



Assessment Task Force

Meeting Notes
January 15, 2014

Submitted by Circe Stumbo, Task Force Facilitator

The Assessment Task Force convened at 10:00 am, January 15, 2014.

Agenda Item: Clarifying relationships between the Assessment Task Force and the DE

The Task Force was provided the legislative language that established the Assessment Task Force. The Assessment Task Force discussed the difference in a Task Force charge versus a commission, which is on-going and less focused.

Dave Tilly reported on the double testing and accountability flexibility waivers the DE requested from U.S. Department of Education.

Agenda Item: Clarifying relationships between the DE and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

A proposal was made by Karen Woltman that legal questions be asked of lawyers other than the DE Attorney, due to a possible conflict of interest. Tammy Wawro amended it that the legal questions be provided to all members and if the members choose, they may ask their own attorneys for a legal opinion. The Task Force decided that if a legal interpretation is needed; all members of the Task Force are encouraged to provide legal interpretations, along with information about the source of their interpretations.

A second proposal was made by Karen Woltman to include information regarding Smarter Balanced to the Legislature regardless of how it scores with the rubric. This proposal was tabled until after the Task Force reviews the rubrics and processes for determining which assessment providers to review

Agenda Item: Task Force charge--which subjects to cover

The Task Force discussed whether or not to include science assessments in the reviews and agreed to include science in their report. The Task Force further decided that options for how and when to include science in the work of the Task Force should be brought to the next Task Force meeting.

Agenda Item: Criteria definitions and rubrics

The Task Force received a report from the subgroup, which had worked through two criteria definitions and drafted a rubric for each. The Task Force read excerpts from Chapter 7 of “Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing and Operational Best Practices for Statewide Large-scale Assessment Programs” and discussed the definitions and rubrics for “fairness.” The Task Force came to initial agreement about the design of the rubric and the details for the criterion “fairness.” The Task Force charged the subgroup with completing definitions and rubrics for all criteria and then focusing the February meeting on reviewing the subgroup’s work.

Agenda Item: Mapping out the year

The Task Force agreed on the following plan for next steps: The subgroup is requested to complete rubrics for all criteria (Fairness; Grade availability’ Availability for spring administration; Accurately describes student achievement and growth; Valid; Reliable; Piloted/tested in Iowa; Content alignment; Alignment in rigor; Ability to predict college / career readiness; Cost; Technical Support—Availability and Cost) prior to February meeting for input and revision by the whole Task Force.

In February, the Task Force will review rubrics and revise as needed. In March, the Task Force will plan to approve rubrics and send out to vendors to complete; in April, the Task Force will complete all the reviews; in May, we will invite vendors in, if needed.

Task Force facilitators will poll the members to see if we can find two days in April for the Task Force meeting.

The Task Force closed by completing a meeting evaluation.

The Task Force adjourned at 3:00 pm.