

**SJR 2 – Assessment Inventory Committee**  
**Meeting #1**  
**Monday, November 16, 5:00 pm**

**Meeting Notes**

**Member Attendees:**

Dr. Godowsky  
Senator Lopez  
Senator Poore  
Mr. Polce (representing Senator Sokola)  
Representative Dukes  
Representative Jaques  
Representative Matthews  
Dr. Bunting (representing Chiefs for Dr. Gehrt)  
Ms. Raina Allen  
Ms. Frederika Jenner

**Members Not In Attendance:**

Dr. Gehrt  
Senator Sokola  
Equetta Jones

**Members of the Public**

Ms. Bebe Coker  
Ms. Kristin Dwyer  
Representative Williams  
Mr. Neil Kirschling

**DOE, Governor's Office and Facilitation Staff In Attendance:**

Susan Haberstroh  
Shana Young  
Liz Farley-Ripple  
Lindsay O'Mara

Meeting convened at 5:09 p.m.

Introductions were made.

Secretary Godowsky made comments regarding hearing from stakeholders about the amount of testing and looking for the balance of what is appropriate. He also talked about the Governor's charge about the assessment inventory and the desire to have the inventory more formal and restated the requirements of SJR2. A process point was made that this is one of several meetings.

Liz Farley Ripple from the University of Delaware facilitated the meeting and used the attached Powerpoint deck as a guide through the meeting. She had developed several exercises for the group to engage. The first exercise was to get the comfort level of how this Committee is on several questions:

What is assessment? How is assessment used and why is assessment valuable?

Values and types of assessment?

What do we mean by assessment?

Additional material on Webb's Depth of Knowledge Levels was provided. There was also discussion on the analysis of standards. It was stated that not one single assessment can measure the extent of the standard.

There was a discussion on assessment validity and reliability. Content validity – alignment of testing to the curriculum and instruction and Reliable – take today and tomorrow and be about the same.

There was discussion on the use and types of assessment - Summative, Interim, Formative, Diagnostic. Diagnostic – identifies gaps (readiness); Formative- typically used during the learning process – and allow for course correction (generally teacher developed tasks); Interim – (benchmark) – typically in a cycle – unit tests are more in line with Interim; and Summative – final judgment - use of assessment to determine what kids know and are able to do (e.g., end of course, SBAC) typically doesn't inform instruction. But how do we adjust instruction in the next year?

There was discussion on a Comprehensive Assessment Framework and how the different types of assessments fit into this framework. It was stated that all four are important.

What makes assessment valuable? Depends on grain size (see ppt). What we assess comes in a variety of "grain sizes" and each grain size can tell us something different about the student.

There was a discussion of the assessment for teacher evaluation and that there are various assessment types. There was also an opportunity to put items in the "parking lot" to be discussed at another time. One was around assessment for teacher evaluation and also about when assessment happens in relation to how the results are used.

There was discussion on how we can make assessment more learner focused. Additionally there was discussion around the "outrage" around assessment.

The assessment inventory process was discussed as well as the charge of this Committee. The overall goal of the assessment inventory is to decrease testing burden by eliminating redundant and non-useful assessments.

There was a discussion of the current process regarding the state and district. The "who" "what" and "why" is included in the inventory and it was discussed that the "parking lot" is indicating that the "why" is important. The purpose of the assessment is very important and is the purpose being fulfilled.

There was discussion on the state inventory and that it has been completed but the final analysis is not complete. Districts were required and charters encouraged to do the assessment inventory. Funding was made available. Many received funding and it was noted that districts did this in many different ways. For instance, some brought in a contractor, while others gave stipends for teachers. Engagement with parents and community was also different.

Document is found [here](#) on the DOE website.

Public comment was made around the availability of the Delaware Quality framework “Baldrige” tools are available.

There was discussion regarding the SAT and how the Department is seriously investigating the possibility of using SAT in the future – “sooner rather than later.” There were technical hurdles that needed to be investigated before a formal commitment was made for when this would happen.

There was further discussion around the SAT in that it has been around for many decades, students’ attitudes around the SAT. There was discussion around the funding. The State would be required to pay for the SAT if it is part of the accountability system.

There was also a discussion on the PSAT. It was discussed that the State pays for every 10<sup>th</sup> grader to take the PSAT.

There was discussion on whether the Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) will be involved in the assessment inventory when it is complete. The Ed Prep Scorecards were mentioned and that this first year is a field test.

There was discussion that parents and students need to understand the assessment results and how to get students engaged. “Test talks” were mentioned as a way to get students involved.

There were other questions and comments from both the public and committee members such as:

- How do we remove the SBAC?
- Do we have to test every kids or can you sample students at different grade levels?
- Test is actually not measuring what is being taught because they (teachers) couldn’t see the test.
- Teaching for a test rather than teaching to a test.
- We need to be looking for the instructional shifts through questioning techniques.
- There is a need to put rigor into the questions – hypothetical thinking, problem solving, ask for more from the little person’s brain and there are many ways to approach a question.
- Are Measure B’s are part of the inventory?

Next steps were discussed. The inventory is due the end of December. For the next meeting there could be input from the districts. It was stated that this information should get to the DPAS II groups.

It was discussed that a doodle poll would be done for the next meetings. Exit slips were provided and the meeting adjourned.

Approved 12.16.15