

**MA Consortium for Innovative Education Assessment
February 17, 2017 Meeting Agenda: 9:00 – 11:30 a.m.
Boston Teachers Union
Meeting Minutes**

Review January meeting minutes. Approved.

MCIEA launch event. There was a good turnout – about 65 people were in attendance, including some legislators and a lot of aides and chiefs of staff. Everyone seemed receptive and support to MCIEA's message of the need for a new state accountability system.

School Quality Measures: MCIEA School Quality Measures draft Framework. Jack and James presented the draft MCIEA School Quality Measures Framework, which is the product of using feedback from student, parent, teacher, administrator and community focus groups in all consortium districts to rethink the original Somerville School Quality Measures Framework. Significant discussion ensued about measures and indicators. There were varied opinions about whether to use MCAS 2.0 test scores within the framework since the indicator is a reflection of what we are trying to move away from. One important item for us to continue to be aware of as we build the system is that race and class considerations are embedded within many of the indicators that we will use.

Agreements:

- **Make the following changes to the draft framework:**
 - **Make sure there is parallel construction so that the proposed measures are topical rather than citing specific indicators which would be used to assess progress on the measures, for example:**
 - **Under academic learning, performance: student growth vs. test score growth**
 - **Under academic learning, student commitment to learning: valuing learning vs. graduation rate**
 - **Suggestions for additional measures: Professional autonomy**
 - **Suggestions for indicators: Student grades**
- **For now, we will keep in MCAS 2.0 test score growth as a measure in order to have some comparison point with the state system, with the goal of demonstrating over time the validity of MCIEA's alternative indicators, at which time we might drop MCAS 2.0 as an indicator**
- **Next steps:**
 - **Jack and James make recommended revisions, and a create a new spreadsheet with the first column being the proposed categories and measures, the second column a brief definition of the measure, and the third column being the proposed indicators to use in assessing progress toward meeting the measure**
 - **Bring the revised spreadsheet to the March governing board meeting for review and approval**
 - **This spring will be a pilot test for the student and teacher surveys which districts can choose to participate or not; the results will then be used to test out the system and make any revisions if needed**
- **Items for future discussion:**
 - **If a measure has multiple indicators of data that could be collected, can districts vary in their selection of which indicators to use?**
 - **Do we need benchmarks of target ranges that signal proficiency within each of our indicators?**
 - **Establishing consistent windows of administration of select indicators (e.g., student and teacher surveys)**

Performance Assessment: Cross-district tasks. We reviewed the proposed cross-district assessments and their purpose. The primary purpose of cross-district assessments is to demonstrate reliability and comparability across districts, that is, teachers from the varied consortium districts score student work comparably (that is, they are in general agreement on the quality of student work). Decisions about student proficiency would come from teachers reviewing a portfolio of student work in a particular grade and discipline, of which student work from a cross-district task would only be one of student work from multiple other tasks, all of which would be local tasks. CCE consulted with our technical quality partner, Center for Assessment (CFA), with the governing board's question (from the January board meeting) about whether there could be multiple cross-district performance assessment tasks per grade for each designated discipline (ELA, math, science) in order to demonstrate comparability. CFA said that there could be multiple cross-district performance tasks for each designated grade and discipline as long as there were a minimum of three districts selecting a particular task to administer and there was some variation in partnering districts from year to year.

The bulk of the discussion focused on not wanting to create a process that is primarily intended to satisfy the needs of the state, rather than the consortium's primary goal of using performance assessments to improve instruction and engage students in learning, with an emphasis on higher order thinking skills and application of knowledge. There was general consensus that there is a significant learning curve in building teacher capacity to create high quality, engaging, and complex performance tasks that require transfer and application of knowledge, and building this teacher capacity should be a primary goal. It was noted that we need to focus first on building teacher trust and capacity in creating complex performance assessments prior to integrating in the creation of cross-district performance tasks, although one consideration of our timeline should be when we want to press DESE to apply for a federal waiver for MCIEA to be released from MCAS 2.0 (except in one grade per discipline per grade span - elementary, middle, high).

Agreements:

- **Laurie will send out to the governing board examples of curriculum-embedded, complex performance tasks**
- **We will schedule continued discussion on how to create a process of creating and administering cross-district performance assessments whose primary purpose is to benefit teacher practice and student learning, while secondarily providing evidence to the state on comparability and reliability**

Future MCIEA Governing Board Meetings

March 17, 9:00 – 11:30 am, Somerville Public Schools

April 27, 2:00 – 4:30 pm, Lowell Public Schools

May 18, 2:00 – 4:30 pm, MSSAA

June 15, 9:00 – 11:30 am, Revere Public Schools