, Latham, Smith, and Wall) and one vote at a level 3 (DeHart).

The next recommendation was moved by Lindaman and seconded by Latham: “The Task Force recommends that the state appropriate funds to provide all districts access to the full suite of Smarter Balanced Assessment tools.” The recommendation passed unanimously with fifteen votes at a level 5, two votes at a level 4 (Brenny and Smith), and 4 votes at a level 3 (DeHart, Hoffman, Smith, and Woltman).

The next recommendation was moved by Gonzales and seconded by Brenny: “The Task Force recommends that the state monitor the effectiveness of the new assessments, including its ability to measure student progress toward college and career readiness.” The recommendation passed unanimously with nineteen votes at a level 5, one vote at a level 4 (Latham), and 1 vote at a level 3 (DeHart).

The Task Force considered a recommendation that, “the state analyze the time spent on state- and federal-mandated testing and determine the benefit to students.” The recommendation died for lack of a motion.

The Task Force was reminded that they had previously (February 2014) recommended that the task force should be reconvened as soon as the new science standards are approved and new assessments are available for review (in the meantime, continue with the current assessment).

Agenda Item: Review and adjust draft report outline

The Task Force reviewed the draft report outline from the small-group and agreed that it covered the appropriate areas and was an appropriate outline to work from when drafting the final report.

Agenda Item: Identify next steps

Wolman volunteered to work with Stumbo in a small-group to work on drafting the report. Additional volunteers were encouraged. It was agreed that the Task Force would review the draft report at the December 10 meeting and every effort will be made to provide a

draft prior to the December 10 meeting. The draft will be available on the Google Drive; Task Force members will be able to insert comments into the draft but not edit that version of the document. The draft will be forwarded via email as a Word document if members are able to provide narrative edits directly in the text, which they may email back to Stumbo.

Agenda Item: Other business

With no other business identified by Task Force members, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.