

Innovation Options for the NY State Assessment System

Scott F. Marion

National Center for the Improvement of Educational
Assessment

New York State Board of Regents

Innovative Assessment and Accountability

- Allows for a pilot for **up to seven (7) states** to use **competency-based or other innovative assessment approaches** for use in making accountability determinations
- **Rigorous assessment, participation, and reporting requirements**
- Subject to a **peer review** process
- May be used with a subset of districts based on strict “**guardrails,**” with a **plan to move statewide by end of extension**

Assessment Flexibility Under the Pilot

- **Assessments are not Required to be the Same Statewide**
 - Approved states would have the flexibility to pilot the assessment system with a subset of districts before scaling the system statewide by the end of the Demonstration Authority.
- **Assessments may Consist Entirely of Performance Tasks**
 - Approved states would have the flexibility to design an assessment or system of assessments that consists of all performance tasks, portfolios, or extended learning tasks.
- **Assessments may be Administered When Students Are Ready**
 - Approved states can assess students when they are ready to demonstrate mastery of standards and competencies as applicable.

Four Major Guardrails/Requirements

Assessment Quality

- System comprised of high quality assessments that support the calculation of valid, reliable, and comparable annual determinations as well as provide useful information to relevant stakeholders

Comparability

- Produce yearly, student-level annual determinations that are comparable across LEAs

Scale Statewide

- Must have a logical plan to scale up the innovative assessment system statewide

Demographic Similarity

- Make progress toward achieving high-quality and consistent implementation across demographically diverse LEAs

Additional (likely) Application Requirements

- **Consultation** with stakeholders and experts
- **Alignment** to full breadth and depth of state's standards
- **Differentiate** student performance
- **Participation** requirements—full participation
- **Accountability** indicator, including for **long-term goals**
- Produce **comparable annual determinations** of achievement (e.g., proficiency)
- **Alternate assessments**—continue to administer AA-AAS
- **Informing parents**—must commit to informing parents in participating districts

Timeline

Application

- ED has indicated that it will release an application within the next couple of months
- States will like have several months to craft their applications

Awards

- ED indicated that they will notify successful applicants by late spring/early summer
- States will likely have several months to craft their applications

Implementation

- Successful states will begin implementation in the 2018-2019 school year

Timeline

Initial

- Up to **seven states** may be awarded initial 3-year application
- Up to four states may be part of a consortium

IES

- Progress **reviewed by “Director of IES”** after 3 years
- **Additional 2 years** based on successful IES review

Expansion

- Secretary of Ed may extend Authority to additional states after 3 years
- Initial states may request an **additional 2 year** extension

Transition

- At the end of the authority, the Secretary, based on peer review, will determine if the state can fully transition to the pilot system

Considering Innovation in NY

Opportunities

- Can experiment with new approaches to assessment to better promote student learning
- Can create true state-local partnerships to build educator capacity
- Can shift the locus of control for assessment and accountability from the state to a state-district partnership

Challenges

- Requires significant resources to develop and implement a system
- Requires additional capacity at SED to support the program
- Comparability is a significant challenge and constrains innovation
- Requirement to scale statewide within 7 years is a huge challenge in small states, overwhelming in NY

The New Hampshire Experience

- NH's Performance Assessment of Competency Education (PACE) started with 4 school districts in 2014-2015 and has now grown to 23 districts (although not full participation in all districts)
 - NH has approximately 175 districts
- Strong partnership among the DOE, districts, NH Learning Initiative, Center for Assessment, and several other partners
- **Could not have happened and cannot continue to function without considerable philanthropic foundation support**

Other “tight and loose” options for innovation

- If the state does not apply for Section 1204, are there **other options for innovation**?
- Of course, but like everything else with assessment, there are **tradeoffs**...
- We’ve talk about things like moving some writing or science work to a “**through-course**” model where all assessments are rolled up to a total score
- This is what I call a “**tightly –coupled**” system
- I created the graphic on the following slide to show the relationship between the technical demands and the level of coupling (or information flow)

Different Entry Points for Including Performance Tasks in a System

Provide high-quality tasks for local educators to optionally use in local instruction and assessment

Supply high quality tasks for **local grading/competency** determinations

Stand alone use reported as a low-stakes **indicator** or as part of a **local assessment** system to monitor progress through the year

Integrated with the **EOY** assessment to **enhance** the depth and breadth of science KSAs assessed

Stand alone use to support **generalizable** claims about student knowledge of the NGSS (i.e., no EOY test)

Increasing Technical Quality Requirements

Some current examples of “loose” systems...

- We are seeing some nice innovation in science assessment in some states, but I highlight Kentucky’s system here...
- **Note:** what they are doing is more expensive and requires more personnel capacity than a single summative assessment
- While they have what I call a loosely-coupled system, they are promoting coherence among the multiple components of the system

Kentucky's Science Assessment System

- **Classroom tasks** developed in collaboration with the state and local educators—**not used** for reporting or **accountability**
- **Through-course tasks**—developed by the state with local involvement—**no stakes**, but used to **provide formative feedback** on opportunity to learn
- **State summative assessment**—developed by state and vendor—**used** for reporting and **accountability**

Questions, comments, discussion

- What are your thoughts and questions about the Demonstration Authority?
- What are your thoughts and questions about other types of innovations?
- Other comments and questions?