

**Assessment Task Force Update
Summary of the June 29, 2015 WebEx Meeting**

Submitted July 13, 2015 by the Center for Assessment

The assessment Task Force met via WebEx on June 29, 2015 from 9:00 am to noon. Twenty-two of the 26 members of the Task Force were in attendance (see below). Scott Marion and Joseph Martineau of the Center for Assessment, LSO consultants, planned and facilitated the meeting in coordination with Brent Young and Deb Lindsey of the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE).

Members Present	Members Absent
1. Dan Coe	1. Christopher Dresang
2. Stephanie Czarobski	2. Cindy Gulisano
3. Sharla Dowding	3. Kevin Roberts
4. Kim Ferguson	4. Marty Wood
5. Molly Foster	
6. Crystal Graf	
7. Joanne Flanagan	
8. Shannon Harris	
9. Cassie Hetzel	
10. Ellen Kappus	
11. Audrey Kleinsasser	
12. Wanda Maloney	
13. Kevin Mitchell	
14. Anne Ochs	
15. Mary Charles Pryor	
16. Jon Lever	
17. Sue Stevens	
18. Byron Stutzman	
19. Sonya Tysdal	
20. Kathy Vetter	
21. Rebecca Weston	
22. Nicole Novotny Wonka	

The agenda for the day was as follows:

Welcome and attendance
Discuss preliminary draft of Chapter I: All but section on comprehensive assessment systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Types of assessment and appropriate uses</i> - <i>Task Force's highest priority purposes and uses</i> - <i>Task Force's intended outcomes of implementing assessment in Wyoming</i>

Discuss preliminary draft of Chapter I: Section on comprehensive assessment systems

- *The importance of the decision on scope of final report (summative only vs. comprehensive system)*
- *The importance of clear, coherent vignettes*
- *Characteristics on which a comprehensive assessment system may vary*

Presentation on summative assessment

- *Quality criteria, existing products, and existing reports*

Setting the agenda for the July 28-29 meeting in Laramie

The facilitators asked Task Force members to focus on big picture issues in discussions. The facilitators received feedback useful for revising the preliminary draft of Chapter I.

Types of Assessment and Appropriate Uses

Task Force members indicated that the draft section on types of assessment and appropriate uses was appropriately targeted at the right level (to an interested lay person willing to put in some time) and adequately introduced the complexity of issues that the Task Force will need to address.

Task Force's Highest-Priority Purposes and Uses

Task Force members pointed out that the mode of presentation of the highest-priority purposes and uses could be interpreted as focusing on summative assessment only, when that was clearly not the intent of the Task Force. Further, the Task Force members indicated that collapsing the specific purposes and uses into the categories in the first draft lost some of the key information associated with the named purposes. Specifically, they were concerned that the way in which the uses were categorized underrepresented the importance of having assessments that can support improvements in teaching and learning. That presentation will be modified based on multiple potential options for more clear presentation.

Task Force's Intended Outcomes of Implementing Assessment in Wyoming

Task Force members' highest-priority purposes and uses were used to deduce the intended outcomes of implementing assessment in Wyoming. Task Force members did not offer any amendments to the deduced intended outcomes, but more time will be devoted to reviewing intended outcomes in the July 28-29, 2015 meeting in Laramie.

The Importance of the Decision on Scope of Final Report

The Select Committee on Statewide Education Accountability was very clear at their meeting early June that the Task Force must make recommendations regarding a statewide summative assessment system that can be used for school accountability. They are open to recommendations regarding a comprehensive assessment system as long as it included specific recommendations for an accountability assessment. Based on results from the kickoff meeting, the Task Force's highest-priority purposes and uses (multiple ways of informing instruction) are inconsistent with making recommendations regarding only a statewide summative assessment system.

Therefore, the Task Force will need to determine whether to provide the minimum intended outcome of its work (a statewide summative assessment system and a reduced set of highest-priority purposes and uses) or make recommendations for a comprehensive assessment system that allows for addressing the broader array of high-priority uses and purposes.

The Importance of Clear, Coherent Vignettes

The facilitators had intended to provide high-level vignettes of how a comprehensive assessment system could be designed to have varying levels of “state touch” for this WebEx meeting. However, the facilitators were not satisfied that they were clearly enough articulated to serve the intended purpose. The intended purposes of the vignettes (a clear vision of how the Task Force could design a comprehensive assessment system to simultaneously meet their highest-priority purposes and respect local control) is critical to making the decision on scope of the final report. Delivery of the vignettes will be made in advance of the July 28-29, 2015 in Laramie.

Characteristics on Which a Comprehensive Assessment System May Vary

A table showing the various aspects in which a comprehensive assessment system could differ was provided as a starting point for discussion regarding the flexibility available in designing a comprehensive assessment system. Task Force members felt that the table was useful, but that when the vignettes are finalized, the vignettes should replace the table, and the table should be placed in an appendix rather than in the body of the text.

Presentation on Summative Assessment

As an introduction to making recommendations on a statewide summative assessment, the facilitators presented various criteria for judging the quality of summative assessments, reviewed the existing products that could serve as summative assessments, and reviewed existing reports regarding existing summative assessments. The reports may be useful in judging quality and in providing a template for identifying important characteristics desired in a statewide summative assessment system. A facilitator pointed out one set of missing reports: those produced by Educational Testing Service regarding the various consortium assessments available.

It was pointed out that the listing of existing products was limited to general academic assessments, and that there are also options for alternate academic assessment of students with significant cognitive disabilities and English proficiency assessment of English language learners.

Setting the Agenda for the July 28-29 Meeting in Laramie

The facilitators presented a possible agenda to the Task Force, with a major feature of breaking into two groups for the meeting, one to focus on statewide summative assessment and the other to focus on the other aspects of a comprehensive assessment system, with time for collaboration between groups to assure coherence. The Task Force indicated agreement with the agenda as presented. The facilitators will flesh out the agenda to provide greater detail on group activities during the meeting.

The next meeting (July 13, 2015) via WebEx will be used to introduce various design considerations for statewide summative assessments, and why they are important to assure that they July 28-29 meeting is productive from the start.

Timeline

The timeline for completing the work of the Task Force is as follows:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Location</i>
July 13, 2015	9:00 AM – 12:00 PM	Meeting 3	Webex
July 28-29, 2015	8:30 AM – 5:00 PM	Meeting 4	Laramie
August 21, 2015	9:00 AM – 12:00 PM	Meeting 5	Webex
September 9, 2015	8:30 AM – 5:00 PM	Final Meeting	Rock Springs

In addition, Scott Marion and Paige Fenton-Hughes will brief the State Board of Education on the Task Force report on September 23, 2015, and Joseph Martineau and Scott Marion will present to the Select Committee on October 30, 2015.