

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
Certificate of Mastery Study Committee

**DRAFT MINUTES**

Meeting of February 19, 2002  
(Burien OSPI Conference Center)

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Nick Brossoit, Barbara Clausen, Terry Densley, Lynn Fielding, Bunker Frank, Marc Frazer, Gary Gainer, Gary Kipp, Bob McMullen, Steve Mullin, Wes Pruitt, Patty Raichle, Dennis Wallace

**MEMBERS UNABLE TO ATTEND:** Greg Hall, Linda Hernandez, Denny Hurtado, Marv Sather, Gay Selby, Laura Jo Severson, Chris Thompson, Andy Wheeler, Ron Woldeit

**GUESTS:** Geoff Praeger, Terry Bergeson, Bob Butts, Sally Zeiger Hanson (for committee member Bill Moore), Brian Jeffries, Christine Perkins (for committee member Don Hanson), Cathy Taylor, Carolyn Tolas

**STAFF:** Larry Davis, Pat Eirish

.....  
Committee Chair Gary Gainer called the meeting to order at 3:08<sup>pm</sup>.

Superintendent of Public Instruction Terry Bergeson shared a brief history on different ways to look at performance. She convened a work group to look at how a student would demonstrate they know the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) if they cannot pass the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). The work group instead asked to look at the WASL and concerns of Superintendent Bergeson's national Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). This led to a discussion of looking at a blended scoring model/approach for the WASL. Superintendent Bergeson then shared a PowerPoint presentation on one approach to a blended scoring concept for the WASL. A copy of the presentation is attached and is also on the State Board of Education (SBE) website. If a blended scoring model is adopted, a new standard setting (cut-score) committee will need to establish the minimum blended passing score.

Superintendent Bergeson shared that using the blended scoring model the percentage of students who passed the high school WASL in reading, writing, listening, and math increased from about 27% to about 53%.

Superintendent Bergeson requested the committee to adopt a motion to in turn encourage the SBE to request her to continue to explore the blended scoring model and report back to the SBE in about a year (2003). A copy of the adopted committee resolution is attached.

## COM Study Committee Minutes

Meeting of February 19, 2002

Page Two

Superintendent Bergeson commented that alternate methods of demonstrating the EALRs require more evidence because the environment is less controlled and those who will evaluate evidence need good training.

Questions raised during Superintendent Bergeson's presentation included:

- \* Is the current passing standard too high?
- \* How do our passing standards compare to other states and countries?
- \* Could the blended scoring model lead to higher reading performance and lower math performance?
- \* Is the international performance standard based on content or the percent of students who meet that nation's standards?
- \* It's important to clarify the difference between student accountability and system accountability.
- \* The current passing standard of 400 assumes equal value among the subjects of reading, writing, listening, and math. Is there a way to build in varying strengths? Example: On the shared blended scoring model (12 point scale), if a student scores 11 in reading, can the student apply 1 point to another subject?
- \* Under the current scoring model, students in the lowest quartile of performance are about five years behind students in the highest performance quartile.
- \* Are any states using a blended scoring model?
- \* If we compensate in real life, then the blended scoring model is appropriate.
- \* A blended scoring model may well reduce the need for developing alternate methods of demonstration of attainment of the EALRs.
- \* Will a blended scoring model impact the achievement gap?

**MEETING BREAK:** 4:40<sup>pm</sup>.

Cathy Taylor, Professor at the University of Washington-Seattle, shared with the committee information about the technical validity and reliability of the high school WASL. A copy of her notes is attached. NOTE: The comparative information between the 9<sup>th</sup> grade ITED and the 10<sup>th</sup> grade WASL needs to be understood that a perfect relationship would be reflected in a "score" of 1.0. A .50 relationship indicates 50% confidence that the two compared assessments are measuring the same thing. The higher the correlation score, the higher the confidence that the two compared assessments are measuring the same thing. Also, the ITED is 100% multiple choice.

Ms. Taylor shared that most states are at about .70 on interrater reliability. Oregon is about .50. Washington is at .93 to .98, which is very high.

The fewer the number of items, the lower the reliability. At .60-.70, the listening WASL for high school is not as reliable as desired. At .70 to .80, the writing WASL 10 is not as reliable as desired. These two subjects have fewer items compared to reading and math.

## **COM Study Committee Minutes**

Meeting of February 19, 2002

Page Three

Ms. Taylor expressed her belief that the best place to find out what a student is doing and how well is in the classroom.

Ms. Taylor shared that courts look at three things mainly relative to challenges to testing programs:

1. Opportunity to Learn (are students receiving the opportunities they need to learn the EALRs before being tested on them?)
2. Sufficient notice of the high-stakes testing.
3. Technical validity and reliability of the test. E.g., Was the process used to set the cut-scores acceptable and did you follow your procedures?

Questions raised during Cathy Taylor's presentation included:

- \* What's the relevance of comparing the WASL to the ITED?
- \* What about giving weight to classroom assessment as counting toward the minimum score line on the blended scoring model?
- \* Does high correlation equal high predictability?
- \* Some WASL items have high omission rates, upward of 56%. When this occurs, we don't really know, do we, what the kids do or do not know?
- \* What happens to students after high school, both those who pass the WASL 10 and those who do not?
- \* If the state goes with the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the WASL to track student progress, is it possible to vertically equate to get a consistent scale?
- \* How do we know that the 4<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grade WASLs are appropriate to those grade levels and ages?

**DINNER RECESS:** 6:00<sup>pm</sup>.

The meeting resumed at 6:13<sup>pm</sup> and Bob Butts, member of the Policy and Partnerships staff in the State Superintendent's Office led a discussion on using incentives to promote the high school WASL until it becomes a formal state graduation requirement, presently targeted for the graduating Class of 2008. A discussion draft of Incentives to Obtain a Certificate of Mastery is attached. Questions raised during this discussion included:

- \* Give consideration to a provisional certificate/diploma. The student's required High School+ Education Plan for the year immediately following high school can/should include what it will take the student to earn a full, regular diploma.
- \* Put on the SBE web page information that is easily understandable and shows pre-2004 (current) state minimum graduation requirements and post-2004 state minimum graduation requirements.

## **COM Study Committee Minutes**

Meeting of February 19, 2002

Page Four

- \* Put on the SBE web page information that shows the “full” picture of graduation requirements and related issues and policies (graduation requirements, including the Culminating Project, High School+ Education Plan, Certificate of Mastery; local graduation requirements; state standardized transcript information requirements; minimum college admissions requirements; policies relating to awarding credit on the basis of seat-time and on the basis of competency not related to seat-time; entry-level workplace requirements.
- \* Should the Certificate of Mastery be required for high school graduation when not all the subjects reflected in the state Student Learning Goals have a WASL developed for them?
- \* A guest expressed strong concern that the focus on academic achievement is resulting in fewer offerings of career and technical education courses, which can be especially valuable to students with special needs.
- \* Secure, stable funding needs to be secured to sustain the ongoing education reform effort.
- \* Differentiate incentives to earn the COM by region. 80% of the school districts in Washington State are Class 2 districts (2,000 or fewer students). All students deserve equitable treatment and access to a meaningful education.
- \* If time is truly not a variable in education, we will be setting up students for failure.
- \* We give credit, now, for not realizing a year’s worth of growth in a year’s worth of time.
- \* Report cards need to note COM/WASL performance.
- \* WASL retakes are critical.
- \* What might mean an incentive for one student may mean nothing for another student.
- \* Share the Butt’s draft incentives list with students and see what they think about the ideas.
- \* Need to develop a parallel list of incentives for adults (to get them to talk to kids differently about the importance of the WASL).
- \* Keep moving forward from your baseline. As you improve, the new performance level becomes your new baseline.
- \* Coach up, not down.
- \* All incentives must be positive.
- \* We must build equity into the incentives or it will be a waste of time. Incentives must be useful to students (and families).
- \* Running Start is an incentive to bail out of high school without meeting the EALRs.

## **COM Study Committee Minutes**

Meeting of February 19, 2002

Page Five

It was decided to establish the next committee meeting dates by polling members via email.

Geoff Praeger, who is conducting the Opportunity to Learn portion of the committee's work handed out draft survey questions for the various groups that will be asked to respond and requested committee members to provide electronic feedback to him within two weeks.

**MEETING ADJOURNED:** 6:20<sup>pm</sup>.

Motion Adopted By COM Study Committee on February 19, 2002.

I move that the State Board of Education request OSPI to develop options relating to the blended scoring concept, identifying the research, rationale, and implications for each option, and timelines.

# Blended Scoring Model PowerPoint

## Cathy Taylor Presentation Notes

### VALIDITY EVIDENCE –

1. Does the WASL measure the same knowledge and skills as other measures of reading, writing, communications (listening), and mathematics?
2. Do the items (questions and problems) on the WASL match (align with) the EALRs?

### RELIABILITY EVIDENCE –

1. Are raters consistent in applying the scoring rubrics?
2. Are the answer keys correct?
3. If a student took the test again, would s/he get the same score?

Correlations Between ITED and WASL Subtest Scores  
(Cathy Taylor)

<u>ITED Reading w/</u>	<u>ITED Lang. Exp.</u>		<u>WASL</u>		
	.808		Math	Writ	List
			.692	.653	.527
<u>WASL Reading w/</u>	<u>ITED Lang. Exp.</u>		<u>WASL</u>		
	.725		Math	Writ	List
			.733	.725	.634
<u>ITED Vocab w/</u>	<u>WASL Reading</u>		<u>WASL</u>		
	.679		Math	Writ	List
			.599	.491	.644
WASL Math w/			<u>WASL</u>		
			List	Writ	Read
			.520	.648	.733
ITED Quant w/			<u>ITED</u>		
		Lit	Lang	Read	
		Vocab	Exp		
		.713	.688	.737	.741
ITED Math and WASL Math	.769				
ITED Read and WASL Read	.744				

Validity Via Factor Analysis  
ITED & WASL  
(Cathy Taylor)

Grade 4 Factors	Math	Reading	Writing
	Listening		
Grade 7 Factors	Math	Reading	Writing
	Listening		
Grade 10 Factors	Math	Language Arts	

## **RELIABILITY GRADE 10**

### Consistency in scoring:

At item level	69% -- 94% agreement in scores
At total test score level	93% -- 98% agreement in scores

### Student Consistency (likelihood of getting same score if tested again):

Writing	70% -- 80%
Math & Reading	88% -- 92%
Listening	60% -- 70%

## Incentives for COM Attainment

