

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Certificate of Mastery Study Committee

DRAFT MINUTES

Meeting of October 1, 2001
(Burien OSPI Conference Center)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Barbara Clausen, Terry Densley, Gary Gainer, Greg Hall, Gary Kipp, Bob McMullen, Bill Moore, Pat Patrick, Marv Sather, Dennis Wallace, Andy Wheeler

MEMBERS UNABLE TO ATTEND: Nick Brossoit, Lynn Fielding, Marc Frazer, Don Hanson, Linda Hernandez, Denny Hurtado, Steve Mullin, Wes Pruitt, Gay Selby, Ron Woldeit

GUESTS: Pat Almond, Nancy Arnold, Dave Boerner, Laura Fuhrman, Mark Haddock, Catherine Hardison, Senator Stephen Johnson, Suzi Morrissey, Patty Raichle, Doug Scrima, Chris Thompson, Tim Washburn

STAFF: Larry Davis, Pat Eirish

.....

Committee Chair Gary Gainer called the meeting to order at 3:10^{pm}. Mr. Gainer introduced Sen. Stephen Johnson and David Boerner of Seattle University Law School.

Mr. Gainer provided the committee an update on the State Board of Education (SBE) contract with Educational Service District (ESD) 101 in Spokane and the ESDs decision to hire Geoff Praeger to carry out the Opportunity to Learn portion of the committee's charge. Mr. Gainer also reminded the committee of the statutory charge to the SBE to make a decision about whether the high school Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) is "sufficiently valid and reliable" for graduation purposes.

From 3:25^{pm} to 5:45^{pm}, Catherine Hardison (Seattle University law student) presented to the committee an independent Opinion Paper/Report, Issues Facing Implementation of Certificate of Mastery, 2007-08. The paper is divided into two parts:

- PART I:** History of School Reform in Washington State.
- PART II:** A Closer Look at Six States: Alaska, Arizona, Indiana, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Wisconsin.
- PART III:** Legal Issues.
- PART IV:** Conclusions and Recommendations.

A copy of the paper is on the SBE web page.

COM Study Committee Minutes

Meeting of October 1, 2001

Page Two

The presentation brought forward a number of issues and questions:

- * Will answering the four Arizona questions be legally defensible vis-à-vis student Opportunity-to-Learn? The four questions are listed below:
 - “Was your curriculum aligned to EACH of the Arizona Academic Standards in the following nine content areas by the beginning of your 1999-2000 school year?”
 - “Will ALL your students be given opportunities to learn EACH of the standards in the following nine content areas in the classroom within the 1999-2000 school year?”
 - “Will you regularly assess progress on EACH of the standards in the following nine content areas within the 1999-2000 school year?”
 - “Will you regularly report progress on EACH of the standards in the following nine content areas within the 1999-2000 school year?”
- * If criteria for Opportunity-to-Learn (OTL) is defined by 296 school districts, the system won’t work.
- * Mobility and transiency have to be appropriately accounted for in defining OTL. Individual tracking raises privacy issues and concerns.
- * The Legislature has been told that Indiana has a good model. If the Indiana graduation test is a basic skills test, it is not the same as the WASL.
- * Do the survey states use conjunctive scoring or compensatory scoring models?
- * How do the survey states deal with home schooled students vis-à-vis the state high school graduation testing requirement?
- * Educator awareness and knowledge is crucial to determining validity and reliability.
- * Local control should not mean local apathy or ignorance.
- * Likely legal challenges: adequate preparation of teachers; adequate instruction of students.
- * Need to issue clear directions to districts to review their syllabi and align the curriculum to the EALRs and SLGs.
- * Content teachers need to know the reading and writing EALRs.
- * Is there a legal argument/requirement to be made relative to OTL vis-à-vis interdisciplinary instruction?
- * How “big” does OTL have to be to be legally defensible? What does the OTL have to be for students?
- * The promise of 1209 was resources necessary to get each student to standard.
- * Need to examine WASL results from a poverty perspective. Greg Hall responded that poverty is not broken out by ethnicity due to privacy issues.
- * Teaching vs. teaching well can impact student learning. A teacher assigned out-of-endorsement can compromise the student’s ability to learn the EALRs before taking the WASL.
- * Will a legal challenge get down to the teacher level or the system (district? State?) level?

COM Study Committee Minutes

Meeting of October 1, 2001

Page Three

- * The weakest link at the building level is remediation.

DINNER RECESS: 5:45^{pm}.

Following the dinner recess, Pat Almond, a nationally recognized alternate assessment expert from Oregon presented information on alternate assessments to the committee. A copy of her handouts is available on the SBE web page. Oregon makes use of juried assessments and extended assessment as alternatives to the regular assessment used to earn the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM). The juried assessment is available only for the CIM.

There are different forms of the assessments: Form A = Low Version; Form B = Middle Version; Form C = High Version. The cut-score is the remains the same. The difficulty of the test items differs between forms. The tougher the form, the greater the number of more challenging test items.

If a student needs accommodations to take the test, the test will count. If the student requires modification of the test, the test does not count.

Pat Almond offered the following counsel:

- * Do not design a standardized test around a limited student population group.
- * Separate system accountability from student certification.
- * Allow lots of ways to earn the COM, but keep high, common standards.
- * Mean it when you say a student has met standards.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 7:52^{pm}.