

## Technical Advisory Committee

Wednesday November 2, 2011

Embassy Suites

8:30-3:30 PM

8:30 AM Welcome and Introductions - Pat  
Open Meetings Act

8:45 AM Approve May meeting summary (Document 01) – Brian

8:55-10:15 AM **Updates and Follow up:**

**The first four items before are informational items, and the NDE would like to report back to the TAC regarding progress made in these areas. TAC members are invited to comment or ask questions but are not expected to provide specific input.**

**NeSA Results** – State of the Schools Report (Documents 2,3,4)-Pat  
On October 19<sup>th</sup> the disaggregated state test results were released for reading, mathematics and writing along with AYP decisions. The reading trend was upward, the writing results stable, and the baseline for mathematics established.

**Mathematics Standard Setting Report\*** - Pat/DRC

The State Board of Education in July approved the cut scores for mathematics using information from the Contrasting Group Method, the Bookmark method, and data from both NAEP and ACT. The process went smoothly and was accepted by the board and the field.

**Mathematics Technical Manual\*** – Pat/DRC

The technical manual has been completed for the NeSA-M and will be submitted as part of the peer review documentation due to the USDOE in December 2011. It is significantly large and is presented in parts.

**\*These two documents are posted on our website:**

**[www.education.ne.gov/assessment](http://www.education.ne.gov/assessment) You may access them by clicking on NeSA-Mathematics on the left hand side of our site. They are posted under “Technical Reports.”**

10:15-10:30 AM Break

10:30-11:30 AM **Update: NeSA-Writing Developments** (Document 5) – Pat, Ed, DRC

The NDE has continued its communication to schools about the writing transition to analytic scoring (Grades 8, 11 in 2012, Grade 4 in 2013) and have provided teachers with multiple opportunities for training in the analytic scoring process. DRC provided an explanation of the process, and a shortened version of that has been distributed to schools. Per the advice of the TAC in May of 2011, the NDE is assembling a group to review the Performance Level Descriptors prior to the new cut scores being established in the spring of 2012.

At the last TAC meeting there was discussion about the scale score to be used with writing. Since that time the NDE and DRC have agreed upon a scale score of 0-70 rather than the scale score of 0-200 as is the case for reading, mathematics, and science.

The transition to online administration in grades 8, 11 will continue in 2012 with the 4<sup>th</sup> grade remaining paper/pencil.

11:30-12:00 Noon **Update and Demonstration: Check 4 Learning (C4L)** – – Jan and Janet Hensley

C4Learning has generated significant interest across the state with 177 districts out of 241 signed up to participate in this state-developed item bank and accompanying interim assessment system. Districts sent staff members to training in item development and submission in September. Items are due November 1<sup>st</sup>; peer review/editing of items will occur at the end of November, and the items will be shipped to Computerized Assessments and Learning (CAL) in December. The NDE will be doing training in December about the use of the system and the interpretation of reports generated by the system. The goal of C4L is to be ready in January.

*Do TAC members see anything that the NDE should be anticipating in providing this new system to our schools? What additional steps should we be planning?*

12:00-12:45 PM Lunch

12:45 – 1:30 PM

**Mathematics Mode Comparability Study** –(Doc 6) John Moon and Bill Auty (will be sent by Oct. 28)

The mode comparability study for mathematics is now complete. The TAC recommendation was that the 2011 study in mathematics be significantly more robust than the 2010 reading study. It was recommended that subgroup performance between modes be examined. Although overall student performance in mathematics does not seem to be affected by mode, there are differences in subgroup performance.

*Participation in online testing has always been encouraged by NDE. In your opinion to what extent are the outcomes of this study statistically and educationally different? What changes or recommendations in future would you make in dealing with the mode differences found in this study?*

1: 30-2:45 PM

**Nebraska Performance Accountability System – Ne-PAS** (Document 7,8, 9) – Pat and Bill Auty

In November of 2010 the State Board of Education adopted a set of belief statements and a Framework for a State Accountability Model, Part I: Beliefs, Values, Purposes. Throughout 2010 and 2011 a subcommittee of the board has studied and examined many approaches to implementation of performance indicators of status, improvement, and growth. The subcommittee has reviewed the impact of each model using actual data from 2010 and 2011.

Most recently the subcommittee has been discussing a direct scale model and various policy weights that might be applied to the indicators. The model being reviewed at this time has been shared with the entire board of education with the intent to adopt an implementation model by January 2012. The State Board of Education intends to examine this model over time to determine its impact and to assure that appropriate classification decisions are being made and that continuous improvement is encouraged.

The model under discussion is basically a descriptive model, “shining the light” on the performance of schools from year to year. The NePAS model will likely coincide with legislation that has been under discussion with the legislature in the last several years. The legislation directs the State Board to build a model to classify schools, identify the “priority” schools that need to improve, and previous legislation specifies a series of improvement steps. These steps include

a plan for improvement, an assigned intervention team, and expected increases in the performance indicators over time.

*Does the implementation model proposed match the State Board's Beliefs, Values, and Purposes Statements? What are the unintended consequences of such a model?*

2:45 PM-3:00 PM

Break

3:00-3:30 PM

Meeting dates - 2012  
Wrap up – Next Steps