

Nebraska Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Nebraska Department of Education
March 27-28, 2025
8:30 – 4:00

March 27, 2025

8:30 a.m. **Welcome and Introductions**
Approval of November 7-8, 2024 minutes (Chair, Chad Buckendahl, Document 1)

8:40 a.m. **NWEA**

Document 2: Item Development Plan SY25-26 NE

Document 3: Mathematics Cognitive Complexity Framework Final 92619

Document 4: AOR Presentation TAC

Document 5: Experimental Analysis TAC

Document 6: March TAC PPT Final

1. *How does the TAC view the use of Aspects of Rigor (AOR) in place of DOK?*
2. *What impact would this change have on peer review?*
3. *Would incorporating a constraint on DOK and/or standards affect cut scores?*
4. *Does TAC agree that guidance regarding SEP/CCC coverage is necessary? If so, which option is preferred?*
5. *If the summative pools cannot sufficiently handle all these constraints, what prioritization recommendations would TAC suggest?*

10:15 a.m. **Break**

10:30 a.m. **NWEA continue**

11:30 a.m. **Allyson DenBeste, Olivia Alberts, Dr. Cindy Gray**

Document 7: Reading Assessment Questions

1. *Are there any other aspects of the approved reading assessments that should be evaluated?*
2. *Can you suggest any vendors who could assist us with this work? (An RFP may be issued)*

12:00 p.m. **LUNCH**

1:00 p.m. **DRC**

Document 8: Slide Deck – DRC Transition

1:30 p.m. **Derek Ippensen – Accountability**

Document 9: Draft Final Report

1. *What do you find helpful about this report?*
2. *What is unclear in this report?*
3. *What questions has this report not answered?*
4. *What implications do you see for the development of business rules?*
5. *What questions remain?*

Adjourn

March 28, 2025

8:30 a.m.

Dr. Trudy K Clark, Nebraska Department of Education

Document 10: Questions

1. *Buros Center for Testing conducted a brief review the 2023-2024 Technical Report. What is the implication for these two notes:*
 - a. *The NSCAS 2023-2024 Technical Report makes no mention of item drift evaluations. Basically, the report says the scoring relies on pre-equating (p. 91). Pre-equating itself requires pretty strong assumptions that the item scoring parameters do not change over time, over annual and seasonal administrations, with repeated exposure, and when items are administered in different test orders. The manual describes the IRT calibration model around Section 6 on "post-administration" analyses, so perhaps drift evaluations and procedures for updating item parameters are being done and the description of these was just hard to track down. Even if drift is considered, it would need to focus at least in part on potential changes across the Fall, Winter, and Spring test administrations, because non-drifting scoring parameters are an important requirement for accurate scores and score growth reports (e.g., NSCAS Growth Reports Interpretive Guide). Evaluations of item parameter drift would also be needed to address any questions that NDE and school districts might raise about the accuracy of student growth estimates.*
 - b. *Another issue is that there could be a potential error on pages 66-72. In this section (Section 5.2.4) the manual summarizes biases and other accuracy measures and states on page 66, "For the overall scores across all students, the mean biases are small (i.e., less than or equal to 0.03 in magnitude) for both ELA and mathematics.....". The tables this statement refers to (Tables 5.15-5.17) show several "Overall" mean biases outside +/- 0.03 for the ELA and Math tests at different grades. In addition, "Mean" bias is not completely sufficient for evaluations of IRT-based MLE scores, because means don't directly show the conditional bias characteristics of IRT-based MLE scores. In fact, studies going back to the early 1980s have shown that IRT MLE scores are systematically too low for low scoring students and systematically too high for high scoring students.*
2. *Do you have any concerns that came from your review of the 2023-2024 NSCAS Technical Report?*
3. *The use of Artificial Intelligence in the development of statewide assessments has changed from "It's an exciting new tool! Let's see where it goes!" to now "Let's be very cautious in moving too fast". What considerations/cautions would you share about using AI in statewide assessment?*