



## Iowa Assessment Task Force

### Meeting Notes

July 17, 2014, 10:00 am – 4:00 pm

*Notes submitted by Circe Stumbo*

Task Force Members Present:

Dave Tilly (Chair), Ruth Allison, Catherine Blando, Shelly Bosovich, Martha Bruckner, Joe DeHart, Diana Gonzalez, Harry Heiligenthal, Tina L. Hoffman, Mark Lane, JoEllen Latham, Jon W. McKenzie, Angela Olson, Elliott Smith, Tammy Wawro, Karen Woltman

Facilitator:

Circe Stumbo

DE Staff Observers:

Colleen Anderson; Connor Hood

Two observers from the public were in attendance.

**Notes:**

**The Task Force meeting convened at 10:05 am.**

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

Stumbo reviewed agenda and work completed during the last meeting and reminded everyone of all the tasks completed to date. Dave reviewed the Task Force timeline from this day forward. Dave reported that the State Board of Education is asking for an update during their August 4 meeting. Notes of each State Board meeting are posted on the DE website.

**Agenda Item: Review small groups' initial findings in the second RFI**

Responses to the second RFI were received from ACT for a combined ACT and ASPIRE; Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) for the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium; and Turning Technologies. Two small-groups met to review the submissions, one on July 11 in Des Moines and one on July 15 in Cedar Rapids.

Turning Technologies' submission did not meet the minimum criteria of the law, so the small-groups did not review their submission.

Group and individual notes from the preliminary scoring of the two assessments were handed out, along with the draft preliminary scores. After discussion, the Task Force made several decisions about the second RFI assessments and round two.

- With 12 votes in favor, **the Task Force agreed to use the same criteria that was used in reviewing responses to the first RFI with regard to which assessments to move to round**

**two:** 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. 12 votes in favor.

- **After much discussion, the Task Force voted on which of the assessments to move into Round 2.**
  - **ACT:** 15 in favor with 1 abstention
  - **DRC for Smarter Balanced:** 15 in favor with 1 abstention
  - **Turning Technologies:** 15 opposed with 1 abstention
- **There was a motion to determine which vendors to invite back for interviews.** 14 in favor, 2 abstentions
- After discussion, **there was a motion to change the order of the agenda to determine the plan for collecting and evaluating multiple forms of data in round two before voting to determine which vendors to invite back for interviews.** 14 in favor, 0 opposed.

**Agenda Item: Determine plan for collecting and evaluating multiple forms of data in round two**

Background: There are three assessments in round two of the Task Force deliberations: Next Generation Iowa Assessments presented by Iowa Testing Program, ACT Aspire and the ACT presented by ACT, and the Smarter Balanced Assessment presented by DRC.

- **A motion to use the current rubric in round 2 with everyone rating round 2 assessments at the same time was made and then tabled, with the vote tally on tabling the motion being 16 in favor, 0 opposed.**
- **After discussion, a motion to interview all 3 providers failed with 3 votes in favor and 11 votes opposed.**
- **A motion to remove ACT from further consideration based on their inability to satisfactorily answer the questions on achievement and alignment passed with 13 votes in favor, 3 votes opposed**
- **A motion to interview DRC for Smarter Balanced and Iowa Testing Program for the Next Generation Iowa Assessments passed with a vote of 16 in favor, 0 opposed.**

**The Task Force voted to move back up in the agenda the discussion of additional questions to pose to assessment developers.**

**Agenda Item: Determine additional questions for new vendors moving to round two**

The Task Force brainstormed questions to ask of both test developers in round two and some to ask of each individually prior to the interviews (questions would be sent to the test developers prior to the interview; some answers would be needed immediately but most could be answered during the interview). There was deliberation about whether to only ask questions of DRC on behalf of SBAC or whether to also go directly to SBAC with questions, but no final decision was made. The same process for finalizing the questions will be used as last time: Connor Hood will clean up the brainstormed questions and send them 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.

Brainstormed questions:

Questions for All Test Developers:

- Please make practice tests available to the Task Force prior to the interview
- Which schools piloted or test your assessment?
- What have you learned from the pilot/field tests? What did you do with what you learned?
- What updates do you have available around studies of validity and reliability? When can you provide validity and reliability data on the piloted/field tests?

Questions for DRC SBAC:

- All questions from the small groups
- Provide additional information about the criteria/sub-criteria where the assessment scored low (1-3 questions about each criterion to help clarify)
- What subgroups were in the pilot/field tests? How large were the subgroups? What other demographics can you provide about pilot/field test subgroups?

**Agenda Item: Determine plan for collecting and evaluating multiple forms of data in round two, continued**

The Task Force returned to the previous agenda item and discussed a rough option for how to run the meetings on September 18.

8:00 am – 9:00 am	Confirm process for the day
9:00 am – 10:00 am	Interview panel of users – students, teachers, principals, and curriculum directors
10:00 am – 11:30 am	Run assessment 1 through the rubric
11:30 am – 12:30 pm	Lunch
12:30 – 2:00 pm	Interview assessment 1 representatives
2:00 – 3:30 pm	Run assessment 2 through the rubric
3:30 – 5:00 pm	Interview assessment 2 representatives
5:00 – 6:00 pm	Supper
6:30 – 8:00 pm	Deliberate findings

The Task Force discussed the merits of this approach to the interviews on September 18. No action was taken.

The Task Force then brainstormed additional evidence to consider in round two.

- Evidence to be provided by the test developer
  - Intended purpose
    - What are the intended purposes of the assessment in relation to students, teachers, principals, schools, districts, and states?
    - How is your test good for kids?
  - Evidence of alignment
    - Alignment proof to Iowa Core State standards
    - Reports, studies/analysis of areas such as alignment of Iowa Core, rigor, etc.
  - How results are presented
    - How are reports disseminated to students and parents?

- Other reports, studies, analysis of any of the areas of the rubrics?
    - Format of results presentation to schools, parents, DE
    - All reports
    - Copies of all tests
  - Information (input/feedback) from districts that piloted the assessments (user experience)
  - Copies of actual tests for all grades
  - Communication plan to the public
  - Timeline –When will the assessment be ready to be actually used (with proof of reliability, validity)
  - Demonstrated accommodations, particularly for students with multiple disabilities
  - All technical manuals
  - What on-going resources are available to teachers and districts? Parents? Students? For PD?
- External Resources/supports
    - Other reports on alignment
    - What do lowans think about experiences?
      - Actual (in person) reviews by teacher and students, who have tested each
    - What others think about experiences
      - Customer satisfaction
    - Costs to districts
      - SBAC tech Readiness Survey
      - News articles (e.g., Ed Week) regarding cost experiences in other states for computerized testing
      - STEM Advisory Council Broadband Committee reports/additional information
      - UEN Tech Directors on tech readiness costs
    - Time
      - Estimated time to administer
      - Estimated time for results

The Task Force discussed ways to combine and weight new evidence and criteria for deciding among assessments. The Task Force discussed the probability that no one assessment will be perfect in every way, so the report likely will need to address several different criteria specifically, discussing the pros and cons of each, as well as discuss how the overall recommendation was developed.

After discussion, there was a general sense of the room (but no vote) that the Task Force is confident that the rubric developed and used in round one assured that all the requirements of the legislation were met. Round two provides a clean slate.

The Task Force generated three different potential ways to make a collective decision about recommendations.

1. Consider the following criteria (no specific method of aggregating ratings was proposed):
  - a. Alignment to the Core
  - b. Measures achievement and growth
  - c. Technically sound (validity, reliability, fairness)
  - d. Accommodations & accessibility
  - e. Test developer quality
  - f. User experience
  - g. Cost (including costs to districts)

- h. Usability
  - i. Technical and other supports
2. Base final decision on the following criteria, with no pre-determined weights and no numeric scores
- a. Collective review of the criteria from round one (with evidence from round 1, the Task Force's review of test items, the interview, and external information collected by the Task Force)
  - b. Confidence in the test developer
  - c. References (user experiences—e.g., the panel of lowans who took part in the pilot—etc.)
  - d. Cost

**The facilitator called for a vote on option two but the Task Force requested a straw poll first. 5 said they were in favor of it, 8 abstained. Of the 8 who abstained, no one said they could not live with this as a final option.**

3. Develop a rubric to collect specific evidence—and come up with a score—on the following criteria (the specific criteria was adjusted through the course of the discussion; the list below is the final list the Task Force was contemplating):
- a. Use the round one rubric to generate scores using additional evidence from the interview and from Task Force-generated evidence
  - b. Presentation and experience of the test developer
  - c. Review of test items
  - d. References (user experiences)
  - e. Cost

**When the facilitator conducted a straw poll on this option, 8 said they were in favor of this option, 2 said they could not live with it.**

With no clear majority on any option, enough Task Force members who could not live with certain options, and the end of the available time for the Task Force meeting, the Task Force decided two next steps:

- **A motion passed to hold a virtual meeting within the next three weeks for the purpose of making a decision on round two criteria, with 11 in favor, 1 opposed.**
- **A motion passed to move forward in collecting the information from the brainstormed questions and to identify students, teachers, principals, or curriculum directors to serve on a User Panel as part of the round two process, with 12 in favor, 0 opposed.**

**Agenda Item: Finalize interview questions for vendors**

This item was postponed to a future meeting

**Agenda Item: Sketch outline of the report**

This item was postponed to a future meeting

**Agenda Item: Take stock of progress today and review schedule for the rest of the year**

The Task Force discussed work to accomplish between the July 17 and September 17 meetings.

- DE staff will identify a process for getting personal input on experience with the tests from students, teachers, administrators, curriculum directors
- DE staff will draft a second round of questions for test developers and follow the process for finalizing and sending the questions

- DE staff will schedule interviews with test developers
- DE staff will draft a schedule for the interview day
- The Task Force will meet virtually in the next three weeks

**Agenda Item: Other Business**

There was no other business for the Task Force to consider.

**The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 pm.**