**Nebraska Technical Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Nebraska Department of Education**

**December 20, 2023**

**12:30-1:30 p.m. CT**

**12:30 p.m. Welcome (Trudy Clark)**

**12:40 p.m. Dr. Maher, Nebraska Commissioner of Education**

*Document 2: PowerPoint: Offering Choice in Test Design and Implications*

Dr. Maher presented context and information regarding the option for choice in statewide assessment.

*Questions:*

1. *By offering choice, what is the impact on accountability?*

**TAC:** Accountability is not impacted because the growth metric would be year-to-year using the scale score for the spring summative assessment. The scale score from the first 27 on grade level items measuring the standards for ELA and math would be used for reporting and accountability. All districts would use the scale scores to determine the achievement level for students, which in turn will be used for accountability.

1. *By offering choice, what are the implications for peer review?*

**TAC:** By just focusing on the scale scores for the summative, offering choice would not impact peer review. Fall and winter administrations would not be discussed in peer review submission because the data and information will not be used for the accountability system.

1. *By offering choice, are their compliance issues with state and federal laws related to assessment and accountability?*

**TAC**: There should not be any compliance issues as long as there is a reliable assessment that has high classification accuracy and all districts are taking the same test for accountability.

**Addition TAC Comments and Considerations:**

* RFP should meet the assessment requirements and be vendor agnostic.
* Choice of language is going to be very important since Nebraska has been using growth. Interim is more of the common language of non-summative assessments administered at different points throughout the year.
* Once the RFI is drafted, the TAC can review it to help with the language. Be efficient with the design and cost-effective.
* Feedback and input on reports for districts, schools, students, and parents. Reports can be more robust to inform accountability.
* Technical issues in the current model that could raise questions for the peer reviewers.
  + Overlap of scale scores from grade to grade where students are performing in terms of achievement because there isn’t enough differentiation in the available information.
  + Wider error bands on the conditional standard errors - the classification accuracy for the “on track” achievement level is considerably lower than expected for an adaptive instrument like this.
    - Uncertain if the level of reliability, specifically with classification accuracy, can be achieved with the number of items without overlap on the vertical scale of scores and possible misclassifications.
    - The classification accuracy for the “on track” level especially in ELA was moderate at best while the other two achievement levels are strong. What is the cause?
  + If the item pool is not large enough, it can limit the adaptability and also limits the type of reporting that can be done.

**1:20 p.m. Adjournment**