

Technical Advisory Committee
Nebraska Department of Education
December 9, 2014
Cornhusker Marriott Hotel Lincoln, NE 8:30 am-3:00 pm
Tentative Agenda

8:30 AM Welcome and Introductions- Valorie

In attendance- Brian Gong, Chad Buckendahl, Richard Sawyer, Linda Poole, Frank Harwood, Commissioner Blomstedt, Molly O'Holleran, Valorie Foy, Jeremy Heneger, John Moon, Sue Anderson, Bill Auty, John Born, Dave Chayer, Dean Folkers, Brian Halstead, Sharon Heater, Chris McCullough, Jenni Norlin-Weaver, Richard Smith, Diane Stuehmer, Scott Swisher, Sherri Woolf, Marilyn Peterson, Cheryl Wolff

8:40 Approve Minutes of May 6, 2014– Brian Document 1

- Correction to May 6, 2014 minutes.
“Neither simple growth, nor Z-score growth is preferable. AYP has set the bar so high for growth that it operates the same as status. Student Growth Percentiles can mask students not being proficient. ~~SGP is more technically defensible based on Z score.~~”
- Approved with correction-Motion by C. Buckendahl, second by R. Sawyer.

8:40-9:40 A QuESTT Discussion Part I: the A QuESTT Classification Model

- Discussion of N=25 based on subject or based on all scores totaled. The intent of the Task Force was discussed (F Harwood) as it wanted to keep focus on all content areas-Reading, Math, Science, and Writing—and thus wanted each to be weighted 25% of status.
- B Gong suggested that NDE examine the results over multiple years to determine the volatility of the classifications changes around the cut points.
- Discussion of school data versus district data. In the December 2014 model, the same impact was applied at the district level as at the school level: 15%/50%/30%/5%. Because a district could have a different classification than any of its schools, it was recommended that the cuts be set at the district level to match the school level cuts that were determined based on impact. Due to this calculation, districts will not show impact of 15%/50%/30%/5%. Big districts will most likely move to the middle.
- Discussion of reasoning behind the impact determinations. C Buckendahl explained the Task Force reasoning on the impact—particularly of 50 schools in Needs Improvement as being a manageable number from which to move to three priority schools. Also of creating “goal” of reaching top category-majority of districts will be in the second and third categories, incentivizing the desire to be in top category. V Foy shared reasoning of Task Force—the notion of “good schools” in Nebraska.
- M O'Holleran concerned about college and career ready. V Foy indicated that adoption of College and Career Ready standards and revision of NeSA tests will address CCR. Discussion of

the operational accountability system. C.Buckendahl indicated that the system provides a categorical profile not an index; the overall decision is compensatory and conjunctive factors

- R Sawyer indicated the importance of transparency and communication for the reporting of the classification component of AQuESTT. NDE provides a data download to districts.
- Valorie shared that NDE was looking at ALL Time Best to determine its inclusion.
- B Gong suggested looking at ceiling and/or floor effects on growth. B Auty suggested that ceiling effect is more likely than floor at this time. B Gong also suggested looking at schools and districts by size for distribution and sensitivity

A QuESTT Discussion Part II: Additional Indicators and

A QuESTT Discussion Part III: Measurement of Additional Indicators

- S Anderson indicated discussions have taken place around adding additional indicators to the first pass of the classification component.
- Several of the indicators that could be used in the A QuESTT classification component are qualitative rather than quantitative in measurement, but also indicated that this concept was being considered mainly as a second pass to be used with schools designated in the lowest level to identify priority schools
- Discussion of the selection of priority schools and support of the improvement process with suggestions given to review schools- Do they have a clue, capacity, commitment?
- R Sawyer indicated that research shows attendance will improve test scores above prior achievement so attendance is important.
- Nebraska does not have consistent definitions of “attendance” and absence” that would provide comparable statewide data across school and districts.
- Important to review achievement data other than NeSA scores, such as national tests
- Indicators should have a purpose linked to improvement
- If an indicator does not show differentiation among schools and districts, it is not usable in an accountability system.
- Interpretation of the data from indicators is important.
- Consider how information about poverty and attendance is factored into identification of priority schools and their improvement.
- Develop a list of best practices for improvement. Use information from successful schools to inform struggling schools.
- Coherent curriculum was discussed.
- Need for systematic and systemic change discussed.

12:30-1:15 Report on Evaluation of the ACT Pilot Project Based on College-Going rates and the Correlation of ACT and NeSA Assessment scores

- NDE was anticipating delivery of final report in the next month. Discussion on correlation between ACT and NeSA, including student motivation, standards alignment,
- R. Sawyer gave a description of current ACT test delivery and research being conducted, along with brief information on Aspire.
- Discussion of college going rate and college success. Many factors affect college success.

- D Folkers indicated that 68% of Nebraska high school graduates enroll in higher education.

1:30 - 2:20 Assessment Transition:

- Discussion of upcoming NeSA transition—linking versus resetting cuts
- Communication is important
- Adaptive testing possibilities were discussed. High number of items needed for adaptive testing.
- New item types will be most concerning to districts as they revise curriculum to meet the demands. B Gong recommended including new item types in Check for Learning so districts have access to them and can have students familiarize themselves with their content and operation.
- General opinion expressed that assessment transition needed to be timely.

2:20-2:50 Norm-referenced testing:

- Discussion of current information around norm-referenced test
- Future discussion should include an alignment to own state's standards.
- A Request for Information might be implemented to provide evaluation of NRTs to inform Nebraska's use of them and recommendation from the State Board of Education.
- States can be helpful to districts by negotiating a state rate for national tests.
- NRTs are helpful to districts only if they use the data received from them.