

August 9, 2011

Special Board Meeting

MINUTES

Members Attending: Chair Jeff Vincent, Vice-chair Steve Dal Porto, Ms. Amy Bragdon, Mr. Randy Dorn, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Dr. Sheila Fox, Ms. Phyllis Frank, Mr. Bob Hughes, Ms. Mary Jean Ryan, Mr. Jack Schuster (10)

Members Absent: Dr. Bernal Baca (excused), Mr. Jared Costanza (excused)
Mr. Tre' Maxie (excused), Dr. Kris Mayer (excused),
Mr. Matthew Spencer (excused) (5)

Staff Attending: Dr. Kathe Taylor, Ms. Loy McColm, Ms. Sarah Rich (3)

Staff Absent: Mr. Aaron Wyatt (excused), Ms. Ashley Harris (excused) (2)

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Chair Vincent.

Cut Scores for Math End-of-Course Assessments and 5th and 8th Grade Science Measurements of Student Progress

Dr. Alan Burke, Deputy Superintendent, OSPI

Dr. Robin Munson, Assistant Superintendent, Assessment and Student Information, OSPI

Ms. Cinda Parton, Director, Assessment Development, OSPI

Dr. Tom Hirsch, Assessment and Evaluation Services, OSPI Partner

The Superintendent of Public Instruction presented cut scores to be used on the End-of-Course Mathematics exams and the 5th and 8th Grade Science Measurements of Student Progress. These assessments, aligned to the most current subject area learning standards, were administered for the first time in spring 2011. Each test has three cut scores, separating four levels of student performance as follows:

- The cut between Below Basic and Basic.
- The cut between Basic and Proficient.
- The cut between Proficient and Advanced.

The Board's cut scores will be used to report the 2011 results and will be used in future years until such time as the standards are revised or revisited.

OSPI staff reviewed the standard setting approval process. The Board first reviewed the process to be used for the 2011 End-of-Course Exams in Mathematics and Science Measurements of Student Progress at its regular March 2011 meeting, and reviewed and approved the process at its July 2011 meeting. The Superintendent's National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) had also reviewed and approved the process, and on August 8, 2011 certified that the process had been followed.

The Superintendent's recommendations for cut scores were based on multiple sources: Contrasting Groups Study, Grade-level Panels, Articulation Panels, and a Policy Advisory Panel. The mean

ratings from the grade-level panelists form the basis for each grade level panel's cut score recommendations. Mean ratings allow every panel member to contribute a fraction of the raw score cut.

The Superintendent recommended that the Board adopt the cut scores for Basic, Proficient, and Advanced on the grades 5th and 8th Science Measurements of Student Progress and for the Year One and Year Two End-of-Course exams in Mathematics as forwarded by the Articulation Panel and the Policy Advisory Panel.

Public Comment

Paul Muckerheide, Hazen High School

Mr. Muckerheide was interested in the discussion about the relationship between new and old cut scores. He was on the standard setting committee in August, 2011 and the PLD Committee in September, 2010. We have a range of cut scores from the panelists and an average was taken. He suggested that maybe an average doesn't make sense when there is a consequence (diploma) in place. Why would we pick the average rather than the lower score when there is a consequence of graduating or not.

Business Items

Approval of Cut Scores for the End of Course High School Mathematics Assessment for Algebra and Geometry

Motion was made to approve the Superintendent of Public Instructions recommended Cut Scores as the Cut Scores for the Algebra/Integrated 1 and Geometry/Integrated 2 End of Course High School Mathematics Assessment.

Motion seconded

Board discussion

Motion carried

Approval of Cut Scores for the Measurement of Student Progress for Science Grades five and eight

Motion was made to approve the Superintendent of Public Instructions recommended Cut Scores as the Cut Scores for the 5th and 8th Grade Science Measurement of Student Progress Assessment.

Motion seconded

Board Discussion

Motion carried with one nay

Chair Vincent asked for feedback on how the communication process should happen moving forward.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:47 by Chair Vincent