8:30 AM   Welcome and Introductions – Pat

8:45 AM   Approve Minutes (Document 01) – Brian

8:55-9:45   **Update: 2011 NeSA Testing Window (Document 1 - will be presented at the meeting)
                 Pat, Patricia**

                 The testing window for the operational reading and mathematics tests as well as the
                 field test for science just closed - (March 28-May 6th). A large percentage of the state's
                 students tested online although there was a drop in online participation in mathematics
                 from the field test participation last year. Throughout the window, technical issues
                 were resolved in a number of districts, but all in all the process was relatively smooth
                 across the state.

                 *Question: As the NDE continues its migration from paper/pencil testing and attempts to
                 eliminate mixed mode testing, how can the department provide more support to reach
                 one mode of testing?*

                 Update: Standard setting (Document 2) – Pat, Ron

                 The steps in the standard setting process for reading were successful in 2010, and the
                 same steps are planned for the mathematics standard setting in 2011.

                 *Questions: For reporting purposes, the NDE is considering use of the same proficiency
                 scales for mathematics as for reading. (0-84 – Below the Standards, 85-134 – Meets the
                 Standards, 135-200 – Exceeds the Standards). These proficiency scales are different and
                 separate from the ability scales for mathematics and reading. What difficulties does the
                 TAC see in that approach, and what recommendations do you have for communicating
                 this clearly?*

9:45-10:00   **Update: Long Range Assessment Plan and Item bank reports. (Documents 03 and 4) -
                 Jan, Jessica**

                 In October the TAC recommended that the long range assessment plan and item bank
                 reports include greater clarity and additional detail for NDE planning. These documents
                 have been updated and revised to provide a better written document for NDE planning.

Questions: Do the documents make clear the long range assessment plan and item development status? Does the TAC have any additional recommendations for improvements in these revised documents?

10:00-10:15   *Break*

10:15 -10:45   Update: *Mode comparability Study* (Document 5) – John, Ron

In October the TAC recommended that the comparability study provided by CAL should be more complete and provide a study of disaggregated groups for possible mode effects in the 2011 mathematics testing. The comparability methodology for the 2011 study has been drafted by the NDE and reviewed by the DRC psychometricians. The outline of the study is included as Document 5.

Questions: Are the questions to be answered in the comparability study the "right" questions? Will the suggested comparability methodology provide the answers sought? Does the DAC have other recommendations for the study?

10:45-11:45   Update: NeSA-Writing Discussion – Next Steps (Documents 6,7 8,9) Pat, Ed

In the summer of 2010 a new RFP was issued and a contract for statewide writing awarded to DRC. The initial planning proposed a transition to both analytic scoring and online administration over the next three years. The plan began with a pilot of analytic scoring and online writing with grade 11 in 2011, included the assessment of both grades 8 and 11 with online administration and analytic scoring in 2012, and proposed analytic scoring and online administration of grade 4 in 2013.

The analytic rubrics were developed for grades 4,8, and 11 and distributed in the fall of 2010; the training in analytic scoring began in January, and the 11th grade online pilot administration and analytic scoring went smoothly.   No pilot test results in grade 11 were released, but many districts printed papers and scored locally. The plan and formula for analytic scoring will be fully shared with districts in the summer of 2011. The NDE has agreed to have another contractor score the 2,000 DRC-scored papers with Artificial Intelligence for research and analysis purposes.

Very little changed in the 2011 administration and scoring for grades 4 and 8 NeSA-Writing administration. Districts received their preliminary score reports for grades 4 and 8 electronically from DRC on April 29th. State averages, disaggregated data and final release will occur with the reading and mathematics release in August of 2011.

Much discussion has occurred regarding the online administration of grade 4 NeSA-Writing. In January the NDE administered a survey to the field soliciting information about the administration of online writing to grade 4. The results were overwhelmingly in opposition to the 4th grade test being administered online. The plan at this point is to transition all three grades to analytical scoring and only grades 8 and 11 to online administration.

Questions: Does the TAC have any recommendations or observations about the analytic rubrics or scoring formula? Does the TAC have any observations about the transition to online administration or the survey results? What is the TAC's thinking about the use of the online editing tools?

11:45 – 1:15   **Lunch -   Begin Discussion of the   "Check 4 Learning" System (Documents 10,11,12)**

The NDE intends to support districts by building a state-wide item bank that can be used to generate interim assessments throughout the school year. The purpose of this proposed system of interim assessment is to allow districts to monitor student performance on standards throughout the school year. This interim system, called "Check 4 Learning" will help teachers prepare students for the summative NeSA tests in the spring and will provide districts with a tool that will generate data to be used formatively to inform instruction on an ongoing basis. District participation is voluntary. The NDE will initiate contractual arrangements with all districts and/or educational service units that wish to participate.

The DRC/CAL contract in 2011-12 includes access to the CAL online interim assessment system using the same software that is currently loaded in most of the districts in the state. The NDE intends to build a state-wide item bank using items submitted by districts. In September the NDE will host and-sponsor work sessions for technical review of the items for entry into the state item bank. Districts have items that have been created for local assessment but they may not have been reviewed alignment to the revised state standards, nor have they likely been through any recent technical validation.

All districts who choose to participate may commit through a contractual arrangement with the NDE to provide items and staff time for the professional development needed to build the item bank.   A contractual arrangement will also be offered to the Educational Service Units in the state in return for their participation in the professional development of the project. Additionally, it would be appropriate for the Educational Service Units to provide assistance to districts in the data analysis aspect of the C4L system.

The "Check 4 Learning" System will include items for reading, mathematics and science and will allow a teacher, or designated persons in buildings and districts the access to generate online multiple choice assessments on selected state indicators at any point throughout the year.   Immediate feedback including raw scores will be provided to the students and teachers. Additional reports generated from the system will provide building and district reports.

Questions: As NDE builds a statewide item bank using items across the state, what should be among the most significant concerns and questions? What specific "in kind" requests should the NDE ask of participating districts and educational service units? Does the TAC have any recommendations for the training that districts will need to implement the system?

1:15-1:30   Break

1:30-3:00   State Accountability Model (Documents 13,14,15) – Pat, Bill

For the past year a subcommittee of the State Board of Education has been working on developing a new State Accountability Model.   The board wants to be sure that accountability decisions about Nebraska schools meet Nebraska goals and are not limited to only the federal accountability decisions of AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) and Persistently Low Performing Schools (PLAS).   The work is in line with the Legislature's thinking as well, for the Education Committee Chair introduced LB# 635 this year that outlined a similar model.

In November 0f 2010, the entire State Board of Education voted to approve the Framework of State Accountability – Part I - that identifies the beliefs, values and purposes of such a system. Since November the sub committee has been examining options for building a model that will represent the beliefs, values, and purposes. The board is aware that whatever model is adopted will need to be reviewed over time and be implemented in stages.

The subcommittee has identified the performance indicators (test scores, participation rates, annual improvement, and graduation rate) to be used in the calculations and intend also to add a component of growth. The committee is considering three options for calculating growth. The intent of the board is to run the data as soon as each data source is available to determine the validity of the model. The board hopes to adopt the model by September of 2011 and run data in the fall of 2011.

Once the index points are assigned and totaled for each performance indicator, the plan is to conduct a standard setting to determine which schools fall below the "cut score"

and are considered to be "Priority Schools" needing the most support and possible intervention.   The Board is also considering identifying "Honor" schools.

Questions: What are the TAC's thoughts about the selection of the performance indicators?   What are the advantages and disadvantages in the three methods of calculating growth? Does the TAC have additional recommendations in how the indicators are combined?   Do the tables adequately explain how points are assigned, or would it be better to share the algorithms? What considerations should the board keep in mind as this framework is released and shared with school districts and the public?

3:00-3:30   Wrap up and next steps
Next meeting date – **Wednesday November 2, 2010 – Embassy Suites**