Assessment Task Force

Meeting Notes
June 12, 2014

Notes submitted by Circe Stumbo

Participants:

Task Force Members:
  Catherine Blando; Shelly Bosovich; Kathy Brenny; Martha Bruckner; Joe DeHart; Lowell Ernst;
  Diana Gonzalez; Harry Heiligenthal; Tina Hoffman; Jo Ellen Latham; Jon McKenzie; Angela Olson;
  Elliott Smith; David Tilly, Chair; Denise Wall; Tammy Wawro; Karen Woltman; Melanie Wirtz

Facilitator:
  Circe Stumbo

DE Staff Observers:
  Colleen Anderson; Connor Hood

There also were four observers from the public.

Notes:

The Assessment Task Force convened at 9:30 am, June 12, 2014, in Room B100 of the Grimes State
Office Building in Des Moines, Iowa.

Agenda Item: Review plan for the day and adjust agenda as needed

  The Task Force began by reviewing the schedule for the day and taking stock of where they are in
  the process. No changes were made to the agenda.

  - 4 vendors submitted materials

    - ACT

    - CTB

    - Iowa Testing Program

    - Pearson

  - Small groups were able to evaluate the assessments we were expecting

Grimes State Office Building - 400 E 14th St - Des Moines IA 50319-0146
PHONE (515) 281-5294 FAX (515) 242-5988
www.educateiowa.gov
Championing Excellence for all Iowa Students through Leadership and Service

- The rubric did not work quite as well for those assessments we were not expecting (e.g., they did not cover all grades or content areas) and may need slight revisions.

Agenda Item: Clarify decision rules

The Task Force reviewed key norms and agreements

- Remember that every decision should be made by considering how it affects children in Iowa

- Scoring criteria should be clear

- Data informs the decision, but the Task Force makes the decision

- The Task Force should seek knowledge from outside the group

- Honor and work within the process; stick to consensus determination made by the Task Force

The Task Force reviewed their decision rules

- Decisions will be made by consensus to the greatest extent possible

- To the extent possible, the Assessment Task Force will be self-governing

- Sufficient time will be provided for dissenting views to be expressed.

- When consensus does not appear to be possible:
  o Members may call for a vote
  o A quorum (50% of the membership) must be present for decisions to be made
  o Decisions will be determined by a ¾ vote of those present and voting
  o The final vote on recommendations will be noted

- Final recommendations may include authored dissenting and supporting opinions

- Assessment Task Force members must be present to vote

Agenda Item: Discuss SBAC Status in the review process

The Task Force discussed the situation as outlined by David Tilly.

- The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) cannot respond to an RFI or RFP

- The SBAC assessments will be open source and any vendor can propose to administer SBAC

- In response to the original RFI, Pearson said they would submit for the SBAC; the Task Force expected that SBAC would be in the mix of assessments to review

- Pearson chose not to submit information about SBAC

- After much discussion, a fist-to-five vote was taken on several options

- Decision: The Task Force decided to open another RFI for all vendors. (ALL voted 5 on the Fist-to-Five scale) The deadline to submit information on the new RFI will be July 8, 2014.

- Decision: The Task Force decided that the RFI should include clarification that the Task Force encourages SBAC submission and a timeline (ALL voted 5)

- Decision: The Task Force agreed to the bullets below (14 voted 5; 2 voted 2)

  o Approach vendors we know are involved with SBAC to make sure they know about the RFI

  o Ask SBAC to work to get a vendor to submit information about SBAC

  o Ask UCLA, WestEd, and CCSSO to submit information about SBAC

Tilly said he would have the Iowa Department of Education's (IDE) legal counsel review the new RFI before it is released. The Task Force wished to have at least one other attorney review the process. Harry Heiligenthal volunteered to have IASB's legal counsel review the process.

Later in the meeting, Thomas Mayes, IDE legal counsel, shared his recommendations on moving forward and confirmed that the actions taken by the Task Force were allowable. It is within the scope of this Task Force to seek information in a variety of ways. The more data collected and analyzed by the committee used to make recommendations to the Legislature, the better.

Agenda Item: Review small groups' preliminary scoring experiences and initial findings

Circe Stumbo reviewed the rotation schedule:

- ACT (reviewed by 2 groups)

- ACT Engage (reviewed by 2 groups)

- ACT Work Keys (reviewed by 1 group)

- ACT Aspire, submitted by ACT (reviewed by 1 group) and submitted by Pearson (reviewed by 1 group)

- CTB CoreLink (reviewed by 2 groups)

- Next Generation Iowa Assessments (reviewed by 2 groups fully, 1 group partially)

  o NOTE: CTB also submitted their formative assessments in response to the second section of the request for additional information

Stumbo presented a broad sense of the results from the small-group reviews, including preliminary score calculations and weightings from the small-groups. The Task Force asked for one update to the score calculations, which was to change the scale for items that had a maximum score of 2; this changed the total possible points available on the rubric to 266, which changed the percent of points scored related to what is possible for each assessment, but did not change the overall ranking or relative weights. The Task Force broke into the small-groups to discuss what came out of the other small-groups, what to do with ACT's submission (i.e., Should ACT be considered as a package?), and what questions they have of the other small-groups regarding the submissions they

reviewed. There was much discussion about the small-group findings and their meanings both in small-groups and as a full Task Force.

Combined Agenda Items: Determine next steps and Take stock of progress today and review and adjust schedule for the summer (Change date of August meeting?)

The Task Force came up with several different next steps:

Determine which assessments go to round two:

- After lengthy discussion, the Task Force decided that they would move forward with determining which assessments that were reviewed by the small-groups would move forward to round two while awaiting additional responses to the new RFI. The question before the Task Force was "Do we stay in round one until the next RFI period closes?" Two members voted yes and 14 members voted no. 1 Task Force member abstained from the vote.

- The Task Force decided that anything that purely does not meet the criteria of the law would not go on to round two—that is, they received a zero in the rubric for the items covers grades 3-11, piloted and tested in Iowa, and available in the last quarter of the school year—with a Fist-to-Five vote of 15 members at a 5 and 1 member at a 3.

- The Task Force decided to move only the Next Generation Iowa Assessments to round two and to immediately notify ACT and CTB and Pearson that they did not make it to round two, along with the rationale above, with a Fist-to-Five vote of 14 members at a 5 and 1 member at a 4.

Other evidence to consider in round two: The Task Force members brainstormed the kinds of evidence they will want to review in round two. They discussed the feasibility of reviewing these types of evidence.

- The Task force decided that Department staff should take the questions we brainstormed today (below) and craft a formal communique to Iowa Testing Program, which we will send out via email to every member of the Task Force. Task Force members will have 3 days to review the draft communique and suggest revisions to the text. The Department will integrate suggestions from the Task Force, finalize the communication, and send it to the contact at ITP. If Task Force members suggest major additions or modifications to the draft communique, the Department staff may send the additions or modifications back out to the Task Force for review.

- Ideas for round two evidence:

  o Every piece to back up every rubric item

    ▪ Alignment of standards reports

    ▪ DOK reports

    ▪ Etc.

  o List of schools in Iowa where it has been piloted

- Analysis of what educators and students in Iowa have said about the pilot; experience of Iowa educators in the pilot/field test; feedback from users of the assessment

    - Evidence of how you are using feedback (e.g., changes you have made in response to feedback)

    - Examples of instructional changes teachers could make in response to data from the assessment; evidence you have thought through how teachers can use the data from your assessments

- Examples of practice tests, prototypes, released items, etc. at all grade levels (or at least grade spans), along with their determination of DOK

- Examples of reports at all levels

- Technical manual, or at least technical reports

- Alignment

    - Results of alignment study

    - Examples of questions that are aligned to the Iowa Core

    - DOK reports

    - How their specifications align to the Iowa Core

    - Are all items on a grade-level test aligned to grade-level content?

    - Evidence that the language is aligned to the Iowa Core

    - Will reports be aligned to Webb's DOK?

- How is proficiency defined and determined? How will you work with the state to provide standards-based proficiency scores?

- More specific information about cost, such as the relative costs. See pages 20 through 23 of your additional information. Provide more information on the different relative costs.

- Total time to administer the complete assessment, not just reading and mathematics

- Where do you get scorers where human scoring is required? How will scorers be trained? What is the process used for scoring?

- Who are the experts in students with disabilities who were involved in development; do they have reports?

- What are you least confident about in the new assessment? What are weaknesses in the new assessments?

- See additional questions from the Small-Groups

- Individual Task Force members posed additional requests

    - Be sure we have enough time to review the evidence

    - Give us Cliff Notes versions of the information as well as specifics of what we should look for in the next round

- Consider developing a review aid, like a table, that could help with taking notes during reviews

- The Task Force agreed that individual Task Force members may wish to begin reading ITP's response to the Assessment Survey Part Two

Map of the Year and Taking Stock of the Day: Immediately after lunch, Stumbo presented a revised map of the year and there was some discussion. Decisions about the map of the year were held until the end of the meeting, when the Task Force returned to this agenda item.

- The revised map of the year proposed collecting more information from June 16-July 10 to analyze in order to finally determine at the July 17 which assessments to send to round two; cancelling the August meeting; inviting vendors to interviews in September; making final decisions about recommendations in October; and approving the final report in December.

- Members wanted to make sure there is enough time to deliberate prior to voting on recommendations. Members suggested looking into virtual meetings between the September and October meeting; however, a member of the Task Force suggested we be careful about using virtual meetings to make sure they are accessible to the public

- Decisions (made by consensus)

  - Task Force members will be invited to participate in small-groups July 8, 10, 11, 14, and 15 to review assessments submitted through the new RFI. As a rule of thumb, there should be a minimum of four Task Force members in small-group meetings. Stumbo will send out Doodle polls to determine who can meet during these dates.

  - In addition to reviewing additional information received in the next RFI, small-groups should begin to develop interview questions and develop a draft outline for the final report

  - Task Force members who are able were asked to hold August 14 for potential small-group work.

  - The Task Force agreed to meet from 10 am – 4 pm on July 17.

  - The Task Force agreed that if vendors are being interviewed on September 17, they would meet from 8 am – 8 pm.

  - Stumbo will send out Doodle polls to find dates for October, November, and December meetings.

Agenda Item: Other business and meeting evaluation

There was no other business