

FILE FOUR

FEEDBACK ON COMMON EXAMS & ROSTER VERIFICATION (CENTRAL OFFICE LEADERS)

MS. PRESTON: All right. Good afternoon again, everyone, and thank you for joining us for today's webinar. We did a sound check just a moment ago, but also want to do a check now and make sure that folks can see the slides that we have on the screen. So just like we did for the sound check, if you can see the screen - you can see an opening slide for today's session - please raise your hand just so that we know both our audio and visual are working.

(PAUSE)

All right, wonderful. Thank you to everybody. Welcome to today's webinar. There's actually a team of folks here from the Department of Public Instruction. My name is Jennifer Preston. I'm the Race to the Top Project Coordinator for Educator Effectiveness, and I'll be sort of walking through the questions to get your feedback on the Common Exams, specifically. I'm going to let everyone else who's in the room introduce themselves just so you know who else is here with you.

DR. MCCOY: Hello, I'm Robin McCoy, and I work with standards and assessments. I'll be working with you particularly on the questions related to roster verification.

MS. DENEAL: Good afternoon, I'm Jen DeNeal, and I'm also a Project Coordinator for Educator Effectiveness.

MR. YARBROUGH: I'm Michael Yarbrough. I'm the Race to the Top Project Coordinator for Communications.

MS. PRESTON: Before we dive right in, just a couple of logistical announcements. This is especially important because we're actually not going to be doing any information-sharing ourselves today. We're really here to gather information.

At this point, we have 85 and growing people logged on to the webinar. Because it's that many, and we

don't want it to get loud with feedback, we are going to keep everybody muted unless, of course, you want to share feedback with us. We hope many of you do. If you'd like to provide feedback, there are two ways that that can happen. You can either raise your hand on your webinar dashboard and I can go in and un-mute you so that, if you're connected via phone or via your computer, you can share your feedback verbally, or you can type feedback into the questions bar. Then what we'll do as we receive that is read the feedback aloud. Some of you may not be connected via audio, just the webinar, so we want to be able to take feedback that way as well.

We're actually going to dive right in, focusing first on a few questions that we want some feedback from our central office leaders about on roster verification. We'll move through a few questions about roster verification and then move into feedback on the Common Exams. So I'm going to turn it over to Robin.

DR. MCCOY: First of all, we'd like to ask you a question about the preparation leading up to our first roster verification cycle. "Did you feel that you had sufficient guidance from the Department and your district to provide support to your teachers regarding the roster verification process?" So we'd like to know what you felt about that and, if not, what would be helpful, or even if you did get good support, what would be helpful to make it even better.

MS. PRESTON: We do have a couple of hands raised, so Terry Hilton, I'm going to un-mute you and we welcome you to share your feedback. You should be un-muted, Terry. Hi, Terry. Terry, are you with us to share some feedback?

(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

MS. PRESTON: Something happened there, so we're going to go on to someone next. Alesia Burnette. Your hand has also been up for a little while, so I'm going to go ahead and un-mute you, except you just took it down, it looks like. How about Antonio Sloan? I'm going to go ahead and un-mute you, Antonio. All right, can you hear us, Antonio?

(NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

MS. PRESTON: Okay, we do have a couple of questions that are coming in typed, so I'll go ahead and read those aloud and then, hopefully, anyone else that wants to share your feedback verbally can do that. So one piece of feedback we have coming in from Sharon Johnson is that, "It would have been helpful to have the percentage of instructional time upfront instead of at the end."

DR. MCCOY: So are you saying, Sharon, that it would have been helpful to have more guidance on how to figure out the instructional time ahead of time or what were you thinking about that?

MS. PRESTON: So, Sharon, if maybe you could just type in some clarification for that. We do have a couple other comments, too. One that we have from Tamra Carter is that, "Roster verification should be available earlier in the school year."

DR. MCCOY: Okay, that's great. We will be talking about that more later, too, as we ask some other questions. Thank you.

MS. PRESTON: Another piece of feedback is that, "Not able to share." Okay, Terry, we can always get that feedback from you another way.

So another comment we have is, "Some of the resources, demos, for example, were helpful, but were received too late in the process."

Kelly Burgess has written in, "It would have been helpful if we had the ability to easily copy and paste entire class lists within the EVAAS system so that we wouldn't have to add students individually in instances where there was a shared responsibility between two or more teachers."

Scott Sage has written in, "Guidance was fine. It would be good to start earlier in the school year since so much is going on during the last month." I know we also share that opinion, Scott. That's something we're going to be aiming to do.

Another comment we have is that, "The percentages still seem confusing and a request for more examples."

DR. MCCOY: Good feedback.

MS. PRESTON: Another thing we have coming in is that, "It would have been helpful if the LEA testing coordinator could get into the system as a teacher and an administrator. That way we could see what they see and be better able to assist them."

Another piece of feedback was that the initial guidance was good, but kept changing. "The timeline was too short," but he guesses that that was expected in an initial roll-out.

DR. MCCOY: Thank you, Jack.

MS. PRESTON: So Sharon has written in to clarify her comment, which was, "Exactly, principals had a difficult time with that piece and I came up with a template for them."

DR. MCCOY: Okay.

MS. PRESTON: I know we've actually heard of a couple folks in districts who created templates to help their teachers come up with percentages.

DR. MCCOY: Right. For quick reference, we are definitely considered including those in the resource materials for everyone next year, or this year now.

MS. PRESTON: So another comment from Brad McMillen is that, "Would have been more helpful if teachers would have been able to just put in a single percentage of responsibility. They had too hard of a time differentiating between the two types."

And another comment that, "Leaving the roster verification window open all year would be very helpful." Some feedback from Danielle Miller that, "The information provided from DPI was not timely. It appeared as if the information was being developed after the process had started."

Another piece of feedback coming in is that, "In talking with other LEAs, it was clear that each system made their own decisions regarding teacher, staff absences, et cetera." That's one thing I know that our new director of human resources will be reaching out to your human resource directors about. Because districts have different policies around things like teacher absences, it can be hard to standardize how roster verification works unless we're all using the same policies around teacher absences. Maternity

leave is one example where some districts have policies around maternity leave that are very different than other districts. A standardized process for how you handle teachers on maternity leave is a bit challenging when everybody is defining that differently, but we are going to be working with on that piece specifically.

"Some clarification regarding ESL, TD, EC and CTE would have been helpful on the front end."

DR. MCCOY: Definitely. We are working on that for this coming year.

MS. PRESTON: "Our EC teachers had difficulty when working with their regular education teachers in determining the appropriate percentages. Teachers became somewhat territorial over decisions about percentages. As much guidance in the future would be very helpful."

Another comment, "The percentages sometimes seem arbitrary. They were tied directly to time when we know that learning and time are not correlated one to one." That's a really good point.

Have a comment that, "More guidance on how to handle homebound, reading specialists, and AIG teachers would be helpful."

"NCDPI needs to provide much more specific guidelines for those in instructional support roles; otherwise, districts will provide vastly differing interpretations on how to assign responsibilities."

"Need more live updates to student and teacher data from Power School so that teachers and students moving in and out of schools are captured by the system. Too much manual entry." That's something we are working on. We're actually planning to do a nightly upload between EVAAS and Power School so that the information is not only updated in roster verification, but also for enrolment data. When a teacher is looking at a student that they're teaching right now, they can see information that's helpful for instructional decisions.

"It would be helpful if DPI could take care of students moving from one school to another so teachers would not have to count days for EVAAS roster verification."

"If there were templates created across multiple districts, it would be helpful if there was a share-point

site for resource documents."

"There should have been more specific guidance regarding special education teachers earlier in the process."

We also have someone providing an example about, "If students are shared 50/50, the assumption would be that the student -- that the learning accountability would be split 50/50; however, potentially 100 percent of the learning could still come from one teacher."

There's a comment that, "The default should not be set to 100 percent."

Question that, "What role would roster verification play in the future in employment decisions now that the legislature has eliminated tenure? Our teachers are worried about this."

"It would have been helpful if the original data from EVAAS would have been congruent with NCWise. False courses, duplicate courses, and incorrect assignments created chaos and caused teachers to question the validity of the process."

"Having just one percentage rather than two. One for the percent of instruction and one for responsibility could have been simpler."

"Would have been helpful if teachers didn't have to enter data for students who were clearly not going to be included in Standard 6 measurements, such as students on alternative assessments, students who had no chance of accumulating a 140 days in membership, and students who had no historical test scores to base growth on."

"Would be helpful if SAS had a phone help desk to contact us. Response system was slow."

"Similarly, while guidance was helpful, the interpretation of responsibility percentages varied widely from district to district, school to school, and teaching pair to teaching pair."

I'm going to do a couple more responses for this question and then move on so that we get through the other questions as well. Some are things we have sort of talked about already. Some more comments about having the true percentages as well as confusion between EC and regular education teacher and that

the EVAAS district administrator should receive a copy of EVAAS communications sent directly to schools.

A suggestion that, "If Power School can capture the enrollment date and figure a percentage, that would help. Relying on a former school putting in the correct percentage did not work in many cases." That's one of the things that that nightly feed will do. The process will start with some of the percentages not at a hundred, at something that's closer to reality because we can use those actual data. A second comment on that - EVAAS should include the school enrolment data so that it helps teachers in their calculation. Those are the comments that came in in response to that first question, so we're going to move on to another question that we would like some feedback on.

DR. MCCOY: All right, and thank you for all of those comments.

This one is about the software. Some of you may not have actually interacted directly with the software, but would have had folks report to you who were using it. "Did you find the software easy to navigate? And if not, what problems did you encounter?"

MS. PRESTON: Okay. "We had too many clicks and a slow response time."

MS. PRESTON: Just a clarification to that - is the response time on the actual system itself updating when you click something, or is it the response time when you email the help desk at SAS asking for help? Was their response time slow? I just want to make sure we know what exactly was the problem. Another comment that, "Principals had trouble knowing when they needed to use the manage list link." Specific things like that are great because those are the kinds of things we can work on.

"Required too many clicks for principals to make edits to rosters and was not super-intuitive. Response time was often very slow."

Clarification that by response time, the first comment was actually about when you click and wait for the screen to update, not actually response time from the help desk.

Another comment was, "The difference between creating users and manage list in the admin section was

confusing to principals."

"When checking individual students, the user had to come all the way out to the class level to get to the next student."

Another comment, "We had issues adding new or instructional support teachers, such as AIG when they were split between schools."

We got some clarification that, again, when folks were talking about a response time, they were talking about the browser actually upgrading a screen and showing new information.

I have another comment that, "It would be easy to navigate, but not so much when directing others"

District administrators couldn't see what the principals and the teachers saw."

DR. MCCOY: We're talking to SAS about that, about a different level of access for you.

MS. PRESTON: "It was difficult to add teachers if they were not in the initial upload of teachers. When there were issues, it was difficult to get in touch with technical help at SAS."

"One school could add and then the second school could not add." Just some clarification on that comment specifically. Would that be referring to adding a teacher, so a teacher was added to one school and then couldn't be added to another, or is that about adding a student? Once a student was added to one school, the student couldn't be added to another? "They couldn't toggle between screens every easily."

Someone mentioned earlier that, "LEA test coordinators need to be able to see what teachers and principals see to help them over the phone. This person had to go to school or bring staff to him to work through the process together."

"The flow of the left-side submission was not clear or intuitive."

Some additional comments coming in about the LEA testing coordinator, or whomever the district administrator is, being able to see what the principals and teachers can see. This person actually did some logging into computers remotely to be able to see the same screen.

"Too many clicks has to do with wanting to see all student lists by each school rather than opening every

teacher one by one."

Another comment: this person had to email the help desk staff six times to get a personalized response and then finally got a phone call. "The training and support provided on the software was LEA-specific and not for charter schools." One thing we definitely want to know here at the Department - all of us that are in the room, especially Robin - if you have trouble getting in touch with the help desk and getting a response to your question, we really want to know that so that we can help push that to make sure that you get a response in a timely manner. As we think about moving forward with this process, please do keep that in mind that if you're experiencing slow response time hearing back from the help desk folks, please let us know so that we can help support you in getting an answer.

"Principals did not understand how to understand the admin function to add or synchronize accounts for teachers. Lots of teachers ended up with multiple accounts." This is absolutely true, one of them was linked to the evaluation dashboard and the other was linked to roster verification. We have worked on cleaning up those accounts over the summer when we can tell it's the same person with the same ID. We've merged those together so that we're at least starting with a cleaner set moving forward.

DR. MCCOY: But we'll try to get that clarified for the principals as well.

MS. PRESTON: "Will we receive a copy of the presentation along with questions and answers?" We're definitely happy to send out the slides. I don't know if we really have answers for a lot of the questions that are being posed because a lot of them are simply recommendations --

DR. MCCOY: Right.

MS. PRESTON: -- but we can certainly get some follow-up communication out after this and have no problem sharing the slides.

"Principals had to spend a lot of time locating UIDs when having to add teachers. A look-up function within EVAAS would have been helpful."

"Principals being the only admin to review in large schools placed a big burden on one person."

A clarification to the comment from before about adding teachers; it was about teachers. "One school could add an AIG teacher, then the school that shares that teacher could not add them or received an error message."

"The list of the test names in the drop-down menu is not always intuitive; so, for example, said Algebra I is the test name instead of Common Core Math I."

We have a comment that, "The help desk responded and that the help desk was very helpful."

"The district level approval process is tedious. I felt that I needed to look at each teacher's roster to have a record that I had reviewed."

One piece of feedback is that, "The software was not necessarily hard to navigate, but there were some things that were not explained in the beginning that caused users to not have any indication as to why information does not go through."

More comments about delays getting responses from the help desk.

Some similar comments about district administrators not being able to see the same things that teachers are seeing.

"Can we develop (inaudible) dates and training sessions for district admins? Those of us in large districts work to support all schools and this would help."

Then a question, "Can more than one person in an LEA have district admin rights?" We can answer that one. There can only be one district administrator for EVAAS, but one thing we are researching is if there can be more than one person who reviews the rosters so that there's not just that one individual that has to go through and approve the rosters to send them forward.

That covers all the feedback we got in the questions bar. I'm going to just flip back and see if there are any hands raised, although it seems like most folks are pretty comfortable just going ahead and typing into the chat window. I'm not seeing any hands raised anywhere.

Okay, we're going to go ahead and move on to the next question then.

DR. MCCOY: You've already referred to this a couple of times in the other question, the beginning question, "Did you find the timelines to complete the process reasonable? And if not, do you have suggestions?" I'll go ahead and, just for sake of time, one of our last questions that we were going to ask you about RV was that we're planning to have two roster verification windows this year already: one after first semester and one at the end of the year. We're already thinking about it and want your feedback related to that. As we think about timelines, "did you think that you had enough time?" Give us some feedback about when you think those windows ought to be, or even keeping them open all year as somebody has already suggested in the first question.

(PAUSE)

MS. PRESTON: So we had a couple questions come in that I think are related to the last question. I don't have anything right – wait, here's one about timeline, one that just came in. "The timelines would have been reasonable if the rules did not change midstream."

Okay, now we've got some more coming in. "No, we did not have enough time, and yes, they should be open all year."

Interesting to see that we do have some differences of opinion on this one. We did have someone write that, "The time windows were long enough and having finite dates forced school admins to comply and actually complete the process."

"Timeline would be better if it could occur prior to end-of-year testing to provide more time for principals."

"Is there any reason there needs to be a window? Let's have access all year so that folks can adjust as needed."

"Absolutely not. We need to begin early in the semester. The timing of this was awful. We should begin by mid-semester at the latest or have all year to complete it."

Several folks saying, "Just leave it open all year unless there's a reason not to."

"Keeping the window open all year and then actually having two might create more confusion."

"If they're able to do fall verification in the fall, the timeline would work in the spring."

"We need a fall and spring roster verification window. The length of the window is okay."

"If we received the guidelines and info in advance, the timelines would be reasonable."

"Timeline would have been reasonable if the resources and help desk responses were received quickly.

Not enough time."

I'm going to go through a few more of these and just see if there's anything that's not really been shared so far.

Someone here said that, "The window doesn't need to be open all year, but should be extended. One of the problems is with the initial part where principals had that time to kind of peek in to what was in there," that specifically wasn't long one.

DR. MCCOY: That two verification --

MS. PRESTON: And that two verification windows would be helpful.

Someone writing that, "Having a finite timeline is helpful" and is referencing the new, more restrictive testing windows that the General Assembly has put into policy. Suggestion that, "The window be closed prior to the last ten days of the school year and the last five days of the semester to ensure that this process wasn't taking place at the same time as testing."

People are also clarifying that keeping it open also still means that you have hard deadlines. There is a shut down date so that schools know there's a date when they have to have their data in and signed off on.

"The roster verification window came at the busiest time of the year for testing," and we do know that most of you are also district testing coordinators.

"Having two windows should help with data load."

And another person saying that, "The timeline could be improved and it won't be an issue with the new testing period that's mandated by the legislature."

A comment that, "As we always tend to know in most processes, the first time you do something it's complicated and that it should be getting better moving forward." We hope that's true not only from people having experience, but also from us being able to improve the process.

DR. MCCOY: Thank you for those, and, of course, we'll print out all of the comments if we didn't read yours. We're looking at them and we will print them out and take them into account as we move forward. Our next question, "what situations did you encounter where it was not clear to you how or even if teachers should complete the instructional availability and/or instructional responsibility field?"

MS. PRESTON: I'm just doing a quick scan to make sure that I'm not missing anybody who may have their hand raised in case anybody does want to share with us that way.

(PAUSE)

Okay, so we're going to go back to the questions bar and see what we have coming in from folks. Specific things that are coming in are clarification for EC teachers and ESL teachers.

"Home-school students, that AIG provided direction to district AIG leaders that was contradictory to what the district set up as district level policy."

"ESL special ed and AIG in just about all cases (indiscernible) hard-and-fast rule."

"Some lack of clarity around how to handle situations in which students transfer between school districts, that they were school districts within North Carolina."

"Did not know it was an option for teachers not to complete if they were the teacher of record."

DR. MCCOY: Let's comment on that one really quickly to do some clarification. If you are a teacher of record, you did do roster verification. The question here was relating to those other types of teachers who were not teachers of record, such as EC teachers, ESL teachers, and so forth, or if it was a team-teaching situation or a co-teaching situation. Some of those sorts of things people had raised questions about.

MS. PRESTON: So a few more folks typing in homebound for sure, then reading specialists, AIG, inclusion EC. Some more folks typing in homebound, whether the student's enrollment or days in

membership should affect the availability, and that the instructions were conflicting throughout the process. Other comments are: students who moved into the school during the year, teachers moving between schools, long-term suspensions or students who were tested in alternative environments, that it was difficult to determine instructional availability and responsibility if the person was instructional support rather than inclusion or resource, incarcerated students, team-teaching situation, student teachers, and a student who took a high school class in two different semesters. Can we ask for some clarification on that? Is that a class that was stretched out over two semesters or a student literally took a course and then retook it?

Someone wrote "Alternative programs." We have a comment that districts that tried to move quickly on this felt that maybe they shouldn't have because additional information that came out would have made them change things.

"The examples on the online webinar used examples that were contradictory to what the district established." And here's some clarification on that previous comment, "A student starting a class, dropping it, and then taking it again second semester."

And the last comments were about substitutes, one about certified substitutes and another about substitutes that were for significant periods of time, like maternity leave, sick leave, and vacancies that didn't get filled until sometime into the school year.

All right. Ready to move on to the next one?

DR. MCCOY: I think that will do it for roster verification from the questions that we had because we went on and talked about the ones that we were going to ask you about first and second semester. So if there are any other things that you'd like to share with us that we did not capture in these questions, if you could either raise your hand and tell us about that now or type those in.

MS. PRESTON: So one thing that did come in that is I think is kind of overarching is, "Principals stated that they would have scheduled students differently and assigned teachers differently if they understood

this process."

"Courses and rosters were imported incorrectly into EVAAS from NC Wise."

A similar situation to one that was mentioned a little bit earlier, you have a substitute, a long-term substitute that comes in, and this specific example was a teacher that actually passed away, but we do see that happen in lots of different situations where you have long-term substitutes.

All right. Any last comments about roster verification? Of course, we do always invite you to send those comments to us at any time if they come to you later today or tomorrow. We do have one question saying, "Clarify after first semester. When would the window be after first semester?"

Someone is trying to raise their hand. Danielle, while Robin answers that question, I will come and un-mute you.

DR. MCCOY: Well, we would like to have your feedback as to when you think it should be if it is after first semester. We were assuming that it would be in January.

MS. PRESTON: Danielle, I'm going to go ahead and un-mute you and let's see if we get this to work.

All right, you should be un-muted, Danielle.

DANIELLE MILLER: Okay. Can you hear me?

MS. PRESTON: Yes.

DR. MCCOY: Yes, we can.

MS. PRESTON: Wonderful.

DANIELLE MILLER: Wonderful. Thank you. Could you please provide some clarification regarding the comment that you made in reference to how you're going to clean up admin lists in EVAAS to reduce the number of duplicate log-ins?

DR. MCCOY: Oh, that's the UID question I think you were talking about.

MS. PRESTON: So what we are doing right now is going through and merging accounts where we have, let's say Jennifer Preston with her UID and her teacher evaluation dashboard account and Jennifer

Preston with the same UID and a roster verification account. In those cases where the UID and the name match, we can merge the accounts because those are the same people.

Some of you have probably gotten emails from me checking in with you about cases where we're not always sure it's the same person. The UID may be the same, but the names may be different.

DR. MCCOY: A lot of time, the simple explanation there is that the teacher has gotten married and the last name has changed.

MS. PRESTON: But sometimes we do have teachers with the same UID that are not the same person and we actually have to clear that up in the UID system. The only time we merge automatically is if we have same name and same UID and it looks like there were just two accounts created for different purposes; otherwise, we'll be asking you to help us clarify if we do indeed have two accounts for the same person and can merge them.

And, Danielle, I took you off mute again. There was a little background noise while I was answering. Is there anything you want to add to that?

DANIELLE MILLER: Yes. So what we are planning on doing in Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools is sending out communication to our principals and district-level staff on our admin lists that we're actually going to wipe clean our LEA admin list and start fresh to ensure that we have some data integrity with who has access to EVAAS. So do you recommend that we proceed with doing that or should we wait for what happens on your end?

MS. PRESTON: No, I think that's fine. All we're doing is combining accounts where there are two of them. If then in the process after it's combined, you come through and wipe them clean, that's fine. It means they were combined, but it doesn't necessarily hurt anything that they were. If you're going through and cleaning the admins, whether it was an admin with two accounts or an admin with one account, you would be wiping it out either way.

DANIELLE MILLER: Okay. What is your timeline then for when you're going to be doing that so we

can time ours accordingly?

MS. PRESTON: We're working on doing that right now and I can definitely have a phone call with you around when we're going to be looking at Charlotte specifically. We're going district by district so we can reach out to admins as we need to clarify things, but we can work out a timeline between us.

DANIELLE MILLER: Okay, thank you.

MS. PRESTON: All right. Let's see what we have here. We just had a couple of comments coming in about that fall window - one that the fall window should be open during the semester and should not be done after the semester, and then two comments that are actually related - one about mountain counties, but then also one about high schools in year-round programs that have schools that test in mid-December. They may want to have access earlier if there's going to be any flexibility for those kinds of timelines.

DR. MCCOY: Good. Good feedback. Thank you.

MS. PRESTON: All right. So with that, we're going to transition over to the Common Exam. Before we really get into this feedback, just wanted to share that many of the questions that we're asking for feedbacks from you folks today are questions we did ask superintendents at the superintendents quarterly meeting that took place a few weeks ago. I think some of the questions we're asking today are ones where there's not going to be a really right answer. There are a lot of people that feel really strongly one way and a lot of people that feel really strongly another way. We're just really looking to get voices and feedback around how you move forward with these decisions, and then we'll be compiling that with what we hear from principals, from teachers, and what we've already heard, of course, from the superintendents.

So the first question is about the Common Exams and the actual makeup of the items. We have had folks suggest that the Common Exams have only multiple-choice items moving forward and that the constructed response items be removed completely. This is one of those topics where we've got a lot of people saying leave the constructed response on, and a lot of people saying take the construction response

off, so we're interested to hear your thoughts on that.

"Only multiple choice" in all caps with a series of exclamation points.

"Constructed response items take longer to score, but are more indicative of what students know and how they can utilize that information."

"They should have constructed responses if you're telling us to teach conceptually, then our assessment must match."

"Multiple choice only."

"I'd vote for multiple choice."

We some of the same kind of splits here that we do with other groups.

"They should have constructed response items. Some of the exams are long."

So kind of as a pair to that, "Yes, they should have constructed response items, but not as many," and that's something that we've heard as well.

"Just multiple choice."

"I think it makes more sense to see how the constructed response items perform in terms of quality before we make that decision."

"Keep the constructed response items, but provide better, more detailed scoring rubric to improve reliability of scoring. I'd hate to see us back off of constructed response items. We really need to get out of multiple-choice land."

"Unless we can lengthen the administration time, I think it's necessary to remove the constructed response items." That's actually a question I'm going to ask in just a couple of minutes = about the length of the assessment.

"Definitely leave the constructed response items, just increase the quality."

"Someone is outdoing the multiple-choice only by adding very many constructed response. Exclamation points for keeping them."

We've got a few other people saying that it should be only constructed response items especially because they were so time-consuming to grade.

Someone has written, "For social studies, we need constructed response to better assess certain standards." For some of the social studies standards, you really can't test with multiple choice.

We have someone here suggesting "the happy medium," which is something we've had other people suggest. "The idea of constructed response is good, but the time to score is difficult, so maybe compromise and do one or two per test," so we again hear that that idea of limiting the number.

"Having the constructed response created a long time for scoring, but they are a better measure of what the Common Core is aiming to do."

"Until a constructed response has a solid response without subjectivity, remove them."

"Leave the constructed response."

"Yes, to leave them. It will have teachers use more constructed response items during class and increase their rigor."

A couple people think keep them, but have them count for less. A few people also saying that the rubrics need to be more specific.

To that point, we have someone writing, "The constructed response may be more indicative, but there are too many discrepancies for scoring across the LEAs." That's something I've been seeing as I've been kind of scanning through, too, is people saying that if we're going to keep them, tighter scoring rubrics would help increase that consistency.

We did have one question come in, which was, "Do the Common Exams falls under the ruling of the recent legislation?" The answer to that is yes. The legislation actually says state tests and any final exam, so that would be any summative assessment that a student takes, even if it's a teacher-made exam, has to be given during that window that's now at the end of the year, so that would be a yes.

This question is getting a lot of people very excited. I have someone writing in all capitals, "Yes, we

should have constructed response items. Teachers have to teach differentiated instruction, so why not test it."

More people writing that, "The constructed response items were valuable, but needed to be revised."

More folks writing that the rubrics need to be made stronger and more specific.

I'm just going to scan through and see if there's anything mentioned that is a little bit different.

Well, now we're actually seeing a little bit of a change given what I just said about the legislation and the testing window.

We have also been joined by Tammy Howard, our Director of Accountability Services, so I'll welcome Tammy to jump in and share anything she may want to share about this General Assembly requirement for a testing window that is more limited at the end of the year.

DR. HOWARD: Right. We are, of course, looking at our processes of administering the test and trying to identify some ways that we can be proactive in making this more doable. The legislation says that the test has to be given within the last five days for the block schedule and the last ten days for the traditional schedule, so it's a little bit different depending on what your schedule is.

We realize that it's going to be difficult to fit that. The one exception, of course, we must remember is for students who have an accommodation, for example, as specified on their IEP or the 504 plan. We are, of course, as I've just said, trying to look at our processes realizing, of course, that we do have some logistical concerns here with how to get all of that testing completed. But we are optimistic that we can be done, and we are trying to be proactive and think about how we can implement the policies from our side that will make that more doable.

MS. PRESTON: So we do have a couple of questions coming, and I just want to underscore that the testing window requirement was passed by the General Assembly. It's not a Department of Public Instruction requirement. It's not a State Board of Education requirement. It was one of the pieces of policy that was passed in the budget bill that was passed by the General Assembly and has been signed by

the governor. So we are, of course, looking forward to working with you and collaborating with you to come up with best strategies and best practices for how to help us all meet this new requirement.

Some people are retracting their constructed response support because of that timeline. That's very good feedback and that's interesting to know.

Tammy, I'm just going to relay this to you because it is coming in quite a bit. Folks are very interested and if there have been any decisions made about retesting. I don't know if you want to address that later or --

DR. HOWARD: Well, I'm going to address now, I think again.

MS. PRESTON: Okay.

DR. HOWARD: There has not been a decision made about retesting. Within accountability and testing, as far as the timeline when we really need that decision to be made, we had shared that we needed that by the end of August for a couple reasons. First, for us to be able to do all the preparation that we have to do, and also to share that information with all of you. So we anticipate that decision coming in the next few weeks. I do not really have a strong sense one way or the other of how that will go.

MS. PRESTON: Okay. I think we'll go ahead and move on to the next question that we're hoping for some feedback about, which is about constructed response items. We're moving forward under the idea that at least there's discussion around keeping the constructed response item. If we keep the items on the Common Exams, who should score them?

One of the comments that came in at the end of the last section was that, if teachers are being trained to score constructed response items and they're all scoring them, that's very good professional development if the training is done well. So I'm going to throw that out there under this question, but looking for some other things to come in.

There's a suggestion that I score all constructed response items. This is why I love this group.

So we do have a suggestion that they should be scored by a third party. One question I would ask as a

follow-up to that comment is that when we talk about a third party doing scoring, there's a couple of different ways we could define that. A third party could be a vendor, an external company that would score, or a third party could be maybe a state-level group of teachers that would score. They could be North Carolina teachers that maybe we could select from districts with a superintendent and central office folks. Those are really two avenues we could go with when we talk about scoring constructed response items.

There is a concern with the constructed response scoring for seniors. "You could potentially delay the credit for ninth- through eleventh-graders, but you would not want to delay the scoring for seniors that might graduate midyear or the end of the year."

"EC teachers for EC students."

Someone is writing, "We should not keep constructed response; but if we do, the teacher should be able to score them to see how their students are thinking." That was one of the original reasons for allowing teachers to score their students.

A suggestion, "It should be left up to the LEAs."

That "It's wonderful professional learning team involvement, but there needs to be standardization and consistency across the state."

"A common group of teachers that represent the state in Raleigh over the summer."

"Agreement that it could be good professional development, but that reliability is important for transparency and confidence in the EVAAS system." Second comment that, "There should be a state-level group of teachers."

"Really from a logistical point of view, from a small system, it's hard to do a true blind scoring process."

DR. MCCOY: Very truly for small ones.

MS. PRESTON: A question that, "If it is a third party, would it delay results?" The answer would definitely be yes, really no matter how we define that third party.

"If you took the pressure off the schools to score, then they would be relieved; but if you are waiting for a final grade, you have incompletes."

One recommendation is for it to be the teacher of record and the teacher who teaches the course, but is not assigned to the same school.

"Third-party scorers at DPI expense would help."

Someone saying, "Not a vendor, but rather North Carolina teachers in Raleigh over the summer," and someone saying that, "We'd rather pay our own teachers than a vendor."

"One system did two scores. One was the teacher of record and the other was highly qualified in the content area and that that worked well for this district."

Whoa, lots of things coming in. "The legislature during their time off." "Outside scorers seem to be impractical. Time is a factor."

"Figure out a way to upload responses to facilitate distributive scoring for remote scorers and let districts do final grades based on multiple-choice items." That's actually something that we've been talking about before. As we move forward to online administration of all assessments - which we're not looking at for this year, but moving forward - especially when we add Common Exams to the mix, but if students are responding to all these constructed response online at some point in the future in Home Base, that kind of distributive scoring becomes a lot more possible with technology.

"Where would the cost for the third-party scorers fall?" That would, of course, be something that we have conversation about.

"When will the 2012-13 MSLs be released to be used by schools for instruction?" So it would be last year's tests.

DR. HOWARD: Right. The reason we have not released yet, we had actually anticipated having already released the MSL Common Exams for 2012-13. We made a decision to hold on that because, just as with this webinar this afternoon, we are gathering feedback about the MSL Common Exams, and we have to

make sure from a development perspective that if there's any chance that we need any of those items to remain secure so that we could use them in some type of linking from one year to the next that we have those available, so that is why we have the delay in releasing the forms. Once we're absolutely certain that we will not need any of these items, then we will release the forms.

MS. PRESTON: So we do have a couple people sharing how they did the process in addition to the process we heard earlier. We had one district that provided, "A lead score teacher to oversee the other teacher's scoring to ensure accuracy, standard policy, and procedure, resulting in a higher level of reliability."

"The scoring of constructed response items turned out to be great PD for our teachers."

Some folks saying that they think it's really important for the teacher of record to score and that while things may always happen, we should be trusting the professional ethics of the vast majority of our teachers.

So we have two questions coming in. One, Tammy, is asking you to clarify something, "So are you saying there's a possibility that the MSLs will not be released?"

DR. HOWARD: Not very -- I would not make that statement very strongly. I'm just saying that knowing that we are gathering feedback, we are looking at how to proceed in '13-14 - knowing that part of the conversation around that is possibly impacting the design of the MSLs from a psychometric perspective - then we just felt that we were not in a position at this moment to release, so I guess you're correct that the assumption there is there's always the possibility they wouldn't be released. I really think they will be released. It's just that I can't do that until I'm absolutely certain that I'm not compromising potential design needs down the road. But I do think they will be released, but we can't do it until we make sure that we know that we don't need those items. And it may be when I say that we will release all the items, it may be only some of the items.

MS. PRESTON: One question that came in is, "Is there any discussion of scaling back the number of

MSLs that will be used in '13-14?" One thing that will be changing as we all transition from high school math being implemented in lots of different pathways and structures to Math I, II, and III, we'll be gradually taking some of the math assessments of the table.

We also are looking at the social studies elective courses. For some of those, there has been a delay in standards actually being written, and, of course, if the standards aren't written, there can't be an assessment. This is something that the State Board is going to be talking about a little bit tomorrow and then we'll be working on throughout the month of August before we put a final list up there as to what will be administered in '13-14.

"In light of constraints on local budgets where (indiscernible) and other teachers are in danger, why is the cost of printing and administering being deferred? Don't say that we can use Race to the Top funds.

Those funds have long since been dedicated and are already depleted."

DR. HOWARD: Based on the feedback that we have been receiving, we're pretty close, if not definitely, to a decision that the Department will be printing and shipping the MSL Common Exams for 2013-14.

MS. PRESTON: Some other suggestions coming in that, "Our district brought teachers to a centralized location to score two scores per item. Worked well when they had the option to move the window away from EOGs or EOCs." So the district is not sure they'd be able to do that again given the new legislation. One thing I think we did last year that worked really well was having webinars where some of you who administered first semester shared with other districts some of your best practices. I think moving forward, we'll definitely want to have those again so that districts can share ideas. For example, CMS' is sending in lots of good ideas that worked for them; we would love for them to share and I know other districts have done interesting things with scoring as well that we would like to share.

"Has SAS validated the 2013 MSLs and their use in calculating teacher effect data?" They have not. We will be sending them the data that they don't have very soon, and they will begin working on that.

We talked a little bit about cost of administration. So a couple folks are sending in comments that they

have somewhat already released the MSLs, so we have someone saying that, thinking that they would be released, they did not collect them back from the school. "As a matter of precaution, we've had them keep secured." Would it be advisable to pull them all in until a decision has been made?" Someone is asking if they can release them even though we are not.

DR. HOWARD: I think it's important to remember that assessments are not released until the Department declares them to be released. So no, they are not released at this time. I would not go to the trouble to pull them back in from your schools if you are certain that they're in a secure location in your schools.

Again, you know, just to say this, we're not releasing because we want to make sure that we don't find ourselves in a position where we are unable to do something from a design perspective to meet psychometric requirements because we released all the items. We really do anticipate releasing, but that's why we're not releasing now is because we just want to make sure. We do anticipate releasing, but they should be still secure and should be stored as such. They should not be distributed or in the hands of the teacher.

MS. PRESTON: There are some questions that are coming in about related topics - about how many booklets will actually be shipping out. I'm going to ask everybody to help me keep track of those so that, if we have time at the end, we can go back to those questions. We have a couple about SAS and the validation process, so I want to get some feedback on some more questions, but looking at time, we should have time to go back and do some answers to these.

Something that was referenced earlier is the idea around constructed response and the idea that students need more time to complete them. So a question we wanted to pose to the group was, "Should the Common Exams fit within a 90-minute administration window or should students have more time to complete them?" I'm more interested in getting your thoughts about that.

So one suggestion is to look at statewide data about how many kids did not complete all items and base

the decision on that.

"Students should have more time if they need it."

"Ninety minutes and ninety minutes."

"We keep hearing that they should be like a final exam, so leave it at 90 minutes. "Yes, they should fit within a 90-minute window since most schools, especially high schools, are on a four-by-four schedule."

"Keep it at 90 minutes unless an IEP says otherwise."

"Extended time and allow students enough time to complete the test, whatever they need."

A couple of comments coming in about the five-day window and that it will be hard to answer that question in light of them having to fit.

"It would be extremely helpful if they could be administered in 90 minutes, but not at the expense of the validity of teacher effective results."

People saying 90 minutes or less.

Someone is writing that it was actually a minimum of a hundred minutes when you add in instructions and breaks. The time was enough, but because a hundred minutes doesn't actually fit within a 90-minute class period throughout scheduling.

So a suggestion for an estimated time of 90 minutes and a maximum time of 120, and that would be if we keep constructed response.

"Ninety minutes seems reasonable."

A suggestion not to time them because students basically get all the time they need on EOCs.

Someone writing that, "Students with disabilities must be afforded extended time if it's under IEP." Of course, that would be true for any assessment - a Common Exam or a teacher-made assessment.

"They must be shortened if they're going to fit within 90 minutes."

A suggestion that there should be a maximum time similar to what we have for EOGs and EOCs, but not four hours, so something a little shorter than four.

"Dictation to scribe or extended time."

Some similar suggestions - up to two or two and a half hours.

We have a comment that, "It's difficult for middle school students who had just completed an EOG where they may have had up to four hours to then transition to something that had a time limit. Some students were very frustrated and couldn't understand why they had to stop."

"Ninety minutes should be sufficient time with the exception of students who have an IEP and need time and things like that."

There are worries that, if the testing window is going to be in the shorter timeframe, the idea of extending may actually be not very practical.

"Are not losing the idea of the concept of a classroom assessment if it goes beyond a normal class period?" That question is really why it was 90 minutes to begin with so that it could fit within that classroom.

A comment that, "EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT are timed; the students need to learn how to work within a specific time window."

"Ninety minutes would be okay if the constructed response time was reduced."

Moving forward to another question that we're hoping for some feedback on, "Should the Common Exams replace teacher-made final exams?" This question is actually coming from a potential State Board policy. The Board members expressed interest in requiring the Common Exams to replace teacher-made final exams so that there would not be cases where a student was taking a chemistry Common Exam and then, maybe later in the afternoon, taking a teacher-made chemistry final exam. So what are people's thoughts on that question?

Oh, this is easy, "Yes, yes," exclamation point. "Yes," exclamation point. "No," exclamation point.

"Students should not have to take two exams." "Students shouldn't take two final exams."

"There should not be both if they are valid and reliable, and yes, require it."

"Teachers were upset this year that Common Exams were not used as finals," and some people saying that they actually already did this. They used the Common Exam as the final exams. "They should not have to take both."

"Yes, yes."

"These were used in lieu of a teacher-made exam. If there was an irregularity, then a student was forced to take the teacher-made exam." That's an interesting approach.

So this question definitely seems to be one where we have some consensus. We thank you for your input on that.

So, related to that question is another question about one of the areas of flexibility that we extended to school districts. It has now come up as a question to revisit, which is, "Should the Common Exams count in student grades?" If they're counting as final exams, we might think they would. Also, "Should the percentage that they count be consistent across all school districts?" What are some thoughts on that?

Someone is writing, "Yes, and it's 15 percent." "Yes, they should count 25 percent like the EOC." Some people saying, "Yes and yes - yes, they should count, and yes, the percentage to be consistent."

Someone is writing, "Yes, they should count as final exam grades, but let districts have flexibility."

Someone else writing that that should be a local decision.

"If it's a final exam, 25 percent." Yes, count in student grades, and yes" with several s's, "be consistent across all school districts.

Someone writing that his or her district did not count them in student grades in '12-13, but are planning to do that in '13-14 to make students take them seriously. They are considering counting them at only ten percent.

"At high schools, they count it as 20 percent of the final grade according to Board policy, but in middle school and elementary school they didn't," and that's fairly consistent with how we do EOCs.

This is one question where we actually have some pretty good consistency across the group. The

percentages that are coming in tend to vary. Some folks are saying 15 percent, 10 percent, 25 percent, but it does seem to be across the board. The consensus is, yes, there needs to be a state standard that they are counted, and some differences of opinion on whether or not there should be a consistent percentage or if that should be left up to school districts.

So the next question we have is, "Did you encounter any problems with the content of the Common Exam? If you did, did you report those problems to DPI?" If you reported it to our regional accountability coordinators, that would be a yes, that you did report it.

So we do have some folks saying yes, they did, and also yes, that they reported them. What we're really looking for here is if we have at this point a list that covers all problems or if there are any still floating out there that maybe have not been reported to us yet. It sounds like things were reported.

"Nothing major, very few content errors."

"Yes, there were problems, and yes, they were reported."

"Reported to the RAC." "Reported to the RAC."

"Most were reasonable, were found as reported."

People are writing that they would really like to review the items again after they're released.

"Could you report those in case an issue is reported, but was actually overlooked?" If anyone would like to send in comments that they have, we certainly welcome that. They can go to Tammy. They can go to the Educator Effectiveness account, and I will make sure to share them with everybody who needs them.

We'd rather hear from you twice about the same issue than not at all, so better safe than sorry to make sure we know.

Okay. So people writing that, "Yes, there were some items that had some problems." Social studies is one we've definitely heard a lot about.

"Yes, we have notes on this one." If you have notes, please feel free to send them in to us.

"Is it possible for teachers to receive feedback forms with the exams?"

DR. HOWARD: Yes, there actually is. I think what you're asking there is very similar to the field tests where teachers actually review the field test items and give us feedback. So if that's what you're asking, then yes, I think that would be possible. That would have to be an activity that was completed after the administration, of course, but I think we can consider that.

MS. PRESTON: Okay. So with the last couple minutes we have, I'm just going to share a couple of other opportunities. Then I'm going to go back through and scan for questions that weren't really feedback, but rather questions that we can provide some answers to.

We're going to hold webinars that are very similar to this with the same exact structure in the next couple of weeks. For school administrators, we're partnering with NCPAPA, the Principals and Assistant Principals Association, to hold a webinar like this where we get feedback from school administrators.

That will be on September 12th starting at 3:30.

We're also going to partner with NCAE to hold a webinar again just like this on September 17th starting at 4:00. We will send out the slides, and we hope that you'll help us pass those registration links out to your principals and to your teachers so that we can get high registration numbers and can hear from administrators and teachers as well.

I'm going to leave this slide up on the screen while I go back through and look for some questions that folks were hoping for answers to. This is the general Educator Effectiveness inbox. You can always send anything about any topic related to educator effectiveness here. If it's roster verification, we will make sure it gets to Dr. McCoy. If it's Common Exams, we'll make sure it gets to Dr. Howard. That's one place you can just kind of bookmark and send in questions or comments. We also have our educator effectiveness website where you can find out more information about educator effectiveness, the MSLS, roster verification and other topics as well.

We do have some questions, not questions, but comments coming in about the Social Studies exams.

Those are definitely places where we are looking at the content of the questions and the alignment with

the standards. I would add World History as well in addition to middle school social studies. Those are content areas where kids are learning about lots of different places in the world and we do know we need to revisit those.

Yes, I'll send the webinar information out electronically so that you can send to your teachers and administrators who may want to join us on those days.

While I'm looking for other questions, I know there was one question that came in about what happens if, in looking at the educator effectiveness data and generating value-added, if either the Department finds that there are errors with an exam or low levels of reliability, or if SAS finds that? If either the Department of Public Instruction or the EVAAS team at SAS find that an exam does not have high levels of reliability, does not have a good distribution of scores - we, of course, for any test want to see that we have some students that did really well, but we also want to see that we have some students for whom it was a challenge - then that would not be used for a teacher's value-added score, so a Physics teacher that taught all Physics just wouldn't see a value-added score for Physics if that exam were one that we could not use. Their sixth standard rating would be based on school-wide data, but just like any other teacher who received a sixth standard rating based on school-wide data, it would not be a year that counts toward their three years of student growth data required for educator effectiveness.

Another question I remember I saw was about Career and Technical Education middle school assessments. We are asking districts to print those because they are modular courses. If we were to print these books centrally and ship them, we would need to ship districts all 12 modules of the Introduction to Business Applications course while you might only administer two to your students. Because districts know what modules they're teaching students, we're asking districts to do the printing, but then we are happy to reimburse you so that it is not on your expense. We just know you know what modules your middle school CTE teachers are teaching and that is not something that we collect centrally here at the agency.

"Has anything been decided about using fall data since the test changed?" If we're able to use both fall and spring data to generate value-added, what teachers will actually see are two value-added scores. So let's say you have a teacher that teaches Civics and Economics during first semester in one of our districts that administered the Common Exams first semester. Then you have a teacher who administered Civics and Economics during the second semester. That teacher will actually see two value-added scores for Civics and Economics - one that's based on their students in the fall and one that's based on their students in the spring. Just like for a fifth-grade teacher, we combine math, English and science value-added scores to produce an overall value-added, we would do the same thing for that Civics and Economics teacher. We would take the Civics and Economics value-added score from the fall, the value-added score from the spring, and combine those together to have an overall score.

I've been asked to go back to the slide with the registration for other webinars, which I'm happy to put that up on the screen. Here they are. We will, of course, send that out electronically.

"How do you get reimbursement for MSLs?" So I just want to clarify. The reimbursement policy is in place for middle school Career and Technical Education pre- and post-assessments that are going to be administered for the '13-14 school year, and that's just because it's how those middle school courses are taught in modules. Districts will do the printing based on the modules their teachers are covering, and then they can send reimbursement information to either me or to our Career and Technical Education division and we will take care of reimbursement for that.

So folks are helping me by typing in questions they asked at the beginning that I couldn't locate in the big list. One question we have is about shipping, "If DPI is going to ship the books, how many books would be shipped?"

DR. HOWARD: Well, there was another question, I think, that was asking if we were going to do class sets that would be reused. At this point, we do not think that is what we do. We think we would do like we do for EOGs and EOCs so every student has a book and it is not reused. That may probably be

dependent upon finances, but at this point we think we'll be able to do that.

MS. PRESTON: We do have questions about versions of the test and how many versions there will be for each administration.

DR. HOWARD: Typically for the MSL Common Exam, we only have one form of each assessment, but, of course, we don't necessarily commit to that. We could have multiple forms if that was decided to do that as the design. This past year, we did have one form. We actually had some negative feedback from the fact that we had one form.

MS. PRESTON: Folks are looking for a little bit of clarification around the ten-or five-day required testing window. "Please clarify students with accommodations or alternative assessments are not required to test within that window."

DR. HOWARD: This is something that we're clarifying with our legal staff. We are, of course, finalizing the testing calendar for 2013-14. The previous calendar was draft until the conclusion of the legislative session. We are having these discussions internally with our attorney, Katie Cornetto, to make sure that we are in compliance with the law. The laws says ten and five days with the exception being students who have an IEP or 504 plan, and, of course, these students could have an alternate or a student who has a general assessment. Those students on general assessments can have accommodations that require multiple testing sessions as well. So we're having those discussions, and we'll have that information to share as soon as possible, but the guidance there is that we have to be compliant with the law.

MS. PRESTON: "With regards to versions of the test, my colleagues and I believe there should be multiple versions."

DR. HOWARD: That was a comment?

MS. PRESTON: Yes, that was a comment. That was not speaking for my colleagues, me, Jennifer Preston.

Question on, "When will the pre-assessments for the middle school CTE modules be made available?"

My understanding is that those are available already. I know I've seen final copies of them. If that is not the case, please let me know and I'll check in with our CTE folks, but I know I've seen finalized versions of all of them. I believe they've been administered in some places, so they should be available through the secure FTP that our Career and Technical Education staff maintain with their colleagues at the district level.

"Are Common Exams considered state exams?" I'm thinking this question is in reference to that testing window. Just a reminder that the legislation actually says state exams or final exams, so this is really any summative assessment a student takes, and that could be an EOG or EOC. It also includes the Career and Technical Education Post-Assessments, and it includes anything that a teacher may give as a final exam. It does have to be administered within that end-of-the-year testing window or end-of-semester testing window.

And I know that one thing we are also, Tammy, looking into is about LEP students - if they can test earlier if they have that accommodation

DR. HOWARD: Do you want me to answer that?

MS. PRESTON: Sure. We do have a question coming in about ClassScape that I'm going to defer to Tammy on.

DR. HOWARD: The ClassScape system as we know it as accessible. It is available, but also please know that all of the ClassScape items have been loaded into Home Base and will be available very shortly as well. We are maintaining the ClassScape system in a transition plan as we move to Home Base.

MS. PRESTON: So we have more questions coming in about the middle school CTE assessments. Those will be scored by CTE teachers. Much like the Common Exams, they have multiple-choice items and they also have what we might call constructed response items. In the CTE world, they're really performance tasks. You can type a paragraph, open a spreadsheet, save it in a different format. Those

will be scored with many of the same policies that we put in place for the Common Exams. The teacher of record can score. If there's another scorer, there is not as much of an issue with scoring disparities on rubrics because whether or not the student can actually do the task is something you can actually say a yes or a no to; yes, they downloaded in an Excel file and saved it with a certain file name.

We are providing a place in PowerSchool for those scores, both the pre-scores and the post-scores, to be recorded and that will be on a module-by-module level so that we don't think that schools have taught all 12 modules and maybe they've only taught two of them. PowerSchool will be the place where we're going to collect that information. So it would not have to go from your CTE colleagues in Central Office to you to be uploaded in any way.

"How do we put an order for the CTE MSL answer sheets?" There are no bubble sheets for those. These are all very short pre- and post-assessments. The one I looked at, actually, one of the pre-assessments was just three multiple-choice items and then a performance task, so we're not having folks go through the process of having to do answer sheets for multiple-choice items.

We have a question about OpenClass that we will definitely get some more information about –
"OpenClass is no longer in development by Pearson." I'll make sure we check on that with our Learning Systems team and get an answer back to that individual.

So I think we're kind of wrapping up, and there are just a few people that are asking sort of individual questions that we can answer as we start to let people get off. One big question is, "What is the timeline for receiving revised test specs for fall semester?"

DR. HOWARD: Oh, I apologize for that delay. There really should not be too much to the revision of the test specs unless there are design changes. Of course, our conversation today around the constructed response, the possibility of removing them, the possibility of reducing the number of constructed response would impact the test specifications, but if there are not those kinds of changes, then they should not change.

MS. PRESTON: So with that, we are coming up right on 5:00. We thank you so much for joining us today and for providing us with all this great feedback, as well as for your continued partnership with us to make sure that what we're doing is fair for teachers and especially fair for students and is the right thing to do moving forward. So as always, as you think of other pieces of feedback, please let us know. Give any of us a phone call or an email. We're always excited to hear from you and work with you as we move forward.

So thanks, everybody. Have a great night.

DR. MCCOY: Thank you very much.

(CONCLUDED)

WPU

Gloria Veilleux, Transcriber