

Minutes
Texas Statewide Network of Assessment Professionals (TSNAP) Teleconference
June 9, 2005

Roll Call – Sandra Poth in the absence of Steve Peterson

TSNAP Issues – Keith Haffey, 2005 TSNAP President

- Review of TETN dates for 2005-2006
 - September 8, 2005 – 1:00p.m.
 - November 3, 2005 – 1:00p.m.
 - March 28, 2006 – 1:00p.m.
 - June 15, 2006 – 9:00a.m.

- Assessment Conference
 - December 11-14, 2005
 - deadline for proposals June 10, 2005
 - encourage campus and district proposals
 - submit proposals on-line at www.tasanet.org

- New District Coordinator's Academy –
 - September 20 or 21, 2005 (one day academy)
 - open to new testing coordinators and added staff
 - no fee charged
 - intended to help earlier, in time for preparation for October testing

- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Large Scale Assessment Conference
 - San Antonio - June 19-22, 2005
 - national conference
 - sessions on data management and assessment on a large scale

- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Forum & Summer Data Conference
 - Washington, DC – July 25-29, 2005
 - national conference
 - practices for tracking students and monitoring NCLB
 - free registration
 - last year's sessions presented by state level and large school district representatives

- Legislative update – Sandra Poth (TSNAP legislative liaison)
 - 79th legislative session ended on March 31, 2005
 - main interest of TSNAP was to secure a law that would provide for released tests every year rather than every other year
 - two bills filed by Rep. Mowery and Rep. Brown
 - April 26 - positive testimony offered before House committee on Education
 - Keith Haffey, Elaine Say, Sandra Poth and others testified
 - bill made it thru committee
 - ultimately attached to Sunset Bill which died on May 23 –
 - voucher bill also attached to Sunset Bill
 - some who may have supported released tests did not support the voucher bill
 - 2004 released tests only; none in 2005 as of this teleconference
 - lack of released tests presents challenges this year
 - legislative initiative for this year strong but needed to be stronger

- discussed online/computer-adaptive vs paper and pencil testing with Grusendorf
 - understands a great deal
 - wants to promote technology
- be open and available to legislators and State Board of Education members
- K. Haffey
 - be active by contacting your representatives
 - released tests a minor point to many; critical piece in assessment and informing instruction

Follow-up items from March TETN - Keith Haffey, TSNAP President 2005

- Legislative update on assessment from TEA
 - Lisa Chandler
 - SB 658 (Madla) – requires the agency to develop a 3-year testing calendar in order to minimize conflicts with UIL activities
 - may have issues when we have to make changes to the testing calendar
 - HB 25 (Hochberg)– requires the agency to adopt norm - referenced tests for military dependents who move into Texas public schools
 - special legislative session for finance - unsure
 - legislative briefing book published in next few weeks
 - will cover all bills affecting schools and charters
- Testing materials – Terri Fish
 - ESCs as materials distribution sites and large print and braille
 - will go back and reexamine additional materials ordering system before discussion
 - Shipping during Spring Break
 - not had a chance to talk about this but will look at it to do something to make it easier
 - Lisa Chandler – have signed contract with PEM to be our primary contractor for next 5 years
 - Keith Haffey - kudos to Pearson for quick processing of Gr. 5 math results - issue of school being out still a challenge
- Additions to the District and Campus Coordinator Manual
 - clearly specify eligibility requirements for large print
 - Lisa Chandler – will look at making a lot of things clearer
 - not aware of any specific changes
 - recently hired head of the manual team - David Bradford
 - need for eligibility requirements because some districts chose to allow many students to use large print
 - student use of telecommunication devices during testing
 - K. Haffey - increasing use of telecommunications devices by students and teachers
 - must deal with these in the hands of teachers during testing so they can focus on test administration
- Laura Ayala - TELPAS audit 2005-2006
 - conducted audit for 04-05
 - researching the possibility to audit something every spring
 - tentative plan - at least every other year; possibly every year for a while
 - Everyone should expect an audit.
 - Can we volunteer to participate?

- will keep in mind
- English Language Learner (ELL) focus group meeting July 6-8 to consider input for the year.
- LAT – Looking back and moving forward
 - Survey results
 - Voluntary online survey input
 - just over 1000 responded; haven't reviewed preliminary run of data; looks fairly positive
 - not high percentages of people who had difficulty with procedures; written comments may be different
 - interested in input on survey
 - will look at whether to continue previewing procedure or allow teachers to help students with the language as the test is being administered
 - K. Haffey – Region 4 – consideration to eliminate preview well received
 - S. Poth - Region 20 in agreement
 - L. Ayala – also considering next year to have a totally separate LAT form; would not coincide with spring administration or be the same test
 - Would that change anyone's opinion about security issues?
 - K. Haffey – whole idea of previewing promotes a lot of anxiety; would not like to do any previewing
 - S. Poth – agree
 - Summer focus group plans
 - L. Ayala - take input from survey and state performance results for LAT administration
 - accommodations used most often
 - data from answer documents
 - try to develop a plan for the future
 - move toward more standardization
 - L. Ayala - 3 district test coordinators included in focus group all along; interested in joining, let us know
- Training update for 2005-06
 - Laura Ayala – planning for changes to TELPAS and LAT training timing in 2006-07 (maybe a good idea to implement in 2005-06)
 - S. Poth – in Northside looking at a model that may provide teacher training in the fall (first of November) not so close to the window – early will help
 - L. Ayala – bilingual and TITLE III directors at ESC level advocate fall training
 - might be required by the state in order to impact instruction
 - focused TOP rater training shortly before testing
 - reaction to the fall training idea?
 - Jaclyn (Irving ISD) – didn't receive information about regional training so we could be involved in that – bilingual department was involved but district coordinators did not receive information
 - L. Ayala – TEA Austin training
 - ESC decided who attended the Austin training from the districts based on LEP enrollment
 - L. Ayala
 - Observation protocol fall training thinking

- use materials already available for training
 - more instructional focus
 - December ESC training in Austin would cover all TELPAS and LAT administration procedures
 - TOP rater training after Christmas
 - early January (11 or 12)
 - include new writing samples for additional practice using collections from spring 2005 audit
 - don't want to have it too far in advance
 - S. Poth – would fit well with the model in our district
 - teachers need to understand OP even if they have training later; December fine
 - highly favor early January rater training
 - K. Haffey – echo S. Poth
 - fall training - anytime you can couch assessment training in an instructional framework the better-
 - in fall training embed elements of things you'll talk about in January rater training only because the more they begin to internalize and implement the easier it will be
 - L. Ayala – strength of this assessment model is that it is tied close to instruction
 - L. Ayala – another calendar issue - Gr. 5&6 Spanish field tests
 - 2006-07– propose to move field tests to beginning two weeks of TELPAS window.
 - 2005-06 would be March 13 - April 7
 - 4-week TELPAS window – 1st two weeks of window for Spanish field tests
 - would like to have some time around the field test because it would come too close to gr. 5 math
 - not the best
 - could ask for an exception
 - S. Poth – appreciate a 2-week window for field test –would prefer the early end
 - L. Ayala – will implement in 05-06
- Latest on RPTE II and field testing for 2005-06
 - Laura Ayala
 - piloted Gr. 2 last spring; went well
 - Gr. 2 issue of how long a test can be
 - in process of developing field test items for 05-06
 - prototypes embedded in test last spring for Gr. 3-12
 - biggest change is a greater emphasis on reading across the content areas
 - TAKS-like reading selections
 - Different from TAKS in that it will try to tap the kind of reading they do in a classroom
 - discussion going on as to whether to develop it as an online test and make it computer adaptive
 - would be difficult to also have a paper pencil test
 - D. Bone - Region 13: TYC students can't have access to internet
 - Will it be a system that will filter out pop ups and no access to the internet?
 - L. Chandler – not something allowed in online testing now
 - D. Bone - present system may limit us to go to a TEA site or Pearson site

- L. Chandler – would have to take a look at this
 - L. Ayala – idea is under discussion
 - no firm decision on it; waiting on legislature
 - If we do move in that direction, it is possible we will not be there by spring 2006-07.
 - not sure we can do an online field test in spring 05-06
 - Implementation of RPTE II may change from the original plan if it is done online.
 - L. Ayala – any other input about moving to RPTE into an online test only?
 - J. Orr – test is a perfect mechanism to work into the computer adaptive test
 - K. Haffey – would like to receive well in advance some specifications so we can make sure our campuses are geared for it
 - L. Ayala – needs much discussion
 - If no online field test, will have paper and pencil field test embedded along with RPTE for Gr. 3-12
 - separate Gr. 2 field test
 - bringing idea of computer-adaptive to focus group in July
- SSI and 5th grade math
 - Difficulties with late reporting and GPC requirements
 - something in the works for next year?
 - Janet Borell – SSI task force
 - aware of difficulties
 - unfortunate consequence to administering test at a later date
 - best we can do right now is get reports out early
 - only thing to do is change test date – issue of opportunity to learn
 - K. Haffey – After 1st administration, could we address the 2nd based on the student's performance at a certain level?
 - set some things in place for students who have a wide gap between performance on 1st and 2nd
 - matter of numbers by end of year going elsewhere
 - L. Chandler
 - could be a local decision
 - not sure state would not want to set a “cutpoint” because of concerns about making assumptions regarding instructional interventions that could occur
 - Contingency clauses when the ARD committee is the GPC
 - Is there a way for there to be language in the minutes where they could talk about a contingency based on performance? Requirement in terms of parent notification and holding ARDs is more stringent than GPC in terms of need, time, diagnosticians, staffing.
 - Cari Wieland
 - Gene Lenz discussion
 - contingency clauses not an option because assessment decisions must be made on data
 - Gr. 5 math biggest issue only –
 - to make a change from TAKS to SDAA II between 1st and 2nd administration should be based on instruction student is receiving – “no” contingency clauses
 - What's another route we may be able to go?
 - E. Knezek – It may be possible in the course of the ARD to set up a process for a non-ARD, informal parent group outside the ARD. Presently it is structured so that an ARD must convene; soften language that the ARD could decide

who the decision makers will be – could throw it back into a more traditional GPC-like group. Would give more flexibility.

- Will take that back
- Assessing Special Education and LEP students at JJAEP - C. Wieland
 - responsibility for communicating IEP and accommodation requirements - Special Education or assessment?
 - ARD committee decisions and responsibility – ARD can happen anywhere
 - responsibility for communicating LPAC assessment decisions - LPAC campus facilitator or assessment? Cari assumes LPAC will be the same way – can get a legal interpretation
- C. Wieland – phase in LDAA system overtime – waiting on USDE – this summer will define eligibility requirements
- E. Knezek – question of access to instruction and access to assessment – particularly Gr. 5 science, Gr. 8 social studies, Gr. 10 science and social studies and all of Gr. 11. How are we going respond to this?
 - L. Chandler - We will have to have state assessments for every test administered in the state.
 - possibly an accommodated version of TAKS – science and social studies
- K. Haffey – Since no released tests, is there anything you can tell us based on SDAA II results this year that will help us go into ARDs that will help us make good decisions as we address SDAA II again?
 - L. Chandler – not a lot of opportunity to see if there was movement from SDAA into TAKS
 - did look at percent of students tested on grade level for SDAA II – 10% migration from 1 grade level below to on grade level
 - indicates districts have made an effort to move students who were close to being on grade level to on grade level
- E. Knezek –looking at data that shows an instructional need to support special education teachers with test support C. Wieland – we recognize the need as well - expectations for improving ARD training
- Marsha Williams - Do we have state and regional SDAA II data?
 - C. Wieland - will post June 16
- L. Chandler: introduced Walter Sherwood – new Director of the Texas Assessment Program for PEM
- Large print and Braille tests
 - Late shipments
 - Terri Fish
 - know there's a problem with late delivery
 - know orders keep increasing
 - will look at this issue this summer and talk about it after that
 - S. Poth – Braille/ large print are ordered on first order and don't come until much later; braille on test day
 - concerned that if a district has approval to test off-date there must be communication to shippers regarding large print and braille
 - T. Fish –TEA usually good about communicating
 - try to pay attention to that date
 - A couple of things slipped through this year.
 - will seek ways to improve
 - K. Haffey – shipping of scorable materials for off-campus/out of district placement (JJAEP, etc.)

- prefer for the materials to come back to us to check coding before they are shipped for scanning
- sometimes ship late to contractor after initial shipment
- aware of that situation?
- T. Fish
 - worked with Joan Mims
 - piloted with one district this spring to send them in on a separate ADPL so regular shipment can go
 - will talk to TEA this summer
- K. Haffey
 - several levels of off-campus placement (local, high security, JJAEP)
 - any help welcome
- Test quality
 - Concerns there might have been errors on braille test
 - wrong or misplaced information.
 - aware of any errors?
 - L. Chandler – have not heard of any
 - difficult for us to proof
 - Region IV brailles
 - send memo to us to improve quality control
 - W. Sherwood – let us know of specific errors
 - K. Haffey – concern expressed about 10th grade test from John Thornell
 - Debbie Grayson, San Angelo – 2 questions on Gr. 7 math with no answers
 - S. Poth – information from inhouse brailier for Northside
 - 3 levels of braille depending on the student skill level
 - have a request to preview by the brailier to determine if appropriate level for this child's ability in braille
 - W. Sherwood - several issues around braille and large print
 - will look at this summer
 - K. Haffey – braille writing test
 - essay must fit on page provided
 - transcribed draft wouldn't fit properly on the test page
 - K. Aaron
 - maybe an issue for David Bradford
 - suggestion in manual – guidelines for those who type to give them a maximum number of typed lines or spaces
 - L. Chandler
 - will look at that
 - D. Bradford visited a campus in Austin ISD to learn more about this.
 - K. Haffey – not just a braille issue but an issue with any transcription of typed essay to a limited size of paper

New Items for June – Elaine Say, TSNAP Past President 2004

- Reflections on spring testing (36:35)
 - Length of time to take 10th grade ELA
 - Steve Wilder (TEA) – original design to be closely linked to English II test
 - included one more crossover item for open-ended and one more passage on revising and editing

- length of reading piece 1000 more words
 - ideally designed to be completed on average in 2½ to 3 hours
 - E. Say - much more lengthy than that and becomes a matter of endurance
- E. Say - Corrections of standards for Exit level testers. (38:41)
 - many who are never classified as a 10th grader
 - 100s of students got ? marks because standard could not be determined.
 - Can we code this on the answer document?
 - L. Chandler – had the opportunity during the last test administration
 - S. Poth – provision was for exit level retesters, not for primary test takers
 - L. Chandler – will take a look at that
 - Joe Orr – most first timers test in February (ELA)
 - Suggestion: Can PEM run a historical check and give us time to make corrections after February administration and before April administration?
 - L. Chandler – makes sense; will look at it
 - E. Say - obvious issue of being able to make corrections as early as possible
- E. Say - Explain the issue of the history mismatch for Gr. 3 and 5 retesters. If Gr. 5 1st and 2nd administrations matched and didn't match a file from a previous year they came back with a "D" score code. What process created the situation? What is the state's expectation for districts to do to get all these corrected? (43:42)
 - T. Fish – Perhaps Gr. 5 file didn't match the Gr. 3 file.
 - common concern - CSR captures that administration only
 - perceived mismatches because of messages on CSR
 - meeting with Maryanna to talk about messages on all of the mismatches
 - meeting this month with TEA on notifying districts on mismatches and how to fix those
 - E. Say - Data files don't match up when they come back.
 - Do we have to do anything now?
 - T. Fish – for a corrected CSR and label, call AOC
 - will know more this summer
 - Ervin Knezek – What are the implications for accountability? Do we have the comfort of knowing data will come back correctly?
 - T. Fish – lots of calls; should be no problem with accountability. Accountability merges all of these files.
 - L. Chandler – Shannon Housson will join us later.
 - E. Say – suggestion from Region IV for online record change opportunity after first submission online
- Cindy Corley (Region 18) – question and concern regarding absence of released tests
 - L. Chandler – referenced legislative update - prohibited by statute from releasing those tests right now. - other resources when talking to parents – information booklets, TEKS, etc.
 - Lee – release of student expectations
 - If no plans for this, could we not look at that?
 - data file lists objectives - too broad
 - released in the past with the tests
 - L. Chandler – would like to talk with the group
 - have discussed at the agency– made sense to us not to release the information
 - concerned that educators may take those and only teach those
 - won't necessarily be tested on the next one
 - may be more harmful than helpful
 - Lee – respectfully disagree
 - need to know where gaps are

- find deficiencies in addressing student expectations
 - withholding information doesn't help us to meet needs of kids
 - must identify where gaps in instructional program lie
 - E. Knezek - issue of programmatic implications and curriculum design
 - 2 kinds of conversations occur when data is received
 - how we did
 - what we need to do to improve instruction
 - J. Orr – sees need for summary data
 - Dawn Bone – Texas Youth Commission – CSR very helpful
 - have a hard time finding information we need
 - hard to plan staff development, etc. if you don't get this information
 - L. Chandler – can look at it again; no promises
 - Mike Strozski – Reg 10 – imperative we receive this
 - held accountable for what we do or don't do
 - need information on specifics to make decisions
 - doubt people would teach only those student expectations
 - K. Haffey – have worked hard to get our instructional staff to realize assessment and instruction go together
 - need to continue to posture that they go hand-in-hand
 - won't be able to thoroughly review the quality of our programs every year without it
 - L. Chandler – will revisit
 - not sure you don't have what you need now
 - can agree to disagree on it
 - E. Say – polled Region 4 – without exception agreed we need individual and summary data
- Performance Reporting Update - Shannon Housson
 - State Accountability Manual - Parts 1 and 2 went up Monday – later than planned
 - new procedures for 424 registered alternative education campuses
 - Key Dates for AYP and state accountability releases posted on website
 - 2005 Accountability Manual – Part 3 out by Wednesday or Thursday next week
 - 2005 AYP guide
 - In USDE's court to work on a 3-year plan for the cap - will post as soon as a decision has been made
 - E. Knezek
 - Appendix E would help us the earliest you can get it out to us.
 - Do we have the peer review report yet?
 - L. Chandler – no because USDE had follow-up questions.
 - expecting to hear from peer review in another few weeks
 - E. Knezek - Issues related to SDAA II standard setting and the demise or redirection or elimination of LDAA
 - L. Chandler - multiple strands of discussion going on with USDE - the response to Title I monitoring report, peer review process and the cap issue
 - regarding LDAA –
 - looking at providing additional guidance for ARD committees;
 - replacing LDAA with some state system appears to be required and will be implemented over the next few years
 - will have to bring in groups to provide direction to help us implement significant changes
 - refining eligibility requirements for students with significant cognitive disabilities

- the recently announced category of students with academic disabilities
 - Questions to Shannon relating to AYP
 - Will data tables be released any sooner than August 10?
 - What will appeals process look like?
 - S. Housson
 - data tables - possibly earlier
 - continue to work on that date as a goal to match the two release dates
 - appeals issue tied to pending decision about the cap
 - 5% cap only allows for an exceptions provision
 - appeals process last year granted a lot of appeals
 - some will not be not granted this year outside the exceptions provision
 - M. Strozeski – earlier discussion about the possibility of having decisions about 05-06 accountability earlier – Can we hope to have it earlier next year?
 - S. Housson
 - As we get more stable we will be able to publish the accountability manual early - as in the past.
 - not too much new about appeals process
 - 2 copies caused some problems with copies not being the same; only one copy to commissioner this year
 - K. Haffey – clarify exceptions process
 - often cluster students at one campus to provide services at one site – increases # of special education students enrolled in that school. Would that be considered in the exceptions process?
 - S. Housson – cap process begins with district, not the individual campus
 - E. Knezek – order in which we assign artificial failers an issue; if no reversal, no structural way for those students to ever receive a passing rate in the current ranking system
 - S. Housson
 - current - top down
 - intention of cap - bottom up
 - Nancy Stevens fairly certain this will be reversed.
 - would meet definition – give us input
 - Poth - Region 20 everyone in agreement
 - Say - Region 4 in agreement
 - E. Say – question about state accountability system
 - Preliminary information indicated a mechanism for campuses that met all requirements for “recognized” except SDAA II
 - no mechanism in plan; an appeals process can be used
 - Why wasn’t a mechanism instituted? Chance of appeal being granted?
 - S. Housson - Mechanism discussed was part of the late March release of final decisions.
 - not in plan because no one could come up with one without removing SDAA II
 - appeal to justify why those results don’t reflect the academic performance of special education students on your campus
 - E. Knezek - impact on accountability for Gr. 3 and 5 history mismatches
 - S. Housson - didn’t affect because combined two files instead of using history data
- Student labels and Writing composition score on label
 - T. Fish – not possible for 04-05 but

- will be discussed for Gr. 10 and 11
 - prefer all grades?
 - E. Say – all grades tested
 - E. Say - would like district people to provide input on these issues during summer meeting
- On-Line testing – guidelines to districts gearing up for the future
 - host a session at the conference about online testing and how it might work in the future
 - Lisa Chandler – good idea
 - will be working on that
- Summer Testing Review
 - Out-of-district test takers
 - T. Fish – registration instructions for Gr. 3 and 5 in Coordinator Manual
 - reports will go to home districts
 - can be registered by parents, etc.
 - call sending district for student information
 - contact PEM for results from last test
 - no separate program for them
- New requirement that superintendent sign off on action plan - no directions in writing; included in manual in future?
 - L. Chandler – looking at all security procedures as we work on new manuals this summer
- No questions before final roll call
- Next teleconference September 8, 2005, 1:00 pm

Final roll call – S. Poth