



*Presentation to the Education Subcommittee of the
Joint Committee on Ways and Means*

Student Assessment System Update

Rob Saxton
Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction
May 9, 2013



Student Assessments and Accountability

- Student assessments are required by ORS 329.485 and federal law.
- ODE is responsible for establishing content standards that contain descriptions of what students should know and be able to do. Assessments measure what they know, using these standards as the basis for the assessments.
- Test results are used as part of state and federal accountability, school and district improvement processes, state performance measures, and a source of evidence for the assessment-of-essential-skills requirement for the high school diploma.
- The current state system is known as “OAKS” (Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills), a system developed and managed by staff in the Office of Assessment and Information Services.
- The state’s assessment and accountability program is supported by General Fund and federal funds (biennial figures):
 - \$11 million from a federal assessment grant; and
 - Approximately \$5 million General Fund.

Student Assessments

- All of Oregon's mathematics, reading, science, and social science proficiency tests are administered online. Writing assessments are administered via paper and the Web.
- Computer adaptive testing delivers questions to a student based on previous responses, providing precise information to a teacher on how well a student is grasping certain learning standards and concepts while taking less of a student's time as compared to traditional paper tests. Oregon is the first state to receive approval from the U.S. Department of Education to use an adaptive test.
- Oregon's online testing window is open from late fall to mid-May for the academic tests. Students have the opportunity to retake a test during this period. But once students pass, parents have to give permission to have their students take it again.
- Districts may elect to administer the assessment during smaller windows and may elect to administer the assessments only once per year. The English Proficiency test is available once per student from mid-January to late April.
- ODE has a KPM for the student assessment system, KPM 16, which measures the percentage of statewide assessment and statewide assessment results provided to districts on time. TARGET: 100%; ACTUAL: 100% (2011-12 results)



English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA)

- About 10% of Oregon's students are non-native English speakers receiving English Language Development services. The most common first language for these students is Spanish, followed by Russian, Vietnamese, and Chinese. Over 150 languages are spoken by Oregon students and their families.
- All English Language Learners (ELL) students in Oregon are required to take the state's ELPA each year, and the results of the test are used to track a student's progress toward proficiency.
- As the lead state representing a consortium of eleven states, Oregon was recently awarded a \$6.3 million grant to build a flexible system of assessment, known as the ELPA 21, based upon a common set of English Language Proficiency/Development standards corresponding with the Common Core State Standards. The new standards are scheduled for adoption later this year and the new assessment will be ready in 2016-17.
- ELPA 21 is one of the components of Oregon's education redesign to ensure ELL students throughout Oregon are achieving at the highest levels possible and are college-and-career ready when they leave our schools.

Current Assessments

Subject	Grades	Number of Students
Math	3-8, 11	280,000
Reading	3-8, 11	280,000
Writing	4,7,11	120,000
Social Sciences	5,8,11	120,000
Science	5,8,11	120,000
English Language Proficiency	K-12	60,000
Extended for Students with Disabilities	3-8, 11	6,000
PSAT/ACT	10	40,000



Statewide Assessment Transition



Transition to a New System

- The State Board of Education adopted the Common Core Standards in mathematics and English language arts in October 2010.
- Districts have begun to implement the Common Core Standards, aligning curriculum and instruction.
- Beginning in 2014-15, Oregon's statewide assessment system will transition to begin assessing students on the Common Core Standards.

Transition to a New System

- Oregon chose to be a “Governing State” member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, a 30-state collaborative effort to develop a student assessment system aligned to the Common Core Standards, because we wanted to maintain key characteristics of our existing assessment.
- Several ODE staff and educators from the field have participated as members of Smarter Balanced workgroups and task forces over the last 12 months covering, for example, item writing, scoring guide criteria, and proficiency-based learning activities.
- Many Oregon school districts are participating in the Smarter Balanced pilot test this spring.
- However, to select the test that best serves Oregon students and schools, ODE has convened a group of educators and key stakeholders to review assessment options.

Assessment Workgroup Objective

School Year	Through 2013-14	2014-15 and beyond
Assessed standards	Oregon state content standards	Common Core State Standards
Assessment	OAKS	Which assessment option? The workgroup will make a recommendation.



Workgroup Timeline

April			May		
9 th	22 nd	25 th	3 rd	10 th	17 th
ODE announces assessment adoption process and workgroup formation.	ODE finishes assessment adoption plan.	ODE completes workgroup selection.	Workgroup meets to review current options.	Workgroup meets to develop assessment recommendation.	ODE presents workgroup recommendation to SBE.

Workgroup Members

Participants in the workgroup include:

- ✓ Catherine Carlson – Salem-Keizer School District
- ✓ Nina Carlson – Oregon PTA
- ✓ Toya Fick – Stand for Children
- ✓ Dan Gaffney – Seaside
- ✓ Dawn Granger – Coos Bay School District
- ✓ Gerald Hamilton – State Board of Education
- ✓ Rep. Betty Komp – Legislator
- ✓ Nanette Lehman – Baker School District (Teacher of the Year)
- ✓ Pedro Marquez – Woodburn School District
- ✓ George Mendoza – Morrow County School District
- ✓ Art Paz – State Board of Education
- ✓ Scott Peterson – Oregon State University
- ✓ Lisa Reynolds – Community Colleges and Workforce Development
- ✓ Cheryl Williamson – Centennial

Features and Criteria for New Assessment System Evaluation

Features	Criteria
Quality assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authentic assessment of instruction • Efficient assessment/Leverages technology • Technical validity • Data/reporting valuable for multiple audiences and purposes
Available accommodations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodations and accessibility features for all students with disabilities • Accommodations and accessibility features for English Language Learners
Suite of available resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment system includes more than just summative measures • Professional development available for teachers
Aligned with college and career	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment tied to college-and-career readiness
Contribution of Oregon to the development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for Oregon educators to be involved in development

Assessment Options Mapped to Requirements

Requirements	Aspire	MAP	PARCC	Smarter Balanced	STAR	SAT
Aligned to CCSS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Available in reading, writing, and mathematics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, reading and math only	Yes
Available at 3-8 and high school	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, available at the high school level only
On-line administration	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, paper and pencil
Comparable across multiple states	Yes	Yes	TBD – pending field test (2014) data	TBD – pending pilot (2013) and field test (2014) data	Yes	Yes
Operational in 201415 academic year	Yes	Yes	TBD - timeline states Winter-Spring 2015	TBD – timeline states Spring 2015; pilot was administered on time in Spring 2013	Yes	Yes

Other Workgroup Tasks

- Determine weight for each feature.
- Evaluate options against the criteria.
- Develop a consensus on the best assessment for each feature.
- Apply feature-weighting and determine best assessment.
- Develop an understanding of the cost for each assessment and consider the cost when developing the recommendation.
- Develop Common Core assessment recommendation.

Process to Date

- Options have been identified (Slide 13).
- Core features and criteria have been established (Slide 12).
- Weighting has been assigned to each feature.
- For each option (shown on Slide 13), an analysis is underway and a “fact sheet” is being developed to document whether evidence exists that an assessment option meets the criteria under each feature.

Next Steps

May 10th meeting of the workgroup:

- Wrap up evaluation of assessments.
- Develop a consensus on the best assessment for each feature, apply feature-weighting and determine best assessment.
- Develop an understanding of the cost for each assessment and consider the cost when developing the recommendation.
- Develop Common Core assessment recommendation.

May 17th meeting of the State Board of Education:

- ODE staff will present the workgroup's recommendation to the State Board of Education for adoption.

Cost Comparison

- Costs associated with current assessments vary depending on additional options (formative, interim) and scoring approach.
- PARCC per student costs have not been updated since proposal.
- Smarter Balanced costs were updated April 2013.
- Estimated costs of MAP and STAR have not been determined at this point.
- SAT does not meet the requirements and costs are known to be much higher.

Test	Grades	Formative Cost/Student	Interim Cost/Student	Summative Cost/Student
OAKS – Math/Reading	3-8, HS	n/a	n/a	\$13
OAKS - Writing	HS	n/a	n/a	\$20
Smarter Balanced – Basic	3-8, HS	n/a	n/a	\$22.50
Smarter Balanced – Complete	3-8, HS	Included	Included	\$27.30
PARCC	3-8, HS	n/a	n/a	\$22
ACT	3-8, HS	TBD	TBD	TBD

Assessment Budget: Revenues and Expenditures

	2013-14	2014-15	2013-15 Total	2015-16	2016-17	2015-17 Total
Total potential assessment costs	\$7.2 m	\$12-13.5 m	\$19.2-20.7 m	\$12-13.5 m	\$12-13.5 m	\$24-27 m
Revenue Sources						
Federal Funds*	\$5.5 m	\$5.5 m	\$11 m	\$5.5 m	\$5.5 m	\$11 m
General Fund*	\$2.5 m	\$2.5m	\$5 m	\$2.5	\$2.5 m	\$ 5 m
Potential Excess/ (Deficit)	\$0.8 m	(\$4-5.5 m)	(\$3.2-4.7 m)	(\$4-5.5 m)	(\$4-5.5 m)	(\$8-11 m)

*No roll-up factors have been applied to revenues; federal funds are assumed to be flat; to the extent General Fund revenues roll up commensurate with General Fund costs, the deficit would be smaller.