

MA Consortium for Innovative Education Assessment
October 20, 2016 Meeting Minutes
Lowell Public Schools, 155 Merrimack Street, Lowell

Decisions about performance assessments, school quality measures, or both. Districts were asked to decide their focus area(s) by October 30th. To date, the following decisions have been made:

- Both performance assessments & school quality measures: Attleboro, Revere, Somerville
- Performance assessments: Boston
- School quality measures: Lowell
- Still to decide: Bourne, Ludlow (will decide by November 8th), Winchester

Agreed: We confirmed that the goal of MCIEA is to redefine what accountability should look like in Massachusetts. With that in mind, we agreed to create a subcommittee that would develop recommendations for the governing board on provisions of the MCIEA accountability system in addition to the school quality measures and performance assessments that we are already planning, including the current system of levels of performance for students and schools, and the federal requirement to identify the 5% lowest performing schools. The subcommittee will consist of Jack Schneider, David Sawyer, Beverly Miyares, Adeline Bee, Donna Muncey, Laurie Gilbert, Jackie Lawrence, Salah Khelfaoui, and Dan French.

Funding and Reporting Requirements. We reviewed the reporting requirements from New Venture Fund. All of the reporting indicators are focused on changes in teacher practice and creation of a modest number of teacher-generated performance assessments. There are no indicators on student outcomes or teacher evaluation. CCE will report in the aggregate; while variations by district in teacher practice will be reported, no districts will be named, just the variation so as to ensure confidentiality of districts and teachers. Each district will be given their own data, with the respective superintendents and teacher union presidents determining how to use it.

Common performance tasks. We reviewed the purpose of creating a limited number of common performance tasks (one per grade per discipline (ELA, math, science). The primary purpose for having common tasks is to build inter-rater reliability among participating districts and schools. Secondly, in terms of making local student proficiency determinations, student work from the common performance tasks will be just one source among student work from multiple local performance tasks that are used to make student proficiency determinations. We reviewed the summaries of New York Performance Standards Consortium (NYPSC) and New Hampshire's Performance Assessment for Competency Education (PACE). Both models have teacher-generated common performance assessments that are used for inter-rater reliability, and are mixed with local performance assessments to make student proficiency determinations; both engage teachers in significant professional development around task design, validation, and scoring; and both have quality control processes to ensure consistency in implementation across schools/districts. The most significant difference between the two models is that, even though both models use common rubrics, the NYPSC's common tasks are much broader than those of PACE, allowing for greater flexibility in embedding them in the local curriculum and providing students with greater choice and agency.

Agreed: We will revisit this discussion in the winter or spring after the local performance assessment work is underway.

Considering new districts. Arlington and Cambridge have both expressed interest in joining MCIEA. We had some discussion about when would be a good time for them to join.

Agreed: We will meet with each district and lay out the body of work and where we are in the process. If the district still wants to join, we would let each district decide when and how they would join (e.g., right away and jump into the work, sit in on governing board meetings this year and join the work next summer). Laurie is meeting with Arlington the first week of November. Dan will contact Cambridge.

Building Support in the Field. We discussed whether we wanted to continue pursuing endorsements from key state associations and organizations.

Agreed: We will delay pursuing organizational endorsements until after our official launch in January.

LMS Subcommittee. We agreed to create a Learning Management System (LMS) subcommittee in order to develop a recommendation for the governing board on whether we should pursue adoption of a LMS on which we could load all MCIEA resources, including performance tasks, school quality measures dashboard, and MCIEA-developed tools and protocols, as well as even conduct virtual task validation and student work scoring sessions. In the meantime, CCE is setting up a MCIEA webpage that can house consortium resources until such time that a separate LMS is launched.

Agreed: Mary Skipper, Paul Schlichtman, Steven Lamarche, and Dan French will constitute the subcommittee.

Conversation with the CORE executive director. Dan talked with the executive director of CORE (California Office to Reform Education), as they coordinate the work of 10 California districts that have created a multiple measures data dashboard. The goal of the meeting was to see what governance structure CORE has. Their governing board meets monthly and is made up of the district superintendents. They have three committees under the governing board, made up primarily of central office administrators.

Agreed: We will continue with just the governing board and time-limited subcommittees until such time when the board agrees that we need a more formal committee structure.

Future meeting location(s). We discussed various locations for governing board meetings and the performance assessment institute. In particular, districts need to know soon about the location of the performance assessment institute so teachers can decide if they want to participate.

Agreed: For the performance assessment institute, CCE will try to get space at either MSSAA (Franklin) or MESPA (Marlborough). The governing board's next meeting will be at MSSAA, and we can determine then if people like the location for future meetings.

Future MCIEA Governing Board Meetings (locations to be determined except where indicated)

November 17, 2:00 – 4:30 pm, MSSAA, 33 Forge Parkway, Franklin

December 15, 9:00 – 11:30 am

January 19, 2017, 2:00 – 4:30 pm

February 17, 9:00 – 11:30 am

March 17, 9:00 – 11:30 am

April 27, 2:00 – 4:30 pm

May 18, 2:00 – 4:30 pm

June 15, 9:00 – 11:30 am