Welcome . . .
Steering Committee Call will start shortly
AGENDA

Welcome, Introductions/Roll Call
Andrew LaManque, Chair Foothill College

Approval of Minutes
Andrew LaManque, Chair
6/24 Meeting 7/24 Meeting

Updates and Reports
Amanda Avallone, Cal-PASS Plus
Shana Levine, Cal-PASS Plus
By Work Group Representatives
Work Group Progress
Individual work group report outs

Full RFI Summary Report
Ken Sorey, Cal-PASS Plus
Shana Levine, Cal-PASS Plus
Discussion/review of content
Decision points to come
How this information will inform the RFP

Request for Proposal (RFP)
Jennifer Coleman, Butte College
Content Development and Synthesis
Process and Timeline

Tidbits and Rumors
Andrew LaManque, Chair
Opportunity to share news from the field
and address rumors

Future Meeting Schedule, Adjournment
Andrew LaManque, Chair
September 29 in-person (Orange County) with evaluation report from RP Group
Role of the Work Groups

Propose the scope of content that will be included in the test (Math, English, ESL)

- define content of the common assessment test only and **not** prescribe a particular curriculum, pedagogy, or cut score
- develop descriptions of specific academic knowledge, skills, and abilities that a student should have as a prerequisite for college-level coursework, which can be evaluated using a test

*All outcomes from the Work Groups will be reviewed by others including additional faculty, discipline-based groups, and the CAI steering committee*
How are Assessment Competencies Being Determined?

• Work is grounded in the CB21 rubrics and the CCC ESL Test rubric, but more detailed competency descriptors needed to be established that will guide the development of testable items.

• Common Core standards plus standards that were developed and validated for California noncredit and Adult Ed ESL are used as a starting place.
Work Group Progress

✧ MEETING ONE: Math: Graph
               ESL: Writing
               English: Mechanics & Grammar, Sentences & Vocabulary

✧ MEETING TWO: Math: Define & Manipulate
                ESL: Reading

✧ MEETING THREE: Math: Solve
                 ESL: Listening
                 English: Resources, Reading & Critical Thinking

✧ MEETING FOUR: Math: Applications
                ESL: Speaking & Grammar
                English: Vocabulary, Literal & Inferential Comprehension, Fluency
Additional Work Groups

✧ **Multiple Measures:** One meeting thus far with progress on how multiple measures overlays onto the Common Assessment. Initial set of input presented to the Steering Committee. Next meeting (Sept) will focus on white paper from the multiple measures researchers.

✧ **Test Development Process:** Small group of CCCCO Assessment Work Group members to provide input on the test development and validation process, as well as necessary components of the RFP to align with current and future standards for approval.
Update from Work Group Members

– English - Becky Roberts

– Math - Patricia Banday

– ESL - Kitty Moriwaki
RFI Full Report Review

The RFI sought to obtain information on a wide range of creative solutions to satisfy the broad and complicated systems design necessary to establish and maintain an efficient and nimble system, which has the capacity to administer 2.1 million tests annually.

Three Response areas:
- Test Curricular Content
- Assessment Administration
- Platform Development
RFI Full Report Review

This RFI was to update the information from the previous RFI with the focus on:

• Feasibility
• Innovations
• Barriers

Vendor response on feasibility
• All desired features are feasible and available
RFI Full Report Review

Vendor responses on innovations:

• Pre-registration as a tool used to create individual test starting spots
• Pre-tests that direct students to tutorials prior to assessment
• White Boards
• Technologies for proctoring and off site testing
• Machine scoring for essay questions
• Adaptive testing: branching or use of testlets to hone in on student competencies
• Tutorials inside the test
RFI Full Report Review

Vendor responses and questions on barriers:

• Because none of the respondents offer all of the desired test modalities, assessment structures, and content delivery features, and because some features have significant timeline and cost implications, there may be a need to prioritize the desired features.

• Will the benefits associated with separating the platform development from the administration development outweigh potential unintended consequences, such as delays in timeline, reduced functionality, and increased costs?
RFI Full Report Review

(Discussion points)

• Scope of test – Does the assessment test full scope or does a portion of the test (high or low) become a local school option or multiple measure testlet?

• Will direct placement without the academic content assessment take place? Will the use of a pre-test or pre-registration with Multiple Measures be a form of assessment to exempt full testing and offer an immediate placement option? (Policy Question)

• Constituency groups’ priorities for test components will differ widely; how will those challenges be addressed?

• Developing content (rather than using existing content) will significantly increase time for test implementation, as developing content is a multi-step process