



# THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

*"Every student receives a high-quality education that prepares for career, college, and life."*

Educational Service District 113, Mason & Lewis Room  
6005 Tye Drive SW, Tumwater, WA 98512

**August 5, 2015**

## Minutes

### Wednesday, August 5

Members Attending: Ms. Isabel Muñoz-Colón, Ms. Janis Avery, Ms. Connie Fletcher, Mr. Baxter Hershman, Mr. Tre' Maxie (via teleconference), Mr. Peter Maier J.D., Ms. Holly Koon, Superintendent Randy Dorn, Mr. Bob Hughes, Mr. Kevin Laverty, Ms. Cindy McMullen J.D. (via videoconference), Ms. Mona Bailey, Ms. Judy Jennings, Dr. Daniel Plung (via teleconference), and Mr. Jeff Estes (via teleconference) (14)

Staff Attending: Mr. Ben Rarick, Mr. Jack Archer, Ms. Tamara Jensen, Ms. Linda Drake, Mr. Parker Teed, Ms. Julia Suliman, Dr. Andrew Parr, Ms. Linda Sullivan-Colglazier, Ms. Stefanie Randolph, and Ms. Denise Ross (10)

### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. by Chair Muñoz-Colón. Member Maxie, Member Estes, and Member Plung identified themselves as being present on the teleconference. Member McMullen identified herself as being present on the videoconference. The Chair announced that OSPI's technical consultant, Dr. Tom Hirsch, would be on the teleconference and available if needed to answer questions.

Members discussed whether to take action on the position statement for setting the graduation cut scores at this meeting. Members were concerned there wouldn't be enough time at this meeting to receive public input and have a lengthy discussion. The Chair proposed delaying the discussion and taking action until the September meeting.

### **Performance Standards Setting for High School Exit Exams and WA-AIM**

Ms. Linda Drake, Research Director

Dr. Robin Munson, Assistant Superintendent, OSPI

Ms. Cinda Parton, Director of Assessment and Development, OSPI

Mr. Mike Middleton, Director of Select Assessments, OSPI

Ms. Linda Drake stated that the actions proposed for this meeting are to set minimum high school graduation scores and achievement level scores on several new state assessments, which included Washington Access to Instruction and Measurement (WA-AIM), Math Year 1 and Math Year 2 End-of-Course Exams, and the Smarter Balanced Math and English Language Arts. Ms. Drake summarized the statutory requirements for setting the scores on these state assessments and the background of the positions the Board has previously taken on state assessments.

Dr. Robin Munson stated that while it's important not to compare the results of this year's tests to previous years' due to the increased rigor of the learning standards and tests, it will be necessary to

---

review previous year testing data. The Board has chosen to establish a cut score that yields “equal impact”, that is, a score that impacts students approximately equally to how students have been impacted by state assessments over the past few years.

Mr. Mike Middleton stated that WA-AIM is designed for students with significant cognitive challenges for whom the general assessments are not accessible. This population of students comprises less than one percent of the total student population. The standards are an adaptation of the general state standards, and the performance tasks are linked to the adapted learning standards used by educators to assess student knowledge and skills. WA-AIM serves as an alternative assessment in grades 3-8 and 11 for accountability purposes in English Language Arts, mathematics and science.

Mr. Middleton reported that OSPI tasked a standard-setting group to establish three WA-AIM cut scores to define four levels of achievement. The process used was reviewed by the National Technical Advisory Committee and by Superintendent Dorn. Mr. Middleton presented the following:

- Proposed WA-AIM cut scores and their outcomes for English Language Arts in grades 3-8 and grade 11. Level three and above will be deemed as proficiency.
- Proposed WA-AIM cut scores and their outcomes for mathematics in grades 3-8 and grade 11. Level three and above will be deemed as proficiency.
- Proposed WA-AIM cut scores and their outcomes for science in grades 5 and 8. Level three and above will be deemed as proficiency.
- Proposed WA-AIM Exit Exam Cut Scores and the target rates in English Language Arts and mathematics for grade 11 using a three year average

Mr. Middleton noted that the high school science assessment test was not administered due to accountability testing completed the previous school year.

Ms. Cinda Parton stated the requirements for the two new End-of-Course (EOC) assessments or an alternative in order to earn a certificate of academic achievement or high school diploma. The new tests were needed due to new math standards, but will not be used for federal accountability purposes. Ms. Parton presented the proposed EOC cut scores for Math Year 1 and Math Year 2, the outcomes and the methodology used to determine the scores.

Dr. Munson presented a comparison of the proficiency rates for the high school English Language Arts SBAC test results for all students and the rates separated out for grade 10 and grade 11. The data separated by grade level showed that the grade 10 students had significantly higher proficiency and participation rates than the grade 11 students.

Dr. Munson presented data that suggested that lack of motivation may be a more likely explanation for the low 11<sup>th</sup> grade performance than a skewed population due to the high refusal rate of the 11<sup>th</sup> graders.

Dr. Munson presented the following English Language Arts Exit Exam Cut Score options:

- Cut score of 2487 using a matched cohort approach. This score falls in the range of achievement level one.
- Cut score of 2548 using a three-year-average of Grade 10 testing results. This score falls in the range of achievement level two.
- Cut score of 2493, achievement level two.
- Cut score of 2583, achievement level three.

Dr. Munson presented the following Math Exit Exam Cut Score options:

- Cut score of 2469 using a matched cohort approach. This score falls in the range of achievement level one.
-

- Cut score of 2595. This score is comparable to the level two scale for the English Language Arts cut score proposal.
- Cut score of 2543, achievement level two.
- Cut score of 2628, achievement level three.

## **Public Comment**

### **Dr. Thelma Jackson, Black Education Strategy Roundtable**

Dr. Jackson is concerned about the 30 percent of students that did not make a level two and the second bullet item on the Board's draft position statement for setting the cut score. She suggested that the intent for the standard should apply to the Class of 2020 and no later than to the Class of 2022. The Black Education Strategy Roundtable applauds the work of the Board, but is interested in disaggregation data for the 30 percent of 10<sup>th</sup> graders that did not make level two this year.

### **Mr. Bill Kleim, Washington Association of School Administrators**

Mr. Kleim is in support of the Board's position for an equal impact level on the SBAC. He stated the Class of 2017 has had little opportunity to learn the standards, nor have the teachers had enough professional development to prepare for Common Core.

### **Ms. Becca Ritchie, Washington Bad Ass Teachers Association**

Ms. Ritchie is concerned that a level three cut score is unattainable for too many students and it's the same failed policy of No Child Left Behind. Linking test scores to graduation will leave many students without a high school diploma and impacting society by increasing dropout rates. Whether or not students had high GPAs would not matter because they didn't pass the test. Ms. Ritchie is concerned about the students that are not passing because there is a linkage between test results and diplomas.

### **Ms. Linda Myrick, Bellevue School District Teacher**

Ms. Myrick feels less valued because the state is determining what she is required to teach and how her students will graduate. Each year, her ability to influence and control how her students are learning is decreasing because they're going to be judged by a one-size-fits-all test score. Special education students have enough unique challenges to face and be required to take the WA-AIM test. These policies are belittling teachers and students as human beings and the state is going in the wrong direction.

### **Ms. Shannon Criss, Winlock School District**

Ms. Criss has seen the poverty rate in her district increase significantly. She encouraged the Board to set a minimum standard that is equal, fair and continues to allow educators to learn the Common Core standards. Educators and students haven't been able to fully embrace Common Core yet and there is fear of failure on the SBAC. The kids in our district are offered opportunities to receive college credits while in high school, but some of the students will go directly to the workforce before college due to the realities of living in poverty. Setting a cut score of level three or level four would be a huge obstacle for kids. Ms. Criss asked the Board to set the cut score to equal impact.

### **Representative Chris Reykdal, Washington State Legislature, 22<sup>nd</sup> District**

Rep. Reykdal stated the legislature has failed the state by giving the Board a false choice. The legislature has given the Board the ability to set a cut score, but under the premise that exit exams are the standard policy for determining the future of a child. When a child is denied a diploma or drops out because of the fear of an exit exam, they lose lifetime income. The false choice is to set the minimum graduation score at a level three or four and have thousands of students fail to meet standard because the preferred alternative of collection of evidence is clearly inconsistent and expensive. The legislature

---

has done an injustice to the Board in asking members to set a cut score. The Legislature should have done the job of placing meaningful alternatives aligned in Common Core so that we get 100 percent graduation for students. Rep. Reykdal requested that the Board go beyond this decision and ask the Legislature for better policy tools on the test alternatives so students are not relying on a single exam.

**Mr. C.J. Nickerson, Longview School District Board of Directors**

Mr. Nickerson agreed with the comments made by Rep. Reykdal and the teachers. He asked the Board to consider the rhetorical question of if a student isn't determined to be college and career ready, what are they and what's the impact on their life?

**Ms. Amy Liu, League of Educator Voters**

Ms. Liu highlighted the 71 percent of 10<sup>th</sup> grade students that were determined to be career and college ready. This accomplishment by 10<sup>th</sup> graders shows that meeting the expectations can be done, and is a testimony to the efforts taking place in our schools. She asked the Board to remember the vision of preparing all students for college and career as they consider their decision today.

**Dr. Glenn Malone, Puyallup School District**

Dr. Malone supports the comments made by Dr. Bill Kleim and hopes the Board will use the matched cohort model. The other proposals by OSPI for setting the cut scores would create a considerable burden for his district and the resources needed to make up the difference would be a hardship. Dr. Malone is in support of the matched cohort model.

Additional public comment received prior to the board meeting is posted on [www.sbe.wa.gov/materials](http://www.sbe.wa.gov/materials).

**Board Discussion**

Members asked technical questions to Dr. Munson regarding her data presentation.

Members discussed adding another motion under the [business item](#) #1. Since a methodology different from the WA-AIM threshold scores will be used for the WA-AIM minimum scores, members felt they should be voted on separately. Member Maxie also proposed separating the motions under item #3 on the [business items document](#) into two separate motions.

**Business Items**

**Motion made by Member Bailey** to adopt the achievement level threshold scores for WA-AIM as shown in Exhibit A.

**Motion seconded by Member Fletcher.**

**Motion carried.**

**Motion made by Member Jennings** to adopt the minimum scores for the WA-AIM to earn a Certificate of Individual Achievement, as shown in Exhibit D.

**Motion seconded.**

**Motion carried.**

**Motion made by Member Laverty** to adopt the threshold score for the Math Year 1 and Math Year 2 End-of-Course exams, as shown in Exhibit B, and to set the level three threshold scores as the minimum to earn a Certificate of Academic Achievement.

**Motion seconded.**

**Motion carried.**

---

**Motion made by Member Fletcher** to table the discussion and adoption of the position statement on score setting for the minimum score to earn a Certificate of Academic Achievement to the September 2015 regularly scheduled meeting.

**Motion seconded.**

**Motion carried.**

Chair Muñoz-Colón noted for the record that the Board had previously adopted a methodology for setting the equal impact cut scores in March. That methodology was adopted prior to learning about the extent of the parent refusals in our testing system and the impacts that would have on the usability of the resulting data. Ms. Muñoz-Colón stated that each member's vote in favor of the recommended minimum scores for both Math and ELA also means that members are consenting to deviating from the original matched cohort methodology that the Board approved. Subsequent events have made the original methodology untenable for our purposes today.

**Motion made by Member McMullen** to adopt a score of 2548 as the minimum score to earn a Certificate of Academic Achievement on the English Language Arts Smarter Balanced Assessment.

**Motion seconded.**

Mr. Rarick reminded members that the score of 2548 is a deviation from the original matched cohort, but in the spirit of the Board's original policy of equal impact. The staff recommends this particular methodology to adopt the minimum score to earn a Certificate of Academic Achievement on the English Language Arts Assessment.

Member Plung suggested adding the specific level number in the motion.

**Member McMullen accepted his suggestion as a friendly amendment** to add the wording "Level 2.6" to the motion.

Members discussed the pros and cons of referencing the level number in the motion. Some members felt it brought clarity to the meaning of the score, while other members felt that only the cut score should be included in formal motion language.

**Member McMullen withdrew her acceptance of the friendly amendment.**

**Member Plung moved to amend** the motion on the floor by inserting the wording "which represents a score in the middle of the 2 range" following the number 2548.

**Motion seconded.**

Member Koon spoke in support of the amendment because it reflects equal impact.

Member Maier expressed concern that the amendment may cause ambiguity. He said the Board should provide clarity to the public regarding the meaning of the levels in other channels of communication, but have only the score stated in the motion language.

**Member Koon made a friendly amendment** to Member Plung's original amendment to insert the words "which falls in the 2 range set by the SBAC Consortium."

**Member Plung did not accept Member Koon's friendly amendment and Member Koon withdrew it.**

**Member Maxie made a friendly amendment** to Member Plung's original amendment to insert the words "that falls within the level 2 range."

**Member Plung accepted Member Maxie's friendly amendment.**

**Motion seconded.**

Member Maier was concerned that there is an additional number in the motion language without a legal purpose.

Member Maxie stated the importance of providing a motion that fulfills the needs of the public by providing the level designated for the score.

**Member Plung withdrew his amendment.**

**Member McMullen made a friendly amendment** to insert the wording "adopt a level 2 score of 2548 as the minimum score."

---

**Motion seconded.**

Some members felt the motion language should state only the score and that the Board should utilize the press conference after the meeting to provide clarity around the decision.

**Motion failed on a roll call** (5 yes/9 no). Chair Muñoz-Colón requested the roll call. Those voting yes: Member Plung, Member Hughes, Member Maxie, Member McMullen, and Member Koon. Those voting no: Member Dorn, Member Fletcher, Member Jennings, Member Laverty, Member Avery, Member Estes, Member Bailey, Member Muñoz-Colón and Member Maier.

**Motion made by Member McMullen** to adopt a score of 2548 as the minimum score to earn a Certificate of Academic Achievement on the English Language Arts Smarter Balanced Assessment.

**Motion seconded.**

**Motion carried.**

**Motion made by Member Laverty** to adopt a score of 2595 as the minimum score to earn a Certificate of Academic Achievement on the mathematics Smarter Balanced Assessment.

**Motion seconded.**

Mr. Rarick stated for the record that the score of 2595 as the minimum score is not based on a methodology from math scores that project equal impact. It is based on the number most equivalent on the scale to the English score. If approved by the Board, this score in math and the score for English would be of comparable rigor.

Members were concerned about not having equal impact for the math score and discussed the possibility of working with the Legislature to change the cut score once more data is available.

**Member Bailey proposed a friendly amendment** to add the wording “preliminary” or “initial” before the score.

Mr. Rarick recommended not adding the wording “preliminary” or “initial” before the score, but rather creating a separate motion stating the board’s intent to revisit and possibly change the score next year.

**Member Bailey withdrew her friendly amendment.**

Member McMullen recommended the motion language state that the cut score be effective for one year. Ms. Sullivan-Colglazier couldn’t confirm that setting a one-year score would fulfil the Board’s statutory obligation, and advised that a separate motion be made instead indicating the Board’s intent.

**Motion carried on a roll call** (9 yes/5 no). Members voting yes: Member Fletcher, Member Plung, Member Jennings, Member Laverty, Member Avery, Member Estes, Member Bailey, Member Muñoz-Colón, and Member Maier. Members voting no: Member Dorn, Member Hughes, Member Maxie, Member McMullen and Member Koon.

Member Maxie ended his participation via teleconference. Chair Muñoz-Colón noted for the record that the Board still had a quorum present after Member Maxie ended his teleconference connection.

Chair Muñoz-Colón directed staff and counsel to draft an additional motion indicating the Board’s intent to review the minimum score on the mathematics smarter balanced assessment.

**Motion made by Member Bailey** to move that the Board review the minimum score on the Mathematics Smarter Balanced assessment to earn a Certificate of Academic Achievement prior to the end of the 2015-2016 school year.

**Motion seconded.**

Member Maier was concerned the language didn’t clarify what specific month is considered the end of the 2015-2016 school year or have a calendar date on which action would be due.

**Member Bailey proposed an amendment** to her motion to change “prior to the end of the 2015-2016 school year” to “Prior to the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year.”

**Member Maier recommended** moving “prior to the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year” to the beginning of the motion.

---

**Member Bailey accepted Member Maier's recommendation.**

**Motion seconded.**

**Member Plung made a friendly amendment** to remove the word "review" and replace with "determines if an adjustment is required."

**Member Bailey did not accept Member Plung's friendly amendment.**

**Member Koon made a friendly amendment** to add the wording "to determine whether or not the current cut score meets the Board's adopted policy of equal impact" as the end of the motion.

**Member Bailey accepted Member Koon's friendly amendment.**

Member Maier was concerned the language was too narrow and broad.

**Member Bailey withdrew her acceptance of Member Koon's friendly amendment.**

**Member Koon made an amendment** to add the wording "to determine or whether not the current cut score meets the Board's adopted policy of equal impact."

**Motion seconded.**

Members expressed concern that it's unknown whether comparable data will be available next year to reflect equal impact.

**Chair Muñoz-Colón made a friendly amendment** to replace Member Koon's amendment to "to determine whether or not the current minimum score needs to be changed."

**Member Koon accepted Member Muñoz-Colón's amendment.**

**Motion seconded.**

**Amendment passed.**

**Motion carried.**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:24 p.m. by Chair Muñoz-Colón.

---