Technical and Logistical Issues
Session 3

00:13:49   Kristine David: Kristine David, ATLAS @University of Kansas
00:13:51   Brooke Nash: Brooke Nash, ATLAS at the University of Kansas
00:13:53   Beth Fultz: Beth Fultz - Kansas
00:13:56   Ellie Sanford-Moore: Ellie Sanford-Moore, MetaMetrics
00:13:57   Julie DiBona: Good afternoon! Julie DiBona, Cognia.
00:14:01   Laura Pinsonneault: Hello! Laura Pinsonneault (she/hers), new to the Center for Assessment.
00:14:01   Tammy Mayer: Tammy Mayer @ ATLAS-KU
00:14:03   Zack Feldberg: Zack Feldberg University of Georgia
00:14:03   Kathleen Judy: Kathy Judy, Louisiana Dept of Ed
00:14:03   Kelly Bolton: Kelly Bolton, ETS
00:14:06   Carla Evans: Carla Evans, Center for Assessment
00:14:08   Andrew Bell: Andrew Bell, WestEd.
00:14:11   Jessica Allen: Jessica Allen, Seneca Consulting
00:14:13   Llana Williams: Llana Williams, Pearson
00:14:14   Stephanie Boyd: Stephanie Boyd, NC DPI
00:14:14   David Harrison (he/his):   David Harrison, Cognia. Great to be here for Day 2!
00:14:19   Emily Bertels Kaufman: Emily Bertels Kaufman, University of Kansas
00:14:20   Jeri Thompson: Jeri Thompson, Center for Assessment
00:14:22   Veronica Zonick: Veronica Zonick, WestEd
00:14:28   Amy Starzynski: Amy Starzynski, Foresight Law + Policy
00:14:43   Matt Brunetti: Matt Brunetti, WestEd
00:14:44   Russell Keglovits: Hello All - Russ Keglovits with ACS Ventures
00:14:49   Mark Johnson: Good morning/afternoon, everyone! Mark Johnson, Cognia-- Frenchville, Maine, and the beautiful ancestral lands of the Maliseet
00:14:55   Terran Brown: Terran Brown - New Meridian
00:15:04   Shu-Kang Chen: Shu-Kang Chen, ETA
00:15:11   Jadi Miller: I'm sorry if I missed this, but I don't see the slides for Session 3, only session 4.
00:15:11   TRAVIS JONES: Hi everyone - Travis Jones, Great Minds/Eureka Math
00:15:18   Brad McMillen: Brad McMillen, Wake County Public School System
00:15:57   Darice Keating: Darice Keating, Renaissance Learning
00:16:01   Laura Pinsonneault: Session 3 slides: https://www.nciea.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/Through%20Year%20Convening%20-%20Session%203%20Slides.pdf
00:16:08   Susan Yesalonia: Susan Yesalonia, Vermont Agency of Education
00:16:13   Kristen Maxey-Moore: Maxey Moore, NC DPI
00:16:55   Russell Keglovits: @ Laura - when you get a moment, could you post the link to the day 1 slides?

00:17:14   Will Lorie, NCIEA: We have not yet figured out how to post recordings ahead of time.

00:17:42   Nathan Dadey: All materials can be found at the bottom of this page: https://www.nciea.org/events/claims-and-evidence-through-year-assessments-what-we-know-and-what-we-need-know

00:17:47   Jeremy Heneger: Jeremy Heneger Nebraska Department of Education

00:18:00   Chris Meador: Chris Meador, NWEA

00:18:14   Laura Pinsonneault: @RK - absolutely!

First: all materials are or will be posted here: https://www.nciea.org/events/claims-and-evidence-through-year-assessments-what-we-know-and-what-we-need-know

Session 1 Center slides: https://www.nciea.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/Through%20Year%20Convening%20-%20Session%201%20Slides_0.pdf

LA slides: https://www.nciea.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/Through%20Year%20Convening%20-%20Session%201%20Participant%20Slides%20Louisiana.pdf

NE slides: https://www.nciea.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/Through%20Year%20Convening%20-%20Session%201%20Participant%20Slides%20Nebraska.pdf

00:18:42   Nathan Dadey: https://pollev.com/cassessment154

00:18:52   Russell Keglovits: @ Laura - thank you

00:25:18   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   Hi all, thanks for joining us again. Please post questions in the chat or Q & A

00:29:53   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   Good thing we have a CDM expert on the panel today!

00:37:30   Randy Bennett: At least three different aggregation possibilities: (1) Where does the student stand at year end (your end of year model with or without conditioning), (2) how much (and maybe what) has the student accumulated (as in NAVVY or in the way teachers award course grades), and (3) how much has the student grown across the year.

00:38:43   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Randy, the third one is tricky for feeding into ESSA accountability systems unless you somehow define proficiency as growth across the year. It will make people's head spin

00:40:42   Randy Bennett: @Scott, Agreed. That said, methods might not be mutually exclusive. One might wish to use one method for ESSA and another method as a local complement, given that there is a useful purpose toward which that type of aggregated score can be put.

00:44:03   Kimberly Hudson: Scale stability is always an important technical consideration for EOC/EOY summative assessments. In a through-year assessment this becomes even more relevant.

00:45:14   Steve Ferrara: Thanks to my long-time friend and colleague for the shout-out!

00:45:44   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Steve, thanks for your insight!

00:45:59   Nathan Dadey: Randy, I can also see variations on those. For example, we might also have an aggregation that is end of the year + how much students have grown. That like Scott said, might make folks head's spin, How about this more tractable one:

"typical" performance on multiple modules, aka assessments, that cover discrete blocks of content. That seems related to your (2), but also a bit different.

00:46:15   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Kimberly, great point!

00:46:31   Nathan Dadey: Another that we've seen: "Best of" performance, typically either (1) a maximum score or (2) from a retesting perspective, in which students can test a number of times with the goal of meeting some criteria (typically a cut point).

00:48:26   Randy Bennett: @Nathan, a useful table might be to list the different aggregation possibilities, their interpretations, and their assumptions.

00:48:27   Katie McClarty: Here, here, Steve. :)

00:48:49   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   What the scale of Bleh and Meh?

00:49:01   Steve Ferrara: @Katie Never thought I'd get caught in public saying "bleh"...

00:49:21   Karen Barton: Wondering why aligning items to range ALDs and providing a truly evidence based design, along with ESS might support the challenge Will is pointing out.. ?

00:49:25   Randy Bennett: @Steve, you're lucky it was only "bleh"

00:49:31   Chris Domaleski: Need a PLD for Bleh Steve :)

00:49:34   Steve Ferrara: @Scott, don't forget "feh." (And how come you know some Yiddish?)

00:49:34   Nathan Dadey: @Randy, I couldn't agree more. Even better, if we can connect that to evidence and methods around implementations of those aggregation approaches

00:50:03   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Steve--definitely!

00:52:26   Ye Tong: What IRT model should we use to set the scale of Bleh?

00:52:42   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Karen, a principled approach should always help, but I think if folks want to classify performance on the through-year components (not a requirement!), it gets tricky. The ALDs are usually established for end of year. So if I use those ALDs, I might say you are at the basic level early in the year even though you might be on track to proficient. Communicating that is tough

00:53:04   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Ye, that's for you!

00:55:24   Steve Ferrara: @Ye, I think it's a new four-parameter model...

00:55:45   Jeremy Heneger: @Nathan +1 "What is the surround?"

00:57:12   Karen Barton: @Scott - RALDs can provide a progression of expectations for teachers. Hiding that seems unnecessary. Building items to those ALDs allows for revealing additional information like - students are doing pretty well on the kinds of skills your state expected for X PL by the end of the year. Or.. have you provided instruction at a higher level of PL/expectation for ALL your kids (OTL and equity) to best prepare all of them for end of year expectations? Or - having trouble in X area.. try going back to the earlier PL to find precursors to help.. not exactly a learning progression, but... I'm not sure I understand the hesitancy to provide such qualitative information in time for instruction to be adjusted..

00:58:40   Nathan Dadey: In 2019, we found that 25 states were providing interims assessments to schools and districts.

00:58:55   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Karen, I am not suggesting to not provide good qualitative information if you have it. In fact, I'd almost always prefer that over scores, especially for individuals

00:59:49   Brenda Dixon: @Nathan Can you provide the research that found 25 states were providing interim assessments? Thanks

01:00:00   Nathan Dadey: Yeah, let me pull the link

01:01:02   Nathan Dadey: See this prior presentation: https://www.nciea.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/Dadey%20RILS%20Draft%209-26-19.pptx

01:01:35   Nathan Dadey: And the spreadsheet that summary used: https://www.nciea.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/Dadey%20Diggs%20State%20Interim%20Scan%209-25-19.xlsx

01:02:01   Nathan Dadey: Although I'm sure many of the links are now dead

01:02:11   Nathan Dadey: In that spreadsheet

01:05:32   Jeremy Heneger: @Ye I was surprised how different the Interim and Summative assessment practices were for accessibility and accommodations.

01:06:17   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Jeremy, do you mean in general or with the Transcend model specifically?

01:06:36   Steve Ferrara: @Jeremy, not to mention degree of standardization of test admin conditions and teacher interventions on student processing and responding...

01:07:11   Jeremy Heneger: @Ye Agree, I think we need to be careful with within year growth---unintended consequences are likely

01:08:15   Monique Redeaux-Smith: If you focus on certain standards as a district for each interim, what about schools/communties with high student mobility?

01:08:18   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Jeremy, absolutely! "Sandbagging" is a well-known phenomenon back from the early days of Title 1 monitoring when within year growth was used a lot

01:08:39   Jeremy Heneger: @Scott With our transition to through-year and the standardization of accommodations. I had warned the districts about needing to be more standardized for interim as move forward

01:08:59   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Monique, great question--we'll try to surface that in the discussion

01:09:43   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Jeremy, yes, easier to start more strict and ease up rather than try it the other way

01:09:49   Jeremy Heneger: @Steve absolutely. Lots of variation in current interim usage.

01:12:56   Randy Bennett: Shouldn't accessibility features be the same in interim and summative?

01:13:12   Jeremy Heneger: @Ye Accommodations can be challenge but worth it.

01:14:01   Jeremy Heneger: @Randy Should be but that is not what is common in practice. At least in my experience.

01:15:23   Ye Tong: @Randy -- yes I would advocate the same in interim and summative but as Scott rightly pointed out, that is not common practice. Summative assessment provides more accommodations.

01:16:06   Jeremy Heneger: @Russell Within year growth challenge is not really about calculation but about misuse or unintended use. In my opinion.

01:17:30   Russell Keglovits: @will & Jeremy - I'll have to think about this a bit... thank you

01:17:30   Jeremy Heneger: Within year growth might be a better little a accountability as opposed to part of the calculations. Nebraska advisory groups are wrestling with this issue....with help from The Center.

01:19:20   Randy Bennett: @Ye, Jeremy, Not sure that's true for Smarter Balanced. "marter Balanced tests are designed so that students who take themâ€"including students who are learning English or have special needsâ€"can participate in the tests meaningfully and demonstrate what they know and can do. As a result, our interim and end-of-year test includes accessibility resources that address visual, auditory, and physical access barriersâ€"allowing virtually all students who take the test to show what they know and can do without compromising the assessment construct."

01:20:33   Jeremy Heneger: @Russell I had to reconsider when I think about what within year growth might mean for individual teachers and how those scores might be misused or misinterpreted by stakeholders.

01:21:08   Jeremy Heneger: @Randy good to know. I have limited experience with Smarter Balanced.

01:21:47   Monique Redeaux-Smith: This really assumes that students' learning environment is stable for the full year

01:22:56   Jeremy Heneger: @Monique Tell me more about what you are thinking?

01:22:57   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Monique--great point, but even if it is stable (what's that?), kids don't learn in a linear fashion.

01:23:13   Monique Redeaux-Smith: How does this data help teachers see where students are getting stuck?

01:23:48   Randy Bennett: @Jeremy, you're welcome. I worry that doing less vis a vis accommodations for the interim seems legally, ethically, and educationally like walking on thin ice, so to speak.

01:24:07   Jeremy Heneger: @Monique Yes, the data coming back to teachers is super important. A test is not enough.

01:24:25   Jeremy Heneger: @Randy +1

01:25:17   Nathan Dadey: @Randy, to me this also suggests that finding a way to create accommodation resources that are program independent or program adaptable might we worth while

01:25:24   Nathan Dadey: be*

01:28:17   Randy Bennett: @Nathan, I believe there is. That's what WCAG is supposed to accomplish. For example, I believe the GRE General Test is built so that examinees with visual challenges can bring their own screen reader. There no GRE screen reader.

01:31:15   Jeremy Heneger: I really like the 'in progress' instead of some sort of not competent symbols

01:31:22   Brian Gong: A little different point: Accommodations are variations in assessment instruments and/or administration procedures that support more valid interpretations in relation to the construct. A corollary is that if the constructs differ, then appropriate accommodations may differ. There is no set of â€œconstruct independent

accommodations.â€ I think we ought to be more specific about what supports and accommodations are suitable for summative and/or instructional assessment uses.

01:31:40   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Nathan, I think there were some efforts to create open source tools, but I haven't followed it closely for a while

01:34:39   Brenda Dixon: Where can I get the slide deck for NAVVY?

01:35:32   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Brenda, the same place as all the other slides. It will be posted later today.

01:36:08   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   @Roland and @David, we won't get to your questions. Please type them in the chat or Q & A and we'll respond that way--sorry

01:36:40   Brenda Dixon: ok thanks Scott

01:38:04   Monique Redeaux-Smith: Do we want students to think of the standards in this way? Where is the opportunity for them to show that they can apply what they learn? Not just learning discreet skills?

01:38:22   Randy Bennett: There is an analogue to the NAVVY aggregation approach #1 that Laine is discussing in the NCARB licensure exam for architects. Each design item maps onto a competency. An item is scored as pass/indeterminate/fail with respect to that competency. Those judgments are then aggregated to a pass/fail on that section of the licensure exam.

01:39:14   Scott Marion, NCIEA (he/him):   Jim Pellegrino just posted this good observation: DLM and NAAVY have certain similarities with respect to mastery and profiles of attainment

01:39:40   Brooke Nash: Similar to the approach Laine is describing, if the through-year assessment is based on a learning map or progression, the aggregation can represent the accumulation of mastered skills in the map/progression (mastery of skills based on all available evidence or most recent or best). Followed by a mastery profile approach to standard setting (see Clark et al., 2017) for reporting performance levels. This approach is currently used for accountability purposes for alternate assessment.

01:39:55   Will Lorie, NCIEA: @Laine, aren't students who had more attempts advantaged in the aggregate?

01:40:10   Brooke Nash:
        https://dynamiclearningmaps.org/sites/default/files/documents/publication/Condens ed_Mastery_Profile_Method_for_Setting_Standards_for_Diagnostic_Assessment_Systems.pd f

01:41:08   Randy Bennett: Also medical licensure is done in a "through course" type fashion. There are multiple steps (exams) taken across several years. The aggregation model is very simple. You have to pass each one.

01:41:54   Jeremy Heneger: @Randy lots to learn from the licensure exam world