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

Attendees: Carol Barlow, Tim Bush, Helen Dennis, Diana Farrell, Miki Hartman, Melanie Hoffman, Letitia Jackson, Mary Johnson, Malisa Knox, Carol Lay, Judi MacBride, Michael Gamel-McCormick, Patrice Madden, Kyle O’Shea, Anja Parish, Jim Salt, Glenda Scott, Vicki Spence, Martha Toomey, Brian Touchette, Janine Weisman, Doreen Walls

Training Update

Diana shared that developer training ended as of 11/1. Supplemental trainings on Data Collection are scheduled for 12/5 in Kent County and 12/7 in Sussex County. Judi indicated that two parent information sessions have been held so far (in Kent and New Castle Counties) with the final one scheduled for this evening. Attendance is higher (4 in Kent, 5 in New Castle) compared to last year.

Scoring Process for 2005-06 – Update and Advisement

Jim related that, as the Center for Disabilities Studies (CDS) and DOE began working on developing the particulars for scoring for 2005-06, concerns about the potential impact of changes in the portfolio process led to a lengthy discussion about the scoring process. This discussion led to a decision to move from the pairs approach (which Brian presented at the October Advisory Council meeting) to a single scorer approach (supported by the Scoring Committee during scoring) that involves the following:

- More intense training for scorers
- Higher qualifying requirements
- Screening of portfolios prior to scoring weekends to make decisions about scorability, and
- Levels of reliability and drift checks throughout the scoring weekends.

The idea was that this approach would remove a significant source of error from the scoring process ( scorer decisions about whether an entry is scorable) and improve scorer reliability right from the start.

Advisement was then sought about how to conduct the portfolio screenings and the reliability checks. Limited discussion occurred with respect to screening, with suggestions to perhaps use the DAPA District Consultants or to screen in pairs. Brian then laid out the CDS/DOE idea of Brian, Diana, and one or two veteran, highly qualified scorers conducting the screening. There was general agreement that this might be the best approach to take.

Limited comments were offered about reliability checks, with the few comments that were made focusing on issues that arise during scoring which can affect reliability (e.g., changes in scoring guidelines in response to portfolio issues).
Brian then sought general comments about the single scorer approach. Comments tended to be favorable, with a few questions about ensuring that scorers would be able to effectively communicate with the scoring committee (asking questions and getting feedback).

**Revision – Update and Advisement**

Michael and Brian led a discussion regarding the Advisory Committee’s (AC) role in the assessment revision process. Because of the extent of the ReVision Group’s (RG) work and other work the AC will be doing, the AC would only have a couple of opportunities at AC meetings to review and comment on the RG’s work. AC members interested in more detail about the RG’s work and in more frequent updates will need to review RG meeting minutes and other materials posted on the DAPA website (www.dapaonline.org).

There was general discussion that the Advisory Committee would like to know what the ReVision Group examined and didn’t examine as far as assessment options, what was decided, and the reasoning behind the group’s decisions. There was also discussion about the role of the AC in shaping the RG’s recommendations. Michael indicated there would be opportunities to provide feedback to the RG. Ultimately the work of the RG would go through the AC before going to DOE, and the AC could recommend major changes (within the boundaries of federal requirements). Michael thought the AC will be especially valuable in commenting on whether ideas will or will not work in Delaware. He also thought the AC could provide helpful input about how the new assessment might best address the issue of the broad diversity of abilities within the 1% of children who participate in Delaware’s Alternate Assessment process.

Discussion also occurred about whether there would be opportunities to pilot assessment pieces before formal implementation. Michael agreed that piloting is desirable, but the ability to pilot would depend on timeline variables which are still unknown at this point.

Malisa presented the highlights from the work of the ReVision Group (RG) to date and passed out the draft vision for the group and a handout about the features of other states’ alternate assessments. Brian gave an overview of the types of assessment used by other states. Some questions were asked about the availability of assessment packages sold by third parties, but issues with needing to modify these to make them Delaware-specific preclude their use. Brian also discussed that Academic Content Standard Development work will need to occur sometime after January. Concerns were raised about the timeframe for that work in relation to the revision process. Martha and Michael indicated that the nature of the federal requirements mean that these processes will have to occur concurrently to some extent.

Finally, Brian indicated that Rachel Quenemoen of the National Center on Educational Outcomes will be coming to Delaware in January for a technical assistance visit related to revision and Academic Content Standard Development. Rachel will give a presentation at the January AC meeting on 1/19 and her presentation will be the primary focus of the meeting.

**Action Steps**

1. Jim/Malisa will let the Advisory Committee know when ReVision Group meeting minutes and materials are posted on the DAPA website.
2. Interested AC members will review RG materials on the DAPA website.