

Reactions from the Field: *Oregon Student Assessment System*

Presented to the State Board of Education on September 21, 2007



Prepared by David T. Conley, Ph.D.

Professor, University of Oregon

Director, Center for Educational Policy Research

Chief Executive Officer, Educational Policy Improvement Center



720 E. 13th Ave., Suite 202, Eugene, OR 97401
p 541.346.6153, t 877.766.2279, f 541.346.6154
epiconline.org,

Reactions from the Field to the Proposed ODE Assessment System

Executive Summary

The Center for Educational Policy Research (CEPR) at the University of Oregon recently solicited input from key stakeholders regarding the Oregon Student Assessment System model initially proposed by Dr. David Conley at a State Board meeting on August 23rd. Dr. Conley revised the model based on feedback received at the August 23rd meeting. CEPR staff then sent the revised model to a total of 15 Oregon stakeholders with knowledge about curriculum and assessment, identified by the Oregon Department of Education for inclusion in the sample. Most of these stakeholders completed and returned a survey, and almost all of them also participated in an interview to provide feedback about the proposed model.

This report is composed of three parts: 1) survey participants' responses to each component of the model; 2) a summary of the responses to the survey's questions; 3) the complete responses to each question from each participant, as contained in the researchers' notes.

1. Survey Participants' Responses to Model Components

Survey Questions: Do you generally support or not support the concept of the following?	Support	Not Sure	Do Not Support
1) A statewide test in English, math, and science focusing on keystone standards?	14	1	0
2) Allowing districts to supplement the statewide test that is focused on keystone standards with items that reflect local priorities so that the results can be used for formative or diagnostic purposes locally?	11	3	1
3) Course-embedded assessments that contain items that are consistent statewide and the results of which contribute to the student grade in the class?	7	6	1
4) A limited number of course-embedded performance tasks that are scored locally using statewide scoring criteria?*	8	6	1
5) A mandatory no-stakes college-readiness exam in 11 th grade?*	6	4	4
6) An extended application given in 12 th grade and designed to assess one or more of the Essential Skills including the Career Related Standards?	10	4	1
7) The overall concept and purposes of the assessment system outlined above?	7	8	0

* Total responses do not sum to 15 for several questions because a participant could not decide between Support and Not Sure.

Overall, the interview and survey participants expressed mixed feelings about the model, primarily because they supported some components and did not support others. Nearly all of the participants supported the concept of a statewide test in English, math, and science focusing on keystone standards. This type of test can be used to meet federal accountability requirements and create a set of universal standards for use statewide. Most participants also liked the concept of supplemental assessment items that could be selected from a state item bank and used for formative purposes locally.

There was considerable disagreement among participants about the integration of both the course embedded assessments and performance tasks with instructional practice. Some participants felt that the statewide scoring criteria would be helpful while others believed this would create a lot of additional work for teachers and that many teachers would resent the intrusion into the classroom.

The college readiness exam was also a polarizing component of the model. Several participants believed it would be helpful if administered in 8th or 9th grade and used to inform high school course-taking patterns. Other participants did not believe that the exam should be mandatory for all students. Another concern was that the results of a college-readiness exam might be used to compare the performance of schools.

The majority of participants supported the concept of an extended application system that is designed locally, but scored by a state panel. Some districts already require this type of assessment as part of senior projects, and these could be used as models statewide. However, participants also noted that the guidelines need to be very specific and that districts, schools, and teachers may need assistance creating extended applications.

It is clear that the state needs to clearly articulate the rationale for any changes to the current student assessment system, provide clear guidelines for implementation, and allow any changes to be implemented gradually. There is also the belief that the professional development requirements of the proposed system would be extensive. Participants expressed overall support for the majority of concepts articulated in the model, despite concern over possible obstacles to implementation. In general, participants maintained that if the proposed system would truly reflect student learning and inform instructional practice, it would be beneficial to schools.

2. Summary of Responses to Each Survey Question

This analysis presents a general overview of participant reaction to the model, and is organized around the survey questions. All of the participant feedback can be viewed in Section 3, beginning on page 9.

1) Do you generally support or not support the concept of a statewide test in English, math, and science focusing on keystone standards? (See Component 1A for details)

In general, participants supported the concept of a statewide test focused on keystone or power standards, noting that these are important to assess student progress. A number of participants mentioned that these standards should align with federal accountability standards and could incorporate current district level standards that have recently been developed in a number of localities. Several participants mentioned that standards should emphasize depth, rather than breadth. Also, both the standards and their relative importance should be clearly articulated to teachers.

2) Do you generally support or not support the concept of allowing districts to supplement the statewide test that is focused on keystone standards with items that reflect local priorities so that the results can be used for formative or diagnostic purposes locally? (See Component 1B for details)

Participants indicated general support for this concept IF the supplemental items were optional and used for formative purposes only. In general, participants believed the idea of a task bank that was validated at the state level and available to districts would be helpful. There would be considerably less support for this option if the items needed to be developed locally.

3) Do you generally support or not support the concept of course-embedded assessments that contain items that are consistent statewide and the results of which contribute to the student grade in the class? (See Component 2A for details)

Some participants suggested that this concept would assist with the standardization of scoring criteria, which would help connect instructional practice to the state assessment system and provide a way for colleges to compare high school transcripts. Other participants expressed concern that it would be very difficult to standardize the scoring criteria across the state. A major concern was how much work course-embedded assessments would create for teachers and administrators and whether they would actually be able to implement these assessments correctly.

4) Do you generally support or not support the concept of a limited number of course-embedded performance tasks that are scored locally using statewide scoring criteria? (See Component 2B for details)

Participants generally had the same concerns about course-embedded performance tasks as they did about other course-embedded assessments: that it would be difficult to standardize implementation and scoring. Several participants enthusiastically supported the concept of student work samples and tasks selected from a state task bank. However, a few individuals noted that the staff development required for this component would be extensive.

5) Do you generally support or not support the concept of a mandatory no-stakes college-readiness exam in 11th grade? (See Component 3 for details)

The college readiness exam was the most polarizing component of the proposed student assessment system model. Many believed that this exam should not be mandatory for all students. Others questioned whether a no-stakes exam was even helpful, because they did not believe students would see any value in a no-stakes exam. One person made the insightful comment that a mandatory college readiness exam is not ‘no-stakes’ for schools because the media will use the results to compare schools. Those participants who supported the concept, or were not sure about it, generally said that they would support the concept if the exam were given in the 9th grade and could be used as a formative tool to inform curriculum choices. One participant noted that they had been using a college readiness exam in 9th grade and found the results to be invaluable to both the student and district.

6) Do you generally support or not support the concept of an extended application given in 12th grade and designed to assess one or more of the Essential Skills including the Career Related Standards? (See Component 4)

A number of participants mentioned that this extended application may be onerous for school districts that have to create it. “Teachers are tired of being told to create [assessments] and simply want to be given the tasks or assessments that ODE wants students to complete.” However, other participants believed that the senior project requirement in their district would be a good example of this. These interviewees mentioned that their districts require students to complete in-depth research projects, including papers and presentations that are scored externally, in order to graduate.

7) Do you generally support or not support the overall concept and purposes of the assessment system outlined above?

Most of the participants expressed mixed opinions about the proposed student assessment system model overall. While they supported some components, they were not supportive or unsure of others. Several participants wanted more clarification and detail before commenting further. Those who supported the model believed that integration of state assessment with instructional practice would be beneficial. Those who were not in support of the model were generally concerned about the state “tinkering with what goes on in the classrooms.” A few others mentioned that the implementation could be challenging for teachers. One thing that participants generally agreed upon was that clear articulation of the purpose of the new assessment system, and a rationale for the changes, would be necessary to ensure school, teacher, and community support.

8) What do you see as the main benefits and challenges of the assessment system outlined above?

Participants generally classified conceptual purposes of the model as benefits and implementation details as challenges. Specifically, a number of participants believed that the proposed assessment system model would provide a more well-rounded picture of student ability. According to responses, the system would better assess depth in addition to just breadth. Participants also noted that they generally appreciated the integration of curriculum and assessment and supported the use of data to drive instructional practices.

In terms of challenges, interviewees mentioned that this model may be overly complex and involve too much testing. Several other participants believed that the model would create too much work for teachers and require substantial resources.

9) If the state were to implement this general assessment model, what would the key implications for professional development be in your district or school?

Participants offered a variety of suggestions on the professional development necessary to implement this proposed system. Suggestions included using in-service trainers from the state or ESD to train administrators and teachers locally. Others believed that paid time off to attend workshops would be important, along with ongoing assistance with implementation. A number of participants mentioned that funding for professional development may be considerable. Specifically, participants noted that intensive professional development would be needed for developing course-embedded assessments and for calibrating scores. According to the individuals who provided feedback, guidance on how to select test items or tasks from a task bank would also be helpful.

10) If the state were to implement this general assessment model, what would the implications be for special student populations (low-income, special needs, ELL, etc)?

In general, participants did not believe that the implications for special student populations in the proposed assessment system would be much different than those of the current Oregon assessment system. One participant, however, believed that the proposed system could be easier to personalize for individual students than the current system. A couple of participants indicated that special education students might be served better through alternate assessments or should only be required to comply with the mandatory components of the model. Other participants suggested that ELL students should be given more time to learn English before completing required assessments or that certain assessments could be offered in multiple languages.

11) If the state were to implement this general assessment model, what additional resources would your district or school need to ensure successful implementation?

The feedback on additional resources was fairly consistent. Most participants mentioned that funding for professional development would be key to implementation. Some interviewees recommended trainers, while others mentioned release time for teachers to attend workshops. Although not truly a resource, a number of participants noted that a long timeline for implementation would help. In addition, a few participants mentioned that state support and clear direction would be valuable intangible resources.

12) What other key policy questions do you feel need be answered before such a model could be considered further?

There was considerable variation in participants' response to this survey question because very few implementation details are described in the proposed model. The list below presents a general overview of the input.

- What is the rationale for this assessment system and how will this be articulated to those involved in implementation or impacted by it?
- The state needs to clearly define what is required, what is recommended, and establish clear guidelines for implementation. This includes defining power standards and providing much more detail on each component of the model.
- What is the timeline for implementation?
- Does the state have the capacity to implement and fund an assessment system with this level of complexity and amount of testing?
- How will this model address special student populations?
- How will this system connect between the grade levels?
- How will this model incorporate non-core courses with few standards?

13) What do you think would be the best way to engage the following groups in the development of this assessment system model?

Teachers?

Participants generally agreed that teachers need to be involved in the development of any new assessment system at the ground level. A number of participants reiterated the importance of clearly articulating the benefits of the proposed assessment model. Participants also offered a variety of suggestions about the best way to engage teachers in the development process. These included participation on committees/advisory groups, regional focus groups, web surveys, and online discussion groups. Others suggested that it might be helpful to use existing educational groups or the ESDs to disseminate information and collect input.

Students?

Several participants indicated that open forums or web surveys might be useful methods to engage secondary students in the development of a new assessment system.

Parents?

Participants noted that it would also be difficult to engage parents in the discussion of assessment because it is so complex. However, basic information could be disseminated through the media, school newsletters, or through groups such as PTAs. In order to involve parents actively, open forums might be helpful.

14) What type of information do you think needs to be conveyed to each of these groups?

Teachers?

According to participants, teachers need to understand the rationale for implementing a new assessment system and the benefits to students and/or instructional practice. Sample assessments may be helpful for teachers once the purpose is understood. Data from other states that have successfully implemented similar models would be beneficial. Teachers also would need to receive clear guidelines for implementation and understand their roles and responsibilities in this process. Finally, an implementation timeline would allow teachers to plan the integration of a new assessment system into their curriculum.

Students?

Participants generally agreed that it is important that students understand the consequences of the assessment system. "Students who find that the assessment system is relevant to their futures will tend to expend more effort." Others maintained that younger students will generally react to an assessment component based on the way their teachers present it.

Parents?

Participants reported that parents need to have information on how the assessments are relevant to their child's future.

15) Is there anything else that you would like the State Board to consider as they move to adopt a new design for the statewide assessment system?

This question was designed to capture any feedback that was not captured by other questions. Therefore, it is not surprising that participants provided a wide variety of responses which include the following:

- The state needs to first consider the purpose they are looking to achieve through a new assessment system. Communication about the purpose is vital.
- The state should determine whether a new assessment system is actually necessary. If it is, then the state needs to implement it and leave it in place long term. The state leadership also needs to stand behind any new assessment system publicly.
- The state may want to consider a nationally normed test.
- It would be helpful if any new assessment system was phased in piece by piece.
- A new assessment system, including the model proposed here, may be very expensive to implement correctly and the state should consider the financial implications prior to implementation. If the state does not have the capacity to implement a new assessment system, no system should be implemented.
- Extensive professional development is essential.
- Set very clear expectations for implementation.
- There needs to be clear statement of how the assessment results will be used.
- It is imperative to get stakeholder input and buy-in to make the implementation of any new assessment system successful.
- The focus of the assessment system should be on measuring what students learn.

3. Extended Responses by Question

This section presents the complete responses collected from participants during interviews or from survey responses. All statements are compiled from researchers' notes taken during telephone interviews or from survey responses from participants. All interviews were conducted by two researchers, one who asked questions while the other took notes on the responses.

1) Do you generally support or not support the concept of a statewide test in English, math, and science focusing on keystone standards? (See Component 1A for details)

- Who develops this? Where does it come from? What states are currently using this type of model? What's wrong with our current system? What grades would this testing take place in?
- I am somewhat concerned that districts who are presently engaged in identifying and designing curriculum around "power standards" will see their work undone, as the State's selection will be different. However, if we are truly focused on power standards, the differences should be minimal.
- I believe that this system will move our assessment program from simply summative for reporting requirements to one which will help to guide instruction.
- How would this look for different grade levels?
- The relationship between federal requirements with heavy consequences and what the state of Oregon is attempting to do with assessment has frequently been in opposition. I think the keystone standards assessment provides a good balance between the federal goals and the state goals.
- Power standards with substantial depth are very important.
- Getting away from a mile wide and an inch deep. Also requires great depth with higher order thinking skills which is good. The emphasis on power standards is important and I totally support this concept, although district need to be involved in determining these.
- It is critical to assess student progress. Our district is already using power standards.
- This makes a lot of sense. We've been working to determine power standards in the district for K-12
- Yes, but the core standards and emphasis need to be clearly articulated to teachers.

2) Do you generally support or not support the concept of allowing districts to supplement the statewide test that is focused on keystone standards with items that reflect local priorities so that the results can be used for formative or diagnostic purposes locally? (See Component 1B for details)

- I strongly opposed this option. The state needs to have one test or assessment. If Districts want to assess additional information fine but this is not the place to do it.

- This needs to be clarified as I'm not sure what this process would look like. If districts were writing the questions, this would be a huge mistake. A state developed task bank however would be useful.

- If 1A is approved.

- If "allowing" means that such supplementation is optional, then I can support it. Generally formative assessments must be administered more frequently, and for much smaller chunks of curriculum, than summative assessments. I think they are best dealt with at the school or district level, not at the state level.

-This will encourage districts at no penalty to explore areas where their data indicates weakness. For example, When math skills are weak at the high school level it will allow the districts to design elementary and middle school assessments which will pinpoint the beginning of the problem.

-It would be helpful to have more information about how this would work and how integrated it would be with the statewide assessments.

- I don't know what this would look like for small districts, especially when resources are already a concern. Our districts are looking this type of data. It would have to be easy to use and not too time sensitive.

- I strongly support this concept. Our good assessment data directly connected to state standards delivered electronically could be a huge asset to teachers, schools and districts. Especially since this would allow districts to focus on and measure particular skills in the sub strands. Would there still be only three attempts at the assessment or would it be possible for schools and teachers to have multiple additional supplemental tests while still having the three keystone opportunities with supplement available? The more teachers could do something like select a 10 question very focused supplemental assessment on an ongoing basis, the more value a tool like this would offer.

- This might enhance the relevance of the assessment for both teachers and students. Tailored formative assessment that allows local discretion could be beneficial.

- As long as districts can choose which ones, how often and the format for the items. They should also be allowed to vary the emphasis from one testing year to the next depending on the needs. Items for use in formative assessments are a good idea.

- This is contingent on support/resources from ODE to help districts with this task. It is not clear how this would integrate with state tests. Would the items be state-supplied and district-selected, or would districts develop their own test items?

- Formative assessment is key for student growth. The state assessments have limited use for most students, and yet they do provide a target at the various grade levels. I support supplementing the statewide test as long as there is time for the teachers to create and evaluate those supplements. Teachers are still railing from the PASS requirements and the CIM requirements and the time it takes to score the work.
- Yes, but the supplemental standards need to be connected with curriculum. This is complicated to implement, although it may be appealing to teachers.

3) Do you generally support or not support the concept of course-embedded assessments that contain items that are consistent statewide and the results of which contribute to the student grade in the class? (See Component 2A for details)

- What if teachers do not want to add elements? Districts, schools, and teachers just want to be told what to do. A task bank for choosing supplemental items is essential if districts. It is also important that it is not mandatory to include these supplemental questions. There is also some fear that districts will compete with each other over who has chosen the most challenging questions.
- Again, this is vague. Would the results be reported to the state? This would be difficult to standardize at the state level, but if they are not reported to the state, than many schools won't implement it.
- Not sure the need for this if 1A is adopted
- I don't understand this proposal well enough to have an opinion. If their purpose is to inform students and teachers how their performance compares to others statewide, then when and how that information is made available becomes critical. That in turn influences the format and delivery method of the assessments. I don't have a problem with comparing performance; I'm not sure this is the best/most informative way to do it.
- This is the only way that high school transcripts are going to make sense to colleges.
- I have a concern about the amount of extra work this may create for school districts.
- It would better if there was more detail about what this would look like. For example, if the assessments are tied to particular courses and a student does not take a particular course, how would they be assessed?
- I support the concept for a number of reasons. Mainly, this is can be an excellent tool to better connect classroom instruction (and teachers) to state assessment and curriculum standards. The implementation of this assessment would need to be well thought out.
- need more details to be determine the merit and effectiveness of this option

- Need more information. Will the embedded questions be provided by ODE? Would the "teach to the test" determine what areas are covered by the "mid term" and which by the "finals" (programming of instruction)? How much work will this require from local schools and districts? Has there been a study of the increased local burden, especially if the mid-term and final test concepts are not included already in some of the coursework? Would this be required of math, reading and science courses or only for replacing the math and writing performance assessments? If so, what about "reading instruction" that does not really occur at all secondary levels?
- This raises questions about how or if the results would be reported, even if it is not for federal accountability. Also there would probably be a need to maintain security of the items.
- This might be a good idea for later in high school.
- Teachers already have course-embedded assessments that contribute to the grade in class. I am more concerned about their level of actual performance than I am about grades. Consistency on a state level would be very difficult and time consuming and there is not enough available time to implement this.

4) Do you generally support or not support the concept of a limited number of course-embedded performance tasks that are scored locally using statewide scoring criteria? (See Component 2B for details)

- I support this if the state really offers a statewide task bank
- Need more details.
- Want to have numerous opportunities for work samples. Do VERY much like the idea of a statewide test bank to draw from--have been asking for this for years.
- Before deciding this, I'd want to see research from other states that supports the claim that the majority of students take such exams seriously, as my experience with mandatory light-weight exams has been otherwise. I also wonder if such an exam would give us more information than we already have easy access to from other sources. If it takes time away from instruction, it needs to be important
- Teachers need practice in this type of assessment in order to strengthen instruction. If the state shows students and parents relevance, they should understand these. Using work samples, there is a lot of calibration involved, requiring a lot of professional development which is time consuming and expensive.
- Training and compensation will be required for interested staff.
- I'm not sure because I'm not sure how scoring would be standardized or how the scorers would be trained. Also, the professional development around scoring could be cumbersome/costly.

- I was not clear based on the description if this concept would replace the current work sample requirements and the areas in which they are required. If these are additional performance tasks, I do not think they will be well received at the classroom level. If this is a refining and streamlining of the work sample component of the current system, I think it will be much better received.

- I need more details to be determine the merit and effectiveness of this option. Districts would need a lot of help to understand the exact performance requirements in order to implement this. However, if the state could figure out a way to standardize performance tasks, that would be a good thing. Also, it is difficult to make these non-intrusive into the classroom. The effort to help teachers correctly implement these would be massive from the state.

- Not sure what it will look like if these performance tasks are developed locally but scored with a state scoring guide? Like the idea of a statewide task bank and that these would include the Essential Skills part of the new state standards. Would this only address Math and Writing to replace the on-demand writing and math problem-solving components?

- I assume these are work samples. They should be required as an integral part of instruction & assessment.

- Performance task in writing and math are important because this is not well assessed currently.

- Our district is already moving to performance based tasks scored in district so all our students will have the same opportunities. Teachers will be trained together and will approach it like the writing scoring guides. Once it gets to be part of the statewide assessment, it will seem just like CIM. Keeping track of all these in the way that CIM required took too much time.

- Teachers need to receive thorough training surrounding scoring. No new assessment system will work without staff development in all areas. Expectations about the purpose and procedures need to be very clear.

5) Do you generally support or not support the concept of a mandatory no-stakes college-readiness exam in 11th grade? (See Component 3 for details)

- The test should be in the Fall so that the results are helpful to the student and staff. The college readiness exam is a good idea, but should be tied to an incentive for students, preferably financial that will encourage the students to take it seriously.

- There are already many college readiness exams such as the PSAT and SAT and I don't think this should be mandatory.

- Too much testing being dictated by the state. No need if we have 1A. If this were offered in 8th or 9th grade, and could be used to inform students, that would be helpful.

- We have been doing this for two years and find the information invaluable both to the student and to the district. We have made modifications in our middle school math curriculum based upon this test. We have also made a greater effort to encourage students to take higher level classes. Students themselves are using the data to plan their career programs. Students will probably see the importance of a college readiness exam.
- The beginning of the 11th grade seems a little late to impact enrollment in AP and college prep classes. I would recommend a college-readiness exam in the 10th grade (prior to students selecting classes for the 11th grade) and then giving the statewide keystone standards tests in the 11th grade. If these were in the 9th grade, it would be even better.
- It depends on what this would look like: SAT? ACT? COMPASS? The definition of college readiness is not completely clear.
- I think this type of assessment could provide useful data for high schools. I think that training and guidelines in the use of the data would be beneficial for schools.
- The concept is fine, but this sort of exam can never really be "no-stakes" for schools or students. It is crucial to know if and how the media will have access to this data and the time-frame that the results will be made available to school districts. Thus, it could be no-stakes for students, but high stakes for schools, especially once the media get a hold of it.. I am also concerned about the source of funding for such an exam and the selection process used to determine which exam will be used.
- Not mandated for ALL; optional and encouraged YES. This adds another assessment (albeit no-stakes), especially for those students who are re-taking their required Math, Reading and Writing tests beyond the Sophomore year if they did not pass them. A college readiness exam in 9th grade could be an option used for formative purposes that allow students to take the appropriate coursework to prepare for college.
- I am not sure what the value of this would be. It raises questions about whether we need another test to help us determine if students are on track to graduate. It may be difficult for staff to buy in to the notion of adding yet another test. Districts/schools would need the opportunity to opt out if this became part of the assessment system.
- I support this as long as we also maintain the regular 10th grade testing as well.
- By the time students are in 11th grade, they only have 3 semesters to become "college ready." I would prefer that it happen earlier-very few students that score in the "not college ready" category in 11th grade will magically be ready to take AP classes as seniors. Also, kids forecast for 11th grade in the spring of 10th grade for all of 11th grade, not one semester at a time. The staffing for classes if students change classes mid-year would be a nightmare. We offer diagnostic testing for 8th graders that helps students select course patterns and I feel this is more beneficial at this time.
- I would prefer if this was postsecondary readiness exam (not just college) would be better. The earlier this is offered the better. Generally, I like the idea, but am concerned about how the data would be used. I am concerned that students who do well on the exam will be the only ones steered toward AP courses and everyone else will not be.
- Will that data be used for any sort of determinations or ratings of high schools?

6) Do you generally support or not support the concept of an extended application given in 12th grade and designed to assess one or more of the Essential Skills including the Career Related Standards? (See Component 4)

- ODE needs to look at creating a task bank. Teachers are tired of being told to "create" . they want to be given the task or assessment that ODE wants the students to take.
- Again, is this locally administered and graded or used for accountability purposes.
- Interested in the time frame for schools and what type of time and monetary support is available.
- It depends partly on scoring and how this would be standardized. These type of assessments are already given throughout high school and thus, it does not need to be limited to 12th grade.
- Relevance and management of this concept are key concerns.
- I support it because 1) it is an adopted graduation requirement and 2) because if it done correctly, it can serve as vehicle to personalize curriculum and motivate students of all abilities.
- Too much testing again and too much for local development. There are insufficient resources to handle this. Local control sounds good, but increases the burden and won't be received well.
- This question requires feedback from high school staff. One question that comes to mind is how this meshes with the work schools/districts have already done on the Career Related Learning Standards and individualized student personal education plans. If this is a continuation of that process and inclusive of what districts have already developed there may be more support than starting with something brand new. Districts have put much time and money into tracking the CRLS and student PEPs.
- If this is not a task assessment, I support this. As a task, it would be very difficult to establish validity.
- I was very pleased with our senior projects last June and this is definitely an extended application. I'm not sure we need to add anything else. We offer senior project where students apply essential skills and career elements to a topic that is interesting to them. This requires research and presentation and is scored externally. Students cannot graduate without the completion of a senior project. These are understandable to parents as well who have trouble understanding traditional assessments. These senior projects meet the state requirements and I am concerned that the proposal here would be in addition to what we are already doing according to the state.
- Would requirements such as the junior paper requirement and the senior project count under such a system?

7) Do you generally support or not support the overall concept and purposes of the assessment system outlined above?

- What are our options if we do not adopt this assessment system? I'm concerned about the increased responsibility that schools and districts would need to take to implement this model.
- I support some parts and don't support others.
- I am very vested in the current system but know of many of the pitfalls--some change is necessary. If there is a need for change, this needs to be clearly articulated and disseminated to teachers. This is too much control from the state.
- I am not able to pin down all of my concerns. When entities such as the State Board starts tinkering with what goes on in classrooms, it makes teachers nervous. Generally, districts want clear guidelines and the ability to create their own assessments. Districts and schools have put a lot of time, money, and effort in developing local assessments that meet current requirements and I don't want to see this undone.
- I believe that this is a great step towards making the assessment system an active part of the instruction system rather than something that teachers just have to do in order to satisfy legal requirements. Students will take it much more seriously. This model however needs examples of what these assessments might look like in practice and a tentative timeline would be helpful.
- I need more information and examples of what is being proposed.
- Strongly support the overall direction and the closer integration of state assessments with teaching and student learning.
- I conceptually support the plan, but most teachers and the public would need to have a very clear understanding of the reasons behind such a dramatic change (expansion) in the assessment system before they would support it. At this point, those reasons are not obvious, but they should be. Having attended a number of the State Board meetings, I think I have a substantial understanding of the logic behind this proposal, but most school officials, teachers and the public need to be brought along slowly and carefully. It must be clear that there is a real NEED for this change and that the "need" is based on what is really good for students and their personal, professional and academic future.
- Too many uncertainties and questions that need to be answered for endorsement. Elementary students pretty much do what they are told to please their teachers, although test anxiety might be a concern. Middle and high school students only do the bare minimum and would opt out of a no-stakes exam. Even middle class parents don't understand instruction or assessment. Massive PR work would be necessary. Teachers and administrators are fed up with assessment system changes. They would need to well-informed about the purposes and procedures of the assessment.
- I definitely support the first two components-the other two need work on the timing (early grade 9 or 10), and the last one is so much like what we are doing with senior projects-also required-that I'm not convinced it would be a good use of time and effort.

- This model needs further clarification in addition to the concepts. In particular, there needs to be more detail about the standards and how these fit in with the assessments. Also, 'teaching to the test' should be replaced with 'teaching for the test' as the former will arouse suspicion among teachers.

8) What do you see as the main benefits and challenges of the assessment system outlined above?

- Benefits - I am not sure at this point. Challenges - Funding, something "New", teachers have lost all faith in the current system.

- Benefits: Consistent testing for all the state of Oregon. Challenges: *Time needed and \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ * More stress put on by add work for teachers and districts. * Teacher buy in. * LOTS of testing with this model

- As it is presented here, it seems overly complex. Faith in the state testing system is not high right now, thanks to the recent TESA debacle. Any system that appears to increase complexity will likely be met with negative enthusiasm. Also, I would want to see a much stronger case for the need for the information the various components of the assessment system purport to deliver. We do not need to spend any more time doing unnecessary stuff, and we certainly do not need to expend precious financial resources of the development of superfluous tools.

- The primary use of computer labs now is for assessment purposes and with the complicated nature of this assessment system, the technology resources may not be adequate.

- Challenges include teacher workload, teacher compensation, building implementation and turn around time for results.

- This system would better integrate curriculum and assessment and get rid of the mile wide and inch deep approach not in place where teachers must focus the same attention to all standards with no clue which ones are of more importance. Challenges would be to redesign and streamline standard curriculum delivery.

- Benefits: The accountability of NCLB is included, but is not as large an emphasis in this system. This is a more well-rounded assessment system measuring student ability. Challenges: This is too focused on high school and I'm curious how this would like for elementary school.

- A likely challenge on the state's end will be the volume of test questions needed to create a system that allows supplemental test questions (1B). Overall, this outline provides a good model for Oregon schools to progress with data driven decision making and data driven instruction while giving them a reasonable chance of meeting the federal academic status requirements.

- This proposal could provide the possibility to personalize required assessments and the curriculum to match local demands and the individual needs and skills of students. However, this is an extremely complex proposal that will require substantial investment in plan development, communication, training and on-going user support. If ever there was a time to be reminded that "the devil is in the details", it is now! Lots of preliminary work is needed to convince everyone that this type of system is needed and working out the kinks.

- Benefits: Depth of knowledge vs. too much content and superficiality (i.e. use of power standards instead of the huge plethora of currently eligible content). Challenges: Shared responsibility of state and local control. This partnership needs much more clarity.
- Benefits: emphasis on testing for information and diagnostics, better integration of instruction & assessment and I think will also help teachers see the value/relevance of work samples/performance tasks; Challenges: outlining all these components for districts (communication), professional development to help districts develop/select local test items & assessments and the extended application assessment system.
- Benefits: This may provide a better overall picture of student ability and would assess students over time, not just once, which is good. Challenges: Change is always a challenge. Validity may be difficult to establish.
- Using power standards is a benefit. The challenges will be convincing districts that already have senior project and essential skills embedded into their work, to do anything else.
- The state connection to classroom activities embedded in this assessment is helpful. I also think the state-level standardization is beneficial. However, many teachers and administrators will resent what they perceive as state interference in their classroom and this will be a challenge. This can be addressed through extensive public relations and allowing teachers/schools/districts to collaborate.

9) If the state were to implement this general assessment model, what would the key implications for professional development be in your district or school?

- The state would need have a trained cadre of approved in-service providers. It is crucial that people are told the same information regardless of your districts size or location. Funding - ODE would need to provide this training to districts free of charge. ODE would need to have trainers available to "go to" the districts at no cost to the districts. OMLI has a good model for this using team collaboration and summer time for training purposes.
- There will be a need for professional development to help teachers understand power standards and how to integrate them into the curriculum. The implementation of course embedded assessments would have a huge professional development component. Extended applications would need very specific parameters and guidance.
- *Time to develop extended application part of the model. * Time to help with teacher buy in-- feels like "big brother" is taking over the classroom.
- Too early to know, but I would think assessment design and evaluation would be very high on the list.
- Actually this system outlines the basics of a program that we are already putting in place. The advent of the system will give more strength to our present movement in the area.
- Training, calibration and consistent interpretation.

- Schools would need a waiver in time to spend on professional development--the key would be to analyze the new core standards, match them to current delivery systems, and this will need time for schools to meet and make a scheduling plan and classroom implementation plan.
- Depending on the scope, it might be necessary to hire additional staff. There would need to be training for students. Also staff would need to attend common scoring workshops and the meet locally to calibrate scoring.
- Teacher training and policy development regarding the course embedded (2A) assessment concept.
- Training would be a secondary issue compared to the massive communication effort that would be required to articulate 1) the reason (the need) for such a dramatic change from the current system and 2) what could be gained for students in the process. 1. Developing assessments at the local level that meet state rubric requirements. 2. Concept of Essential Skills flushed out with examples. 3. Assessment Literacy in general (i.e. knowledge of using assessments to improve instruction and learning).
- We would need assistance & training in selecting test items and creating assessments (components 1 & 2) and in implementing the extended application assessment process, as well as clear communication from ODE about the components of this system and the accountability expectations.
- Money and time are big issues. If you want to make this successful, there needs to be paid time for professional development around this assessment system.
- Our district has been working on power standards and performance assessment for a few years- we do not have everyone trained, but this could help us get there. We also have a commitment to get kids college-ready, but need more professional development for teaching ALL students.
- I would like to see staff development that aligns with their current system in my district. We need to help teachers integrate their curriculum with the standards and assessment system. It may be helpful to consult the ESD. Teachers need a lot of assistance figuring out the relevance. Short professional development sessions with follow up is best.

10) If the state were to implement this general assessment model, what would the implications be for special student populations (low-income, special needs, ELL, etc)?

- Would the state have alternate assessments for Sped? So many issues - ability to challenge up or down. Assessments only at grade level or at ability level?? Would these standards be the same as NCLB?
- They need to be considered, but I don't have a good answer for how to include them.
- Good question -- how was this question of special populations needs dealt with in other states? Does this count against schools if not 100% participation for report card etc?

- I don't see that the issues for ELL will be any different from the present - we are testing some students in a language in which they are not sufficiently fluent, and it's not fair. Impact on special ed. remains to be seen - but I believe if the assessment focuses on essential standards some of these students will have a better chance to demonstrate proficiency on a written test. I would hope that locally controlled aspects of assessment would be tailored to meet IEP requirements.

- The assessment would more closely relate to their IEP's and instructional needs. Teachers would have to continue a strong focus upon meeting the needs of each individual student.

- Would this change the school and district report cards? How are students who take extended assessments included.

- The college readiness exam might not work for special populations. However, there could be another option offered to measure other types of postsecondary readiness if not college. Also, for special populations in particular, how would this assessment system work if these students miss a particular class...how would the skills/content associated with that class be measured?

- A state system is already in place and there are already implications for special populations that schools are addressing. My initial thought is that there are no additional implications unless the requirements for these populations change significantly.

- The opportunity exists, as briefly described, for this new system to be locally and individually personalized to a degree that will be controlled by the details of the plan that are yet to be determined. Assuming that the focus of the system will be to maximize the personal and academic growth of each student, rather than the average student, this make education much more meaningful for student groups that have previously been somewhat disenfranchised.

- 1. Huge challenge for Special Education. They should be only required to comply with the mandatory elements, including that the test for college readiness NOT be required but an option. Already the current assessment system does not take into account the instructional levels of our Severely Cognitively Impaired and Learning Disabled kids. It's a disaster that makes no educational sense. When we eliminated the possibility that SpEd students could test at the level of their instructional goals, AND we eliminated the Career and Life Skills assessment for our severely disabled kids, we essentially made the assessment system irrelevant and useless. This model deviates even further from their realities. While challenges and increased expectations are a good and proven effective strategy for increased student achievement, we must face the reality of what the true inclusion model of education means. 2. For our low-income kiddos, there are fewer discrepancies but the challenges are equally there. Yet, this is an area that can more easily be addressed through training on instructional strategies and approaches along with training on generational poverty. I agree with holding high expectations for these populations, but I also agree that the parent component here is vital (e.g. home visits by school personnel, space for homework, time for homework, encouragement, behavioral norms, parent understanding how to help students without necessarily knowing the content of the work, etc. - see "The Ron Clark Story") 3. For ELL kiddos language rich assessments (such as in science), will always be a challenge. As we move toward a higher conceptual "power" standard, this requires higher order thinking skills rather than being "content" rich. While this is a good thing, these skills will depend on depth of understanding of the prompts if not in their native language (if they are proficient in it). Math assessment system components should be allowed in any language. The writing performance tasks will always be a challenge to an ELL, especially at the high school level. Special conditions for types of ELLs might be considered (e.g. those recently arrived, those from

eastern European descent, those "poor white" students who are language deficient and truly benefit from ELD (English Language Development) strategies, etc.)

- We would need the ability to modify and adjust as needed for special populations.
- An alternate assessment is needed for those with special needs and ELL students need time to learn the language before assessment. Low-income students should be required to pass the regular assessments like everyone else.
- We would need a more comprehensive support system starting in the lower grades.
- The needs of SpEd students probably won't differ much between the proposed assessment system and the current ones. SpEd students need an alternate assessment. Schools might also benefit from assistance from the state about how to select supplemental items or cater embedded assessments for SpEd students in particular. ELL students might benefit from more time before assessments are required.

11) If the state were to implement this general assessment model, what additional resources would your district or school need to ensure successful implementation?

- Funding, staff development days, approved trainers, phase in for staff and students
- Time and professional development are considerations.
- *\$\$\$\$\$ for development. * Time for scoring guide training (yearly for new teachers and refreshers for the "old" ones!! *Time for development. * Professional trainers to be able to come to schools/districts and do trainings. *Data from other states to help with teacher buy in especially
- Other than professional development, I don't know yet
- State support of the model which we are now moving toward would be invaluable. Of course additional resources for teacher development is always welcome and needed.
- Reduction of content standards, funding for support staff and release time for implementation, improved regional testing centers.
- Time to make adjustments within the contract and our professional management teams.
- There would need to substantial funding for local training and for scoring standardization. Also, time away from instruction is a concern.
- Training, support and a well thought out implementation schedule. Teachers, schools and districts do not need any additional "must be done yesterday" projects. Additional input and refining of model from stakeholders would help smooth implementation. Also, considering stakeholders from small schools and rural areas to help identify potential issues not thought of by larger districts.

- The second resource would time (several years) and funding (for training and local work sessions over the course of a year or more) to allow schools to integrate the various aspects of the new assessment system into their local academic culture

1. A grant-type of funding (based on local response to an RFP) to assist in having local teams such as during the summer, much like the OMLI grant (Oregon Math Leadership Institute), only for "assessment literacy" purposes. There is NO time during the school year to work on these requirements. 2. Regional "Assessment Literacy" trainers accessible via ESDs, for example, using the train the trainer model for districts. This would develop the capacity to design local assessments more formative in nature. 3. Task banks and further examples of assessing the Essential Skills component. Question: Why are the Essential Skills included in both the course-embedded assessments as well as the suggested "Extended Application"? Is the former more formative and the latter more summative in nature?

- Professional development, clear communication materials (for staff and parents)

- Computer resources are needed if it is a computer based exams. Staff development and the money for it needs to be adequate.

- We would need more teachers, funding for full day kindergarten, more bi-lingual teachers, and more training in strategies for differentiation

- Professional development, particularly information on how to implement this on the front end and how this ties to instruction. Direction is needed about how to spend instructional time and what to focus on the most. We also need funding for this professional development.

12) What other key policy questions do you feel need be answered before such a model could be considered further?

- Not sure. I am a little over whelmed with the whole "new" system.

- There are a ton of unanswered questions right now about implementation.

- * How many days of instructional days are necessary for all of the testing outlined? * Is the test outlined in 1A consist of one test or three separate tests as we currently have?

- I don't know about other policy questions, but the state assessment policy (and philosophy) needs to be clearly articulated, and each component explained and defended as to its importance. If a portion of the assessment system does not provide crucial information, it should be eliminated. If it does not provide the information it was conceived to provide, it should be amended. We should not waste our time and resources on nonessentials.

- When can we start!!!

- Student membership and accounting rules need to be defined. What about student who take extended assessments?

- All core power curriculum would need to be verified, imbedded assessments described, and assessment bottom lines established.

- How does this connect between grade levels? How much time would it take to implement this, for different levels of implementers? How much would this cost to implement?
- I think the key policy issue will be special populations. How does this model change requirements for these populations? How have these populations been considered in the process?
- As I've mentioned before..... there needs to be a clear statement of WHY we need an expanded assessment system. Now is the time to remember that ".... if ain't broke, don't fix it"! If the public, teachers and media aren't clear that this (or any) proposal effectively addresses specific and important shortcomings in the educational experience of students, it is doomed to repeat the CIM/CAM story
- 1. Clarity (specificity on what is "required" and "recommended" as well as outcomes) on shared responsibility of state and local agencies in the assessment system. 2. Who determines what the "core" or "power" standards will be? There are many districts who have begun to tackle this issue (Hillsboro, Beaverton to name two). According to Marzano and Reeves, power standards are only as powerful as the district ownership is involved. 3. Should the system be rolled out progressively or all at once? The former might be difficult since the "system" has interrelated components. Nearly all new initiatives, however, have a progressive implementation plan to allow for understanding and comfort in application and implications.
- What does an assessment look like that pairs state-provided tests or items with teacher-created or district-selected items, and how are results reported? I think the purpose is pretty clear but is it doable? How will additional test items be made available to districts (components 1 & 2)? How will a state-wide task bank work? Does the state have the technical capacity to provide this successfully? Will the embedded, standardized performance tasks replace teacher-created and scored work samples? How will teacher-created work samples fit into this assessment system? Will the college readiness exam be optional?
- We need a good pilot that establishes validity.
- Why would we change?
- Public relations is critical to assure the schools that the state is not big-brother. Also, you could set a future date for implementation that allows schools time to prepare or gradually cater current assessments to the future requirements. Another question is how does this model incorporate non-core courses with few standards, such as art.

13) What do you think would be the best way to engage the following groups in the development of this assessment system model?

Teachers?

- Provide a regional in-service where all teachers are required to attend. Districts would need to have an additional in-service day. Again funding
- First, there needs to be clarity and extensive explanation about the benefits of this to kids and the value in so much testing.

- Get teachers involved @ the ground level to help with the buy in. Be clear about the time involved and the benefit for the students
- Via the Oregon Assessment and Information Advisory Committee, other existing professional groups, and ESDs
- Active involvement in the development of the course embedded assessments. An active voice in tweaking the mode
- Content area panels, online discussion group and training, come to districts directly instead of regional focus groups
- Make sure all information is out there and there is no wiggle room--all information is standard to all schools in the state--we do not want to invent the wheel again--we want one path!
- The ESDs could hold multiple focus groups with stakeholders from each district and school. Or, schools/districts could host information sessions to educate each group after receiving a standard message from the state.
- advisory groups, visits for input, web survey, through districts and buildings.
- Articulate the need for such a change and describe the future academic, personal and professional value to students.
- Representative groups at regional meetings called by the ESDs.
- Teachers need to be on any committees that help develop this system. You will need good communication first for teachers about this system and the reasoning for changing it, and then you'll need to recruit teachers to help with the process. You need teacher buy-in to make this successful.
- Invite them to participate, but give them the opportunity to have their legitimate concerns addressed
- Website or task bank. An ESD specialist who can come to each school site to perform in-service training is helpful. Training for principals and teachers is critical so that teachers feel like the system is a good thing.

Students?

- Higher stakes. If the state feels that these assessments are that valid or important than they need to put "state" teeth into it. i.e. Students do not graduate (statewide) if they do not pass or colleges offer an earlier admission window for students who have met and or passed these assessment.
- High performing kids will respond well....the rest wouldn't care.
- Provide information to students in guide groups currently set up in most schools to get their buy in and stress on them the importance and how this fits into their lives. ?

- Make it mean something. We have found that the students take the AC T exam very seriously because it means something. Get colleges and employers as a force behind the system. Students do not realize that the skills needed for a family wage job are the same as those necessary to enter college.

- Maybe web surveys to be conducted in a class with data submitted to ODE?

- Articulate the need for such a change and describe the future academic, personal and professional value to students

- Open forums with student leaders at the secondary levels (at least starting at the 7th grade). For elementary students, the task is unimaginable.

- Talk to some recently graduated students for a real perspective

- We need to educate low income students about the consequences of assessment. Teachers and principals would likely have to convey this information.

Parents?

- Tough sell. ODE does not have a very good record with the crash of TESA the termination of CIM and CAM. Parents just want a strong education for their children, more technology etc

- Parents need to receive clear explanation about how the different types of assessment fit together.

- Information in newsletters, report cards, conferences - the typical types of correspondence. *Set up an assessment group that includes all 3 groups and try to gather understanding and support for whatever model or parts of the current system that are going to be used.

- Parent advisory committees and PTCs

- Newspapers, web, school info sent home.

- Articulate the need for such a change and describe the future academic, personal and professional value to students. I hope you get the point here..... this process is NOT ready to engage anyone until it has some clearly articulated benefits, beyond just being different from the current system!

- Open forums, site councils. However, experience has shown that school boards, let alone parents, have a difficult time understanding standards and assessments. We find ourselves spending many hours "educating" our school boards on how to read current assessments.

- At least have an information page for parents on your website, similar to the Get Ready Oregon site for changing graduation requirements.

- hold forums

- Parents need to understand that the standards are important to their child's future and how they can help at home.

14) What type of information do you think needs to be conveyed to each of these groups?

Teachers?

- Need to see the actual plan before this can be determined
- * Reasons WHY the proposed changes. * Results from other states using this model or one similar to it. * Sample tests shared that are being used right now from this model
- How the system will be different, what their roles and responsibilities will be in the new system, and most importantly, how they and their students will benefit from the new system
- sample assessments, core skills
- Overview of the assessment system, sample assessments, timeline, implications for teachers and impact on instruction.
- Again, what are the bottom lines here, what are the kids measured on, what exactly do they need to know, and what are the assessment tools and how do they work?
- Teachers need to receive information about the relevance to their instruction, specific requirements involved, and time to implement.
- For all groups, I would say to identify process, role group would play and variety of ways to communicate or provide input. The information provided above in the overall description would be very useful for schools and teachers to examine and digest.
- Teachers are already skeptical of state control over assessment because CIM and CAM did not make a difference for student. Any new assessment system needs to be well-supported and planned by the Board to be successful.
- clarity of purpose for each component and how they fit together. Teachers have fewer problems once they understand the rationale for the system, even if this requires their participation (such as what is being asked of the local schools and districts)
- You will need very clear reasoning for why you are changing the system and why each of the components is best practice for students' sake. Communication should emphasize what is not changing so teachers see that not everything will be changing radically. Emphasize the "de-emphasis on federal accountability."
- a very clear and concise reason for changing- we have had so many changes from paper/pencil to TESA back to paper pencil- they would also need to understand the connection between the state assessment and their own work in the classrooms.

Students?

- WHY the need for all these different types of testing times.
- What's in it for them, in terms of both rewards and penalties.

- Students will react the same way that teachers do, positively or negatively.
- Sample assessments.
- They need to understand the relevance of the assessment to the future. They also need to understand the time vs. value tradeoff.
- (Again for 7th grade and above). What are the stakes and why they are important. Understanding what they will get from the system and how it relates to their purpose for obtaining an education (e.g. career goals and aspirations of higher learning).
- why we would change-what is the benefit to them
- Elementary students will respond to the assessment according to how teachers frame it. Middle School and Elementary school students will react to the assessment based on the perceived relevance to their interests...will it make a difference?

Parents?

- * Importance of what this model will provide for students, parents, schools and college
- What good will it do their children, and what potential negative impact could it have.
- Parents will react based on how the media reacts
- Overview of the assessment system and sample assessments
- why we would change-what is the benefit to them
- Parents are concerned about assessment in general.

15) Is there anything else that you would like the State Board to consider as they move to adopt a new design for the statewide assessment system?

- Have they actually talked to the state PTA or students??? Consider a nationally normed test, then we really know how we compare to other states. A nationally normed test would be cleaner, and less costly. Any adopted assessment system needs to be publicly supported by the state Superintendent and other leadership so that districts know that it will be around for a while. It would be helpful if any adopted system could be phased in piece by piece, instead of implemented all at once.
- School performance cannot be assessed well through multiple choice exams. -Work samples are a good idea and need to be included. - we need to provide motivation for students to Work hard on these assessments, such as course credit for a high score. - Also, the state needs to determine power standards and communicate these. Then, the districts could use these standards to structure assessments.

-* Implement slowly and do it right with the necessary funding and professional development opportunities for this model or whatever is adopted to be successful. * Make sure there are sufficient staff trained to go out to all schools/districts to explain the new system. * Provide LOTS of professional development times. * Recommend opportunities for districts to have extra PAID days for staff development beyond what is offered now. * Put \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ where the new design model is or it's not going to work any better than the current CIM/CAM(extinct) model. I support the use of computer based assessment that provides immediate feedback to students.

- Please make sure that any change you propose is both necessary and edifying. Change for its own sake is not defensible.

- Please think of the kids not the convenience to districts and teachers. That a school does not have enough math teachers to implement the system does not change the needs of this generation of kids for more math in order to be competitive in the world

- Please be aware of the time and cost implications for districts related to statewide assessments. Secondary schools have to equip and dedicate a computer lab for statewide assessments

- Now that we have the chance to make this assessment system more meaningful make a decision, stick to it, and do not let schools develop their own means--that only muddles the picture and gets us no where. If this system is researched and found to be sound and productive--implement it with all bottom lines clearly evident so we as school and districts have targets and goals to achieve and can share info among ourselves for the best curriculum delivery for our students.

- Meet the federal requirements with what is necessary, then focus on what is important for Oregon in order to continue to improve Oregon's educational system. Focusing on the student, tracking the student growth over time and supporting the districts, schools and teachers with systems and information to enable them to continue to improve Oregon's educational system. I think a clear statement of how data will be used and for what purposes will have a significant impact on the success of the model. Also, to the extent possible, ODE needs to adhere to the initial data use statement. There is some concern that ODE introduces a great system, districts use it as advertised (i.e. to identify weak areas) and then all of a sudden that data is used to say schools are doing a poor job of teaching geometry."

- The Board appears to be "fishing" for a new system, without any solid idea of what they want to catch! An assessment system has to have a clear purpose and be able to provide significant benefits to the education of all students before it has any merit. Any new assessment system needs to be implemented slowly, with lots of exploration and planning before implementation.

- 1. Be cognizant of the lack of assessment literacy at the local level. (NOTE: our district has this as one of its Continuing Improvement Plan (CIP) strategies for increased student achievement and the undersigned is primarily responsible). Based on initial surveys and sessions, it is uncanny what teachers are NOT prepared to handle, based on a less than adequate university training.
- 2. Districts are already strapped for resources, and assigning more responsibility as outlined in the current proposal means additional provision locally.
- 3. Consider the timeline for implementation. Note that the current timeline of the life of an item to be included in the state assessment is three years - this is just for "an item"! What would the implications be, then, for an entire system change?
- 4. Take into account that the RIT cut scores for meeting state standards was recently changed (April 2007) and that this was based on the current system of an item bank based on eligible content. Moving the "power standards" will, in effect, eliminate all the work that 270 teachers did

to arrive at the currently in place markers. 5. Consult with the State Office of Assessment Advisory Task Force just as you are doing with this survey (unless all of the members are already included in the sample). It is comprised of a huge amount of assessment experience and there is great collective wisdom in the group.

- Don't put this in place if you do not have the technical capacity/support to do it successfully. You need to get feedback from all the stakeholder before such a process is implemented. This primarily includes teachers, but also involves students and parents. There needs to be good information about the rationale for changing the current system for teachers and administrators. Parents and students need to understand the relationship of the system to graduation requirements.

- We have changed cut scores, testing methods (TESA-paper/pencil), grade level for writing assessments (from 5, 8, 10 to 4, 7, 10), doubling conventions as a measure of writing ability (eliminating scores for word choice and voice), CIM/CAM no CIM/CAM, social studies test/no social studies test and countless hours a few years ago training and scoring PASS-with no real benefit for students. Teachers feel duped and betrayed by the announcement that there would no longer be CIM and CAM, and yet all of the parts of CIM (except the actual certificate-not recognized by colleges as a mark of accomplishment) are still a part of the state expectations. The current research says that teachers need to pre-assess students and then help them learn what is important. Our district has instituted data teams to look at student learning and to design lessons and activities to help them learn. Spending hours practicing for tests is not particularly "real world" friendly and the new design for statewide assessment will be helpful if it can be aligned with what kids need to know and be able to do to be successful in school and in real life. The senior projects are great and the parents and community can look at them and say, "Wow, look at what our kids can accomplish." The assessment system needs to emphasize student learning as a goal, instead of test scores. Any new assessment needs to have formative and diagnostic application to students and parents.

- The focus should be what students can learn.