Assessment and Accountability Task Force
ENVISION

Meeting Agenda – October 12, 2011

10:00 – 10:15 Reframing Previous Work
Review of summary document from our first meeting

10:15 – 11:00 Dispersing Summative to Formative to Create Balance
Six table groups will use the ACT-Based Summative Assessment Draft to discuss how to disperse it across the balanced assessment chart

11:00 – 11:45 Continued from above
Six table groups will be regrouped into three table groups to share their ideas from the prior session and condense into shared recommendations

11:45 – 12:00 Report Out

12:00 – 1:00 Lunch

1:00 – 1:30 Accountability
Overview of current and next generation models of accountability

1:30 – 2:15 Components of a Balanced Accountability System
Six table groups will discuss the components that should be included in a Balanced Accountability System

2:15 – 2:30 Break

2:30 – 3:15 Components of a Balanced Accountability System
Six table groups will be regrouped into three table groups to share their ideas from the prior session and condense into shared recommendations
3:15 – 3:30 Next Steps

Assessment and Accountability Task Force – ENVISION

During the first meeting of the ENVISION Task Force, the following was the overall thinking of the group:

1. A Balanced Assessment System is based on a clearly articulated and rigorous K-12 curriculum inclusive of all grades and subjects, is an integrated component of the teaching and learning process and has as its overarching goal that every student graduate from high school college and career ready.

2. A Balanced Assessment System utilizes the above referenced articulated curriculum to provide each student with a clearly aligned K-12 learning trajectory across all grades and subject areas which is inclusive of academic knowledge and skills, career interest and career aptitude resulting in multiple pathways for students to achieve the same goal of college and career readiness.

3. A Balanced Assessment System is comprised of formative, benchmark and summative assessments that hold equal value, are based on growth versus status, are flexible in format and use based on the learning needs of students and teachers, and are meaningful to students, teachers, leaders and parents.

4. A Balanced Assessment System is supported by organizational structures that allow for data-informed decision making by groups of teachers and leaders, on-going and job-embedded professional learning and a comprehensive guidance and counseling program that views guidance and counseling as a function shared by all adults having influence over student learning and decision making.

In the second meeting of the task force, building upon the thoughts captured in the first meeting, the group proposed the following:

With College and Career Readiness as the overarching goal for all students, given the fact that the ACT and its suite of assessments is already a part of the Alabama Assessment Plan, the fact that the ACT is an established benchmark of public education in Alabama and shared by public and private state institutions of post-secondary and higher education, and the fact that the ACT
is based on College and Career Readiness - an ACT aligned assessment program for Alabama would look like the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Assessment(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WorkKeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ACT w/Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Transition Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EXPLORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ARMT+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ARMT+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ARMT+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ARMT+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARMT+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developmentally Appropriate Assessment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Developmentally Appropriate Assessment(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Developmentally Appropriate Readiness Benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since this framework is based on an overall summative perspective, the logical next step was to determine how to “distribute” these assessments across the multiple components of a balanced assessment system so there is truly a balance of the formative, benchmark, and summative assessments throughout the system.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Subsequent to the presentation to the State Board of Education of the recommendations by the Assessment and Accountability Task Force, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was convened for input. The Technical Advisory Committee was formed to offer technical and psychometric advice related to the testing and accountability programs for Alabama, including technical guidance related to the implementation of No Child Left Behind requirements. The committee has guided the state testing program in Alabama since the early 80s. Names and positions of TAC members may be found on page X of the Appendix.
The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on January 24, 2012, at the Gordon Persons Building in Montgomery, Alabama. TAC members present at the meeting were Dr. Glennelle Halpin, Dr. Scott Snyder, and Dr. James E. McLean. State Department of Education (SDE) staff present included Dr. Thomas Bice, Dr. Gloria Turner, Ms. Kanetra Germany, Ms. Rhonda Patton, Ms. Nannette Pence, Ms. Susan Beard, Ms. Rebecca Mims, Dr. Melinda Maddox, Mr. Jerome Browning, Ms. Shanthia Washington, Ms. Alfredia Griffin, and Mr. Tony Thacker. Invited guests in attendance were Dr. Sonja Harrington and Dr. Jennifer Good.

Issues Discussed
The following items were addressed:

- **Vision for New Assessment and Accountability Systems**

  Dr. Bice set the tone for the meeting by providing the vision for the new assessment and accountability systems. He shared with the TAC the draft recommendations from the Assessment and Accountability Task Force (Task Force) that had been meeting since fall 2011. The Task Force was charged with development of recommendations that reflect a balanced assessment system (formative, benchmark, and summative) and an accountability system that provides flexibility in determining if students are college and career ready.

  The TAC reviewed and discussed the draft recommendations from the Task Force. The TAC recommended that a timeline be established in implementing the changes in the assessment and accountability programs in order for them to be defensible. Timing of the rollout of the new systems is critical and should include transition time if there will not be parallel systems in place. The TAC suggested that the issue of instructional validity be addressed for phasing in the new assessment and accountability systems without running parallel systems. Following discussion, the TAC provided the following comments:

  **Proposed Assessment System Recommendations**

  **Positives** – Overall, the TAC was pleased to see that the ultimate goal is to provide a logical, linear relationship all the way down to kindergarten with the assessment program. The TAC viewed the proposed assessment system as a coherent, comprehensive, and integrated program across grades. They were especially pleased that the proposed plan included end-of-course assessments.

  **Cautions** – Most of the cautions were related to ensuring appropriate technical requirements are met within the tight timeline requirements. These include the following:
Alignment studies
Instructional validity studies (especially if the assessments count as part of grades)
Content and bias reviews
Consequential validity studies
Equity studies

Additional concerns are as follows:

**Use of test as part of final grade** - In use of a test score as part of the final course grade for end-of-course assessments, the TAC was concerned about differential consequences that could result for specific subgroups of students; thus the need for consequential validity studies. For instance, what are the consequences for the C and D students who may be more negatively impacted than the A and B students? What are the consequences for students in different geographical locations within the state? The TAC recommended that the SDE consider percentages lower than 20% for the test score to count towards the final grade and to determine if one administration of one test is reliable enough to be used as 20% of a student’s final grade.

**Through-course assessment by standards** - The TAC had concerns with the through-course idea proposed for summative purposes that would allow LEAs to test one standard at a time and roll the scores up at the end of the year for an overall summative score. They thought that the need for significant technical and logistical support and instructional validity by standard makes it almost impossible to do. Paper-pencil delivery would be a huge problem in a through-course assessment by standard as would security.

**Use of test scores to determine effective teachers** - If test scores are used to determine teacher/leader effectiveness, scores should be validated for such purposes.

**On target for college and careers** –Given the project that the SDE has entered into with ACT to establish benchmarks indicating “on target” to be college and career ready, the TAC was interested in seeing data across several years in validating the “on target” scores. The TAC suggested that projected ACT scores at all grade levels might also be established given the current work with ACT

**Project-based assessments** - The TAC suggested that the project-based assessments might be part of a grade, but not part of the summative assessment. It was suggested
that there would need to be a great deal of professional development in order to ensure validly- and reliably-scored projects as well as comparability across schools.

Proposed Accountability System Recommendations

**Positives** - The TAC thought the approach to the accountability system is good and especially liked the combination of gaps, growth, and achievement.

**Cautions** - The TAC suggested the need to consider different types of growth models and to be cautious in the use of growth percentiles. An additional challenge in implementing the new system will be in establishing comparability across systems with the differentiated, individualized system-level improvement component. The TAC suggested that if this component is added to the accountability system that guidelines need to be developed as to what can be included in the system-level improvement component and that there be standardization in the scoring of this component.

- **Graduation Rate**

  **Minimum N** – The TAC recommended the minimum N should not be lower than 40, the minimum N currently implemented for proficiency rates and participation rates. They also recommended that impact data related to the number of subgroups that would be eliminated with the recommended minimum N be considered in making the final decision. This is data that the USDOE will probably request as well.

  **Current Graduation Rate Goal of 90%** - The TAC indicated that the graduation rate is a policy decision rather than a technical one.