

Oklahoma Assessment System Recommendations

Oklahoma State Board of Education Meeting

Erika Hall, Ph.D.

Juan D'Brot, Ph.D.

Presentation Topics

1. Purpose and goals of the feedback process for House Bill 3218
2. Task Force representation
3. The process for obtaining feedback
4. Role of the Task Force experts
5. Draft recommendations for Oklahoma's assessments
6. Response to the House Bill 3218 assessment requirements

Purpose and Goals

- House Bill 3218
 - Directed the State Board to evaluate Oklahoma's assessment system and provide a report to the Legislature
- The Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) sought to study the degree to which the assessment should
 - Align to the Oklahoma Academic Standards (OAS);
 - Provide a measure of comparability among other states;
 - Yield both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores;
 - Have a track record of statistical reliability and accuracy; and
 - Provide a measure of future academic performance for assessments administered in high school

Purpose and Goals

- To study the requirements, the OSDE sought feedback from across the state
 - Hosting regional feedback sessions
 - Convening the Assessment and Accountability Task Force
- The role of the Task Force was to provide input and feedback around the major study requirements
- The Task Force was supported by experts in assessment and accountability to inform discussion and deliberation

Task Force Representation

- House Bill 3218 required the State Board to consult with representatives from the following groups
 - Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
 - The Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability
 - The State Board of Career and Technology Education
 - The Secretary of Education and Workforce Development

Task Force Representation

- Additionally, the OSDE included representatives from the following to provide public comment:
 - Districts across the state
 - Educators and parents
 - Business and community leaders
 - Tribal leaders
 - Lawmakers
- A total of 95 members participated on the Task Force, including OSDE and facilitators/experts

Process to Obtain Feedback

- Using HB 3218 as a guide, the OSDE sought feedback from the Task Force on each major topic
- The facilitators (Drs. Juan D'Brot & Marianne Perie) worked with the Task Force to discuss the following:
 - The requirements of the House Bill
 - The role of the Task Force
 - Research and best practices in assessment and accountability development
 - Considerations for ensuring an assessment demonstrates technical quality (i.e., reliable, valid, and fair)
 - Requirements for peer review as a means to present evidence of technical quality
 - Considerations for the intended use of the assessments (i.e., grade-level performance and accountability)

Role of the Experts

- Several experts were invited to discuss aspects of assessment and accountability development:
 - Dr. H. Gary Cook, University of Wisconsin (ELL Expert)
 - Dr. Juan D’Brot, Center for Assessment (Primary Facilitator and Expert)
 - Dr. Marianne Perie, University of Kansas (Primary Facilitator and Expert)
 - Dr. David Steiner, Johns Hopkins School of Education (Goal-setting Expert)
- The facilitators sought to collect Task Force feedback and ensure input was comprehensive and clear
- The experts strove to ensure the Task Force members were informed about technical constraints and design considerations during their discussions

Draft Recommendations for Oklahoma's Assessment System

Draft Recommendations for the Assessment System

- The following over-arching recommendations are specific to the assessments for students in grades 3-8 and the high school assessments.
- Following the over-arching recommendations, recommendations are summarized under each major point of HB 3218.

Draft Recommendations for the Assessment System

*For assessments in **grades 3-8**, the OSDE recommends the adoption of a standards-based assessment that is aligned to the new Oklahoma Academic Standards (OAS).*

*For assessments in **high school**, the OSDE recommends the adoption of a single off-the-shelf college-readiness assessment (e.g., ACT/SAT) for **grade 11**, and further consideration of writing, science, and U.S. History.*

Draft Recommendations based on HB 3218 Requirements

As a reminder, the following recommendation summaries are based on the major points of study in House Bill 3218:

1. Alignment to the Oklahoma Academic Standards
2. Comparability with Other States
3. Norm-referenced and criterion-referenced interpretations
4. Statistical reliability and accuracy
5. Future academic performance for assessments administered in high school

Draft Recommendations based on HB 3218 Requirements

- 1. Align the assessment system to the OAS, but also provide a signal for college-readiness in high school;*
- 2. Use available national data (e.g., NAEP) to set CCR cut scores that reflect nationally competitive expectations;*
- 3. Provide meaningful and accessible criterion- and norm-referenced interpretations, but limit the norm-referenced interpretations to within-state comparisons;*
- 4. Ensure assessments demonstrate the technical quality necessary for the intended uses of grade 3-8 and high school assessments. The assessments must exhibit sufficient evidence of reliability, validity, and fairness for all students; and*
- 5. Provide students with a score indicating the likelihood of success in post-secondary academics using a college-readiness assessment.*

1. Alignment to the Oklahoma Academic Standards

- Statewide summative assessments for accountability must demonstrate evidence of reliability, validity, and fairness;
- These assessments should provide evidence of student progress against Oklahoma's college- and career-readiness standards;
- Summative assessments for accountability are required to undergo peer review, which include evidence of alignment to the state standards; and
- In addition to these needs, assessments must also be valuable and provide a clear signal of college-readiness for students in high school.

2. Comparability with other states

- The ability to make comparisons between Oklahoma performance and other states is a desired feature in the assessment system;
- The strength of the comparison is dependent on the design and administration of the assessment;
- In order to support strong comparisons at the student, school, or grade levels, test design and administration could become cumbersome (e.g., increased test length, additional research studies, additional testing); and
- Leveraging existing data (e.g., NAEP, college-readiness data) and research methodologies into standard setting activities can establish nationally competitive expectations on Oklahoma assessments.

3. Norm-referenced and criterion-referenced interpretations

- The Oklahoma assessments can support both norm- and criterion-referenced reporting;
- Recommendations suggest the prospective assessments should report both criterion-referenced and norm-referenced interpretations;
- In light of the constraints to support state comparisons, norm-referenced interpretations should be focused within state to contextualize student learning on the Oklahoma standards; and
- Normed comparisons can be made at grades 4, 8 and 11 through NAEP and a college-readiness assessment (e.g., ACT/SAT).

4. Statistical reliability and accuracy

- A statewide summative assessment should signal grade-level mastery of standards for students and be used for accountability;
- These types of assessments must exhibit strong evidence of technical quality: reliability, validity, and fairness for all students;
- Evidence of technical quality for state-developed assessments requires field testing and operational administration, but can be demonstrated procedurally; and
- Off-the-shelf college-readiness assessments (e.g., ACT/SAT) demonstrate evidence of technical quality if administration conditions are unchanged.

5. Future academic performance

- The perceived value of a college-readiness assessment is in part based upon its ability to predict future academic performance;
- Using this type of assessment can provide a probability of success in post-secondary academics; and
- Additional evidence should continue to be collected to strengthen the claims of likely post-secondary success.

Thank you!