

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

January 21, 2005 Hearing Room E

1:00 P.M. Tapes 8 - 10

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Linda Flores, Chair

Rep. John Dallum, Vice-Chair

Rep. Steve March, Vice-Chair

Rep. Debi Farr

Rep. John Lim

Rep. Chip Shields

Rep. Carolyn Tomei

STAFF PRESENT: Jim Keller, Committee Administrator

Kellie Whiting, Committee Assistant

MEASURES / ISSUES HEARD:

**Oregon Assessments - Informational Meeting
No Child Left Behind and Adequate Yearly Progress –**

Informational Meeting

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words. For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE/#	Speaker	Comments
--------	---------	----------

TAPE 8, A

108	Chair Flores	Calls the meeting to order at 1:01p.m. and opens the informational meeting on Oregon Assessments.
-----	--------------	---

Oregon Assessments - INFORMATIONAL MEETING

004	Steve Bogart	Chair, State Board of Education. Introduces Pat Burke and Doug Kosty.
021	Doug Kosty	Assistant Superintendent of Assessment Information Services.
026	Pat Burk	Chief Policy Officer, Oregon Department of Education (ODE). Introduces Oregon Revised Statute 329.485 (EXHIBIT A) and explains the statewide assessment system, types of assessments, subjects, rules, additional services and alternative educational options.
071	Rep. Dallum	Asks who designed the criteria for the assessment tests.
076	Burk	Responds that sample test items are used to determine the standards. Explains that the Rosh unit score is used to determine the level of difficulty at equal intervals.
099	Kosty	Presents the procedure of assessment. Refers to the Oregon State Assessments (EXHIBIT B, Page 1).
182	Chair Flores	Inquires what the contract quires are.
185	Kosty	Responds that they are informational based inquires regarding the types of assessments that are being provided for Oregon.
190	Chair Flores	Inquires if they could replace existing assessments or enhance current assessments.
192	Kosty	Responds that they could be used for an array of situations.

194	Rep. Dallum	Asks what the cost of the program would be.
199	Kosty	States that he cannot respond on the cost.
203	Burk	Responds that the quoted price for junior high and high school is \$12.75 per test.
219	Kosty	Comments that the costs are due to not being able to preserve the historical data. Presents the assessment process on page one.
316	Chair Flores	Inquires at what point are the teachers involved in the assessment process.
323	Kosty	Responds that they are typically involved in the Spring and Summer.
325	Chair Flores	Inquires how many teachers are involved in the collaborated effort.
329	Kosty	Responds that there have been hundreds of teachers involved at one time. Comments that this is done to secure the item so they are not used by kids.
338	Chair Flores	Inquires how often does the process take place.
343	Kosty	Responds that it is an annual process.
348	Chair Flores	Inquires about the cost relating to the process of teachers interpreting and collaborating together in the spring and summer months.
353	Kosty	Responds that the cost of item development in 2003 was \$1.2 million.
361	Burk	Explains that the items are tested for bias. Explains that the advantage of having teachers write the item is to measure the teacher standards.
385	Chair Flores	Comments that teachers review numerous components to determine if they are being sensitive to the areas of overview.
393	Burk	Concurs. Explains that they also look for readability and level of difficulty.

414	Rep. Dallum	Inquires if the standards for educating a child at a certain levels were developed by teachers.
418	Burk	Concurs. Responds that the prior documents used were called common curriculum goals and notes that the legislature has now adopted academic standards. Explains that there were panels of teachers who determined what the students should be able to comprehend and at what level. Explains that that process has built the framework for the standards that are used today.

TAPE 9, A

010	Rep. Dallum	Inquires if Oregon standards are developed by Oregon teachers.
012	Burk	Concurs.
013	Kosty	Explains that the field-test items do not count for the accountability tests but rather used to gather information to assist in making it an operational item.
015	Chair Flores	Refers to page one and inquires about the cost for the different phases used to test items.
020	Kosty	Responds that the State Financial Management System would hold that information. States that there is no category in the budget for each of the phases.
083	Kosty	Refers to page four and describes the test specifications and the process to measure how the system is functioning.
093	Rep. Tomei	Asks what the timeline is for the beginning of phase one until finally administered to students and graded.
097	Kosty	Responds that it is typically two years.
099	Rep. Tomei	Asks if the system can be used year after year, or if they have to develop new items.
100	Kosty	Responds that they can be reused as long as the individual items have not been compromised.

103	Burk	Responds that there are sample items used and they are released into the public domain and will never appear on a test item.
116	Chair Flores	Clarifies that the test items are reused year after year and the information is gathered to analyze if it is reusable.
120	Kosty	Concurs.
124	Kosty	Refers to page two and explains the purposes for the assessment systems. Describes the differences between the state assessment and the local assessment. Notes that the state assessment does not have a planning component.
190	Kosty	Refers to page three and provides an overview of the mathematics problem solving test. States that there was a drop in the results in the Spring of 2004.
216	Chair Flores	Asks him to clarify the correlation between the results.
220	Kosty	Responds that the levels dropped 17% at the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) level in 03-04, down from 43% and in 2004 it dropped around 50%.
245	Rep. Dallum	Inquires how long the math solving testing template has been in place.
250	Kosty	Responds since 1997.
252	Rep. Dallum	Comments that there was a track record of six years and the results dropped.
253	Chair Flores	Inquires if they were disregarded because they were not useful.
256	Kosty	Clarifies that the tests were not able to be scored and the tests were not delivered to be scored this coming Spring.
262	Rep. Dallum	Inquires if there is concern with other disciplines with similar track records taking a drop.
270	Burk	Responds that there was not the same result in the writing assessments. Comments that the issues with math problems is if the

item was flawed, if there is a decline in math knowledge as a whole or if there was flaws in the system.

298	Chair Flores	Inquires if the process is on hold due to not knowing what element has failed.
300	Burk	Concurs. Comments they are open to the question of if they are solving math problems in the correct and most efficient way. States that the training for teachers to be on the same level of examination and grading would require more time and resources.
315	Chair Flores	Inquires if there have been past years where the same problem has occurred.
316	Burk	Responds that this is the first time they have seen a drop without an explanation.
322	Rep. Dallum	Clarifies that the teachers were the designers, developers, implementers and practitioners and have experienced a failure.
333	Burk	States Oregon teachers are committed to teaching real world skills in regards to math. Comments that the process of testing and assessing math problems through multiple choice is an idea that teachers reject.
355	Rep. Dallum	Asks why do we have to train teachers in the process in which they have created.
364	Burk	Clarifies that he was explaining the training in regards to writing and scoring the item. Explains the scoring guide and the criteria used.
413	Chair Flores	Comments that there is concern about the re-occurring problem that was in existence in 1998 and 1999.
420	Kosty	Explains that there is an advisory committee that monitors the assessment system. States that with enough results from using an array of different tasks, the tests can be designed to be more reliable.

TAPE 8, B

048	Chair Flores	
-----	--------------	--

		Requests an estimate for the cost of developing the math scoring process.
053	Kosty	Responds that the cost for a performance assessment is \$13. 00 per test, which includes item writing, scoring, development of the test, delivery, and reporting components.
058	Chair Flores	Addresses that the number of students served was 288,168.
060	Kosty	Responds that the cost was \$3.7 million for 2003-2004.
063	Chair Flores	Clarifies that the process is now in suspension and expresses concern for the accountability and effectiveness.
067	Rep. Dallum	Asks if other states have had the problem in math discipline.
070	Kosty	Comments that Oregon is the only state that offers a single task to test standards. States that he does not know what the standards of other states are in regards to math problems.
081	Burk	Responds that most states do not use the single task approach and instead they use the multiple choice approach.
128	Rep. Dallum	Inquires if the states that are assessing math are encountering the same difficulties and asks if they are on their own to develop a system.
134	Burk	Concurs. States that all states develop their own systems and develop their own assessment.
152	Chair Flores	Requests them to come back to respond to questions.
163	Rob Kremer	<p>President of the Oregon Education Coalition. Provides a background of his experience in education. States that there is uncertainty among Oregonians about the assessment systems. States the principals that should be included to achieve a functional and reliable assessment system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure only academic skills and knowledge that can be validly measured. • Use tests that meet the highest standards of reliability.

- To have the most efficient and cost effective assessment system.
- The implemented system should have the smallest impact on the classroom in regards to time spent on training and practicing assessments.

188	Kremer	States the Oregon Assessments fails on all the mentioned principals. States that the performance tests are intended to measure a deeper understanding of the content areas. States that the performance tests can not measure the understanding with any reliability and validity. States that the methodology is not working. Comments that there has been an ample amount of money invested into the test items and training has been provided for teachers to apply the assessments. Refers to the Math Assessments (EXHIBIT C, Page 1) and states that the testing is only correlating to communication skills and not to math ability. Points out that the scoring techniques are vague, difficult and expensive.
270	Kremer	Refers to page two and explains the grading scale. Comments that the scores are vague and impossible to discern on a consistent level. States that the score of four to six will meet the standards but yet the score of four does not mean the answer is correct. States that the true flaw in the tests is the impact on the classroom. States that a student's day of instruction can never be replaced. Explains the cost and time to instruct teachers and students on how to follow a process of taking the tests is taking time away from students' time of learning math knowledge and skills.
330	Kremer	Refers to page three and explains the process that teachers have to follow to help the students do well on the tests. States that the teachers are to follow this procedure once a week or frequently. Notes that there are many school days being took from the school year to instruct teachers on how to fill out the form.

TAPE 9, B

033	Kremer	Presents the question of allowing people to audit themselves. States that the Oregon Department of Education has been implementing an Oregon School Reform for the past 14 years. States that the success of the reform will be based on student test scores and the tests are created by the Department of Education. Poses the question of knowing if the difficulty of the tests has maintained the consistent difficulty over the years. States that there is evidence that they have not. Refers to assessing the assessment handout (EXHIBIT D) and explains that the difficulty of the assessment tests have declined in
-----	--------	--

difficulty since 1998. States that it is not good public policy to let the developers and implementers evaluate and measure the success of their own program. Agrees that there should be an assessment that demonstrates effective teaching so that it can be replicated to other classrooms.

- | | | |
|-----|--------------|--|
| 051 | Rep. Farr | Inquires about the type of system methodology system Mr. Kremer would recommend. |
| 059 | Kremer | Responds that he would recommend it to a request for proposal (RFP) or with perimeters in place, allow an assessment company to provide a suggested test. Suggests a constructive response to the students or a short answer response. |
| 072 | Rep. Farr | Inquires about the quoted price for the companies to provide a service. |
| 074 | Kremer | Responds that McGraw Hill quoted 13-18 million for the development and administration two years ago. |
| 080 | Rep. Shields | Requests a peer review journal about assessment validity. |
| 083 | Kremer | Suggests <u><i>The Schools We Need and Why We Don't Have Them</i></u> , by E.D. Hirsh. |

No Child Left Behind and Adequate Yearly Progress - INFORMATIONAL MEETING

- | | | |
|-----|--------------|---|
| 099 | Pat Burk | Refers to the No Child Left Behind Act informational material (EXHIBIT E) and gives a brief background of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Explains the policy guidance, 1. The law itself 2. Rules for the operation of the law and 3. The non-regulatory guidance. Notes that the NCLB Act is the name for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that was passed in 1969. States that the act needs to be re-authorized every six years through Congress and was done so in the Clinton Administration and then reauthorized by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002. |
| 145 | Chair Flores | States that the current components requiring states to develop standards were imposed during the Clinton Administration. |
| 151 | Burk | Concurs. States that some of the components pre-date the Clinton Administration. States the purpose of the Act on page one and |

explains that states have to adopt state standards and have state assessments on their standards.

202	Chair Flores	Inquires if the NCLB Act was mandated due to non-compliance of the states.
210	Burk	Responds that Oregon was the first state to implement the state assessments and standards. States that Oregon is due to have a peer review in the Fall of 2005.
238	Burk	Explains the definition of a Title 1 school. Refers to page two and explains the requirements for a school to be considered a Title 1 school.
268	Rep. Dallum	Inquires if the academic testing system requirements are in place to receive federal funding and is not a statewide requirement.
272	Burk	Concurs. Responds that the federal funding is an implied contract and the schools are required to abide by the regulations and rules.
301	Burk	Continues to present the state assessment requirements on page two. Refers to the performance on page three. States that adequate yearly progress is when a target is established and areas of proficiency are observed 100% at state standards by the year 2014 and a plan of incremental targets are developed to achieve the desired objective.
380	Burk	Refers to page four and describes the subgroups and threshold requirements. States that each subgroup must achieve a 40% level of meeting or exceeding state English and Math standards.
419	Rep. Dallum	Inquires about how the 40% threshold is established.
494	Burk	Responds that the law requires that the subgroups be looked at based on prior population data and look at the average of the lowest performing subgroup.

TAPE 10, A

001	Rep. Dallum	Reiterates that the lowest performing school's average is the standard for Oregon Schools to grow from.
-----	-------------	---

005	Burk	Concurs.
007	Rep. Dallum	Comments that they are working towards a high threshold and started at a low threshold.
009	Burk	Concurs. States that federal law is targeting the students that are below that average to bring those students up to the higher average by the year 2014.
040	Rep. Farr	Inquires if a school with a disproportionate number of economically disadvantaged English language learner students with disabilities, impact the performance in regard to meeting the standards.
044	Burk	Responds that it would. Comments that schools with a high concentration of students with diversity, learning disabilities and language barriers creates more challenges for that school versus other schools. Comments that the federal funding is targeted towards those schools and is distributed in addition to general funds on the basis of poverty counts. States that the districts determine which schools receive the money in rank order of poverty.
088	Rep. Dallum	Inquires if the funds go to the appropriate schools.
093	Burk	Responds that the Title 1 schools receive the funds they need.
118	Chair Flores	Asks Mr. Burk to return at a later time.
127	Chair Flores	Closes the informational meeting on the No Child Left Behind and Adequate Yearly Progress adjourns the meeting at 3:03 pm.

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A. **Oregon Assessments, copy of Oregon Revised Statute 329.485, Pat Burk, 2 pp**
- B. **Oregon Assessments, Overview of Assessments, Doug Kosty, 6 pp**
- C. **Oregon Assessments, Math Assessments, Rob Kramer, 3 pp**
- D. **Oregon Assessments, Assessing the Assessment, Rob Kramer, 4 pp**
- E. **No Child Left Behind Act, informational material, Pat Burk, 7 pp**