

## **State Testing Review Committee**

Meeting Minutes: September 23, 2010 – *Finalized 10/4/2010*

Attendance in person: Kenneth Hunter, Harvey Smith, Jim Shriner, Samantha Dolen, Tim Truesdale, and Dan Brown

Attendance via telephone: Steve Cordogan and Katherine Ryan

Comments submitted by members:

TIM

I think it's important to address how schools with lower technology capacity will be prepared for the format of the exams, not only to administer them but to give students sufficient experience with technology for it not to exacerbate an achievement gap.

Also, I think it was mentioned that it seems problematic that the weighting system for the four exams each year might "ding" students who don't master a standard on the first assessment but do master on the final assessments.

The student presentations of the third assessments for ELA was also discussed. This would take a significant amount of instructional time to complete, and students' varying public speaking comfort would need to be considered, as well as training teachers how to evaluate the presentations.

JIM

111TH CONGRESS

2D SESSION

S. 2781

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 9, 2010

Referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned

**AN ACT**

**To change references in Federal law to mental retardation to references to an intellectual disability, and change references to a mentally retarded individual to references to an individual with an intellectual disability.**

1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

1 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

2 This Act may be cited as "Rosa's Law".

3 SEC. 2. INDIVIDUALS WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES.

4 (a) HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—Section

5 760(2)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20

6 U.S.C. 1140(2)(A)) is amended by striking “mental retardation or”.

8 (b) INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION

9 ACT.

10 (1) Section 601(c)(12)(C) of the Individuals

11 with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C.

12 1400(c)(12)(C)) is amended by striking “having

13 mental retardation” and inserting “having intellectual disabilities”.

15 (2) Section 602 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1401)

16 is amended—

17 (A) in paragraph (3)(A)(i), by striking

18 “with mental retardation” and inserting “with

19 intellectual disabilities”; and

20 (B) in paragraph (30)(C), by striking “of

21 mental retardation” and inserting “of intellectual disabilities”.

23 (c) ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

24 OF 1965.—Section 7202(16)(E) of the Elementary and

25 Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 17512(16)(E)) is amended by striking “mild mental  
retardation,” and inserting “mild intellectual disabilities,”.

3 (d) REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.—

4 (1) Section 7(21)(A)(iii) of the Rehabilitation

5 Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 705(21)(A)(iii)) is amended

6 by striking “mental retardation,” and inserting “intellectual disability,”.

8 (2) Section 204(b)(2)(C)(vi) of such Act (29

9 U.S.C. 764(b)(2)(C)(vi)) is amended by striking

10 “mental retardation and other developmental disabilities” and inserting “intellectual disabilities and  
12 other developmental disabilities”.

13 (3) Section 501(a) of such Act (29 U.S.C.

14 791(a)) is amended, in the third sentence, by striking “President’s Committees on Employment of  
People With Disabilities and on Mental Retardation”

17 and inserting “President’s Disability Employment

18 Partnership Board and the President’s Committee

19 for People with Intellectual Disabilities”.

STEVE

From our ACT EPAS research, we have found that growth is very closely tied to initial EPAS performance: the higher the EXPLORE score, the higher the growth. Rather than, for example, students growing 5 points from EXPLORE to the PSAT ACT, they actually will grow 1.3 times their EXPLORE score.

So the average student with a 14 will only grow to an 18 (4 points growth), while the average student with a 23 will grow to a 30 (7 points growth). This is not due to EPAS scaling, it is due to the fact that students who have made greater growth in the past will continue to do so; growing more each year than those with lower initial performance. This has tremendous policy implications, since it means that a switch to growth models will NOT compensate for differing school demographics, since schools in more disadvantaged areas will see less growth levels as those in less disadvantaged areas, unless substantial changes are made. However, admitting such a problem may be politically problematic, since it suggests that we should have lower standards for growth for more disadvantaged schools.

Harvey

1. I strongly second Jim's point re use of common language/statement of objectives across content areas for CCS.
2. To iterate my point in your notes, the advantages of formative reporting of learning MUST be effectively installed in the new system if teachers are to take it seriously (and yes reporting must be directly and understandably aligned to the Core standards) - for example, building on but improving current reporting which is more closely related to Assessment Frameworks.
3. Don't know the background, but can you and agency keep pushing to have improved reporting and guidance for instruction for ELL and spec ed. in the new system as regards performance relative to the Core standards . Right now that greatly needs improvement.
4. Agree with Steve C's cautionary point that growth measures per se won't remedy how accountability is "imposed" - yes it is imposed - by magically showing better results. However, growth is a more robust reporting of actual improvement, and can be supported on grounds that it is a metric that more closely represents outcomes accurately, PLUS other factors about the characteristics of student "inputs" can be used to weight the growth measures to make for better alignment, whereas using current accountability 'cut points' can't provide such corrective adjustments. In other words, if growth persist to lag for some kids, that is what it is. Also, need to focus the growth reporting from early elementary onward, not just at high school. Anyhow, I don't basically disagree with Steve's caution.

Notes taken during the meeting **AND EDITED VIA EMAIL RESPONSES:**

Below are the bullets I wrote down. Please feel free to expand on the topic(s) and respond. I will incorporate your parting comments and send out final notes next week.

Jim—common language between standards content areas

Many—assessment level—how detailed will the results be presented—level of disaggregation?

Ken—unfortunate losing ISAT writing

Steve—CCR—useful as curriculum spine **RATHER THAN AS A CURRICULUM**

Harvey—potential advantage—formative (ref CCR, correct?)

Harvey—appreciated the Item Analysis Summaries created for ISAT – [would PARCC be producing something similar?]

Ken—PD—overcoming teacher fear—good front end communication to minimize fear

Jim—terminology across subjects—same CCSS structure across subjects—this would help with PD

Steve—growth/value added—different growth rates for different **INITIAL** ability levels

Jim—what about adaptive computer testing—[how does it work with...]scaling—meeting standards—accountability

Samantha—high school—end of year by grade level or end of course by content?

Jim—intellectual disabilities

Answer for Harvey about **ACCESS**—yes it is FED approved

Answer for Jim about **computer adaptive testing**—PARCC is **NOT** developing CAT. It appears that PARCC is going to let Smarter Balanced develop that technology.

Answer for many about SPED and LM – PARCC is **NOT** tasked with creating alternative assessments – the SPED educators wanted their own grants to handle it themselves.