ReVision Committee Meeting  
Minutes  
November 2, 2005

IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS MADE BY THE ReVISION COMMITTEE ARE NOT BINDING. THE DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (DDOE) MAKES ALL FINAL DECISIONS REGARDING THE ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT.

Attendees: Julie Bowers, Deborah Dilts, Jerry Dorman, Lori Loveland, Judi MacBride, Diana Farrell, Deb Fleischer, Royce Hoffman, Malisa Knox, Sarah Lyman, Samantha Miller, Mike McKibbin, Carmen Sheppard, Nancy Storch, Brian Touchette, Janine Weisman

Meeting:
- Minutes from last meeting were distributed and reviewed.
- Discussed minutes and committee member contact information being posted on the Center for Disabilities Studies website. Received contact information corrections. Members agreed minutes and member names would be posted on the CDS website.
- Questions that arose during last meeting were addressed.
- What is an adequate number of standards?
  - This committee will determine as a part of this process.
- Can individual scores come from an integrated source?
  - Due to requirement for each content area to have a separate score, it is believed that individual scores must come from different sources or separately. This will be verified.
- DPAS II - Will DAPA scores be used?
  - DPAS II is a teacher accountability system being piloted in two school districts.
  - DAPA is not being used in the pilots as a teacher accountability measure. Brian’s understanding is that it is not certain if the new assessment could be used as a measure in the teacher accountability system. The type of assessment chosen will be a factor in this decision.

Vision Building – Purpose and Values of Alternate Assessment (continued discussion).

Reviewed the following two lists of suggested elements to be included in Alternate Assessment which were originated during the 10/19/05 meeting.

- List 1: Each member stated what he/she thought was important to be included in an Alternate Assessment on 10/19/05:
  - Compliance with the law
• Make the alternate assessment meaningful for students
  • without adding work that does not benefit the students
  • Student product and work
  • Make everything more simplistic
  • Evaluate student work rather than program
  • Consider the issue that the time that it takes the staff to
    complete these portfolios is taking time away from the students
  • Connect functional activities to academic standards more effectively.
  • Consider the number of entries
  • Develop programs instead of developing portfolios
  • Snapshot vs. representing the year
  • Funds
  • Represent what happens in the classroom
  • Teacher weekends should not be needed to complete assessment.
  • Parent understanding
  • Have assessment activities be embed into students’ current programs.
  • Research-based; consistent
  • Create a product that will last over time
  • Content standards—functional activities
  • Relate standards to practice
  • Remove biases related to disabilities

• List 2: Group discussion on Vision for Alternate Assessment 10/19/05:
  • Manageability
  • Student – focus. Product of what student produces in terms of skill,
    behavior, and outcomes. Student performance vs. Standardization.
  • Cannot be tied to IEP as they are too individualized. Don’t know yet if
    same number of standards are required for each content level. There must
    be grade-level expectations for everyone, although regulation does state
    that students in this alternate assessment may be accessing the grade-level
    expectation at a lower level of complexity or at pre-requisite skills.
  • Scores – can’t have scaling system to relate to results from DSTP. Will
    ask tech folks if individual scores can come from the same setting/activity.
    New teacher evaluation system (DPAS-II) is being piloted in 2 districts
    Appoquinimink and Caesar Rodney. Currently there is no way to use
    DAPA scores when determining student progress in this evaluation
    system, and student progress is one of five pieces of this new evaluation
    system.
  • The committee will be looking at creating assessment from the ground up.

The group discussed the following general items for Vision. It was agreed, however,
that no elements (from prior 2 lists) will be discarded until each element is carefully
reviewed.
• **Manageability**, e.g. time required for teachers to collect data/evidence and administer/complete assessment to take approximately the same amount of time as does the administration of the DSTP.

• **Meaningful/Useful** – Results of assessment to measure progression of student achievement over time. This information would assist teachers as students advance to subsequent grades, e.g. has student achievement slowed, maintained, or regressed? This information could assist in determining effectiveness of different teaching methods for individual students.

• **Degree of disability** does not affect score.

• **Technical adequacy.** Assessment developed will be demonstrated to have reliability/validity. This will yield a stable tool that can be utilized for years to come without need for significant modifications. It is understood that subsequent changes in federal law/regulations may require modifications. It is hoped that a stable assessment will require teacher training only one time and additional trainings to occur for new teachers.

• Assessment should examine **age-appropriate content**.

• **An assessment that requires data collection** was compared to an assessment that requires only teacher recall, e.g. a checklist method.

**Methods and Types of Alternate Assessments reviewed.**

• Norm reference vs. criterion referenced

• Hybrid Assessment

• Some states use more than one type of alternate assessment. For more detail, see [http://education.umn.edu/nceo](http://education.umn.edu/nceo)

• Different types of assessments that states use:
  
  o Checklists
  
  o Observation in Structured and Unstructured Settings
  
  o Performance Assessments
  
  o Samples of Student Work and Body of Evidence
  
  o Portfolios

• In order to remove degree of disability as a variable, some states have tiered levels of functioning or communication, i.e. Level I - student is reading words; Level II – student uses picture symbols; Level III – student is pre-symbolic. A low achievement score from a Level I student would be equal to a Level III student with a high achievement score.

**Access to General Educational Curriculum**

• Discussion occurred regarding the struggle to collect data for IEP goals while having to collect additional data regarding access students have to general educational grade-level curriculum. Some programs use the IEP as their sole curriculum. There are ways to modify the language of IEP goals that already do incorporate general educational curriculum.

• Concerns were raised about access to the general educational curriculum being done in ways that are meaningful for the student.
Discussion included the fact that access to the general educational curriculum is required by IDEA 1997 & 2004.

An outside expert will be brought to speak to group. Expert will speak about how to allow for Access to General Educational Curriculum in a meaningful way for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

**Review Different States’ Assessments**

Committee Members divided into 6 pairs and each pair received alternate assessment summaries of six states. Committee members will review each of the states and may confer with their partners. Before the next meeting, members will complete an evaluation form that includes recommendations as to further exploration into a state’s assessment type/method. At the next meeting, pairs will use the first half-hour to discuss their evaluations of their states.

Member breakdown:

Carman Sheppard & Deborah Dilts  
North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and South Carolina

Mike McKibbin & Jerry Dorman  
Michigan, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Louisiana, and Kansas

Lori Loveland & Deb Fleischer  
South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin

Royce Hoffman & Nancy Storch  
Arizona, Colorado, Arkansas, Alabama, California, and Alaska

Julie Bowers & Janine Weisman  
Florida, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, and Iowa

Samantha Miller & Sarah Lyman  
Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, New Hampshire, and Nevada.

Next meeting: 11/16/05 4:30pm – 7:30pm at KCCS.