

Wyoming Assessment Task Force Meeting 5

July 28-29, 2015

Laramie, Wyoming

Guiding questions and activities for the Comprehensive Assessment System Strand

1. What is it that makes a collection of assessments a system (**brief presentation**)?
 - a. Coherence—the components must “talk to” one another!
 - b. Comprehensiveness—serve multiple purposes and stakeholders
 - c. Continuity—must inform student progress over time

2. Focusing on components: We suggest focusing on the following potential components of a comprehensive assessment system:
 - a. District assessment system
 - b. Formative assessment/instruction in the classroom
 - c. Interim assessment (e.g., MAP)
 - d. Is this an appropriate focus **for now**?

3. In groups associated with each component noted above, clearly lay out how your component fulfills a particular piece of the ToA.
 - a. What use(s) does it address? As part of this question, please specify the content areas and other knowledge and skills (e.g., critical thinking) that will be addressed by your component. For example, while the district assessment system is statutorily required to address the full “basket of goods,” I might choose to focus mathematics, language arts, and science in order to support my intended uses of program evaluation/monitoring, to identify students in need of remediation and enrichment, and to potentially contribute to school and educator accountability determinations.
 - b. How does your component support this use?
 - c. What needs to change to better support the intended use?
 - d. What specific mechanisms/processes/actions are necessary to fulfill the intended uses?
 - e. What data are necessary to support these mechanisms?
 - i. Timing
 - ii. Item type and quality
 - iii. Transparency
 - iv. Other?

Lunch on Day 1 about here

4. Sharing out **within** the comprehensive group
 - a. What are the three subgroups saying?
 - b. How will the three components “talk” to one another? In other words, how will we create and maintain coherence?
 - c. Are there other components of a comprehensive assessment that we need to address specifically in this discussion?
 - d. How can we best deal with the justifiable “efficacy” (or over-testing) concern?

5. Continuing with the interim and district assessment groups (formative assessment members will join one of the two groups), please address.
 - a. Should your component be used for accountability? If so, what form(s) of accountability?
 - i. District (Accreditation)
 - ii. School (WAEA)
 - iii. Leader and teacher
 - iv. Student (e.g., graduation)
 - b. What are the risks (potential unintended negative consequences) in using the results from your component for any or all of the accountability functions listed above?

6. Based on what we’ve discussed thus far, what do we want to recommend to the summative assessment group?
 - a. As part of our ToA, do we envision the state and local components “talking” to one another? In other words, will any of the local assessment information be used to support uses typically in the exclusive domain of large-scale summative assessment? If so, how?
 - b. What do we need from a summative assessment to better support our comprehensive components? Think specifically in terms of design, reporting, and timing.
 - c. What are we worried about with a summative assessment in terms of “getting in the way” of our hopes for a comprehensive system? Are there particular aspects of potential designs, timing, etc. of a summative assessment that might hinder what we’d like to do with a comprehensive assessment system?

End of Day 2 about here

7. Details, details, details...Issues of capacity and control

a. What does the group recommend regarding the relationship between the state and local districts for each of the components for the various characteristics of assessment design? Use the little graphic to

i. District assessments

- a) Design requirements
- b) Implementation quality
- c) Capacity and expertise building
- d) Quality control/quality assurance
- e) Funding



ii. Interim assessments

- a. Design requirements
- b. Implementation quality
- c. Capacity and expertise building
- d. Quality control/quality assurance
- f) Funding



iii. Formative assessment/instruction

- a. Design requirements
- b. Implementation quality
- c. Capacity and expertise building
- d. Quality control/quality assurance
- e. Funding



8. Details, details, details...Implementation timeline
 - a. What does the group recommend regarding the timeline for implementing each of the various components?
 - b. How does this—or does it—vary by content area?
 - c. Is it all at once or phase in? If phase in, should the phase in occur:
 - i. By district (e.g., pilot districts)
 - ii. By component (e.g., district, formative)
 - iii. By grade span
 - iv. Some combination of i-iii?
 - d. Who is responsible for enacting the implementation timeline?
 - i. State?
 - ii. Districts?
 - iii. Combination? If so, what is the combination?

9. Finally, now having thought through the multitude of issues regarding a comprehensive assessment system, **it's time to call the question.**
 - a. Do we recommend to the State Board and legislature that we move ahead with a comprehensive/balanced assessment system in the ways that we've discussed over the past two days?
 - b. If not, how do we recommend addressing what appear to be the highest priority uses among stakeholders?
 - c. If so, what would we recommend for shaping policy to support these uses while avoiding what might appear to be an increase in state-mandated testing?