



Date and Time of Meeting:	November 20, 2014 – 1:00-4:00 PM
Reporting:	Margo Allen and Robin Russel
Subject of Meeting:	Graduation Guidelines Assessment
	Work Group
Facilitator:	Elliott Asp

In Attendance: Elliott Asp, Mike Bowers, Floyd Cobb, Jonathan Dings, Mary Kay Dore, Stephani Duke, Larry Giddings, Jeni Gotto, Rebecca Holmes, Amy Lobue, Ian Macgillivray, Barry Martin, Pam Osborne, Matt Pickering, David Platt, Mary Ann Roe, Robin Russel, Misti Ruthven, Holly Sample, Chris Selle, Paula Stephenson, Stacy Stolen, Patti Turner, Johan van Nieuwenhuizen, Robert Williams, Catherine Wilson. Guests: Susan Ortner (Holyoke), Angela Powell (Holyoke), John Nelson (ACT).

1. Meeting Minutes:

No.	Discussion	Initiator
1	Overview and Introductions	Elliott
	Reviewed Goals for today	
2	Remediation-Ready-Success: What is the difference between these? Where should these	All
	guidelines be focused?	
	• What is the bar we are talking about? Being post-secondary and career ready? What do	
	we mean by ready?	
	o Remediate in college.	
	 Ready to step into college or career. 	
	 Have success already – college classes in high school. 	
	 Broke into small groups to discuss. Key discussion points included measuring 	
	competency versus seat time, providing remediation before entering college, how to	
	measure readiness, what is the workforce looking for (soft skills), and observing that our	
	menu is college-centric. Elliott mentioned that there was not much discussion around	
	"success" – our menu already shows student success.	
3	Phase-in as a strategy: Should the guidelines be phased-in? How could that be helpful? What	
	are some potential negative consequences? How might this work?	
	• Split in two groups: K12 and Higher Education.	
	 Comments from the groups included a possible option to concentrate on literacy and 	
	phase-in social studies and science. If our menu is competency based, then phase-in	
	doesn't help. If we don't raise the bar now, when will we?	
4	Does a student need to be "ready" in all content areas?	
	• There are many content areas not considered at this time, i.e., PE. You have to start	
	some place.	
	• If we are going forward to full competency-based measurements, a good starting point is to limit our efforts to only English language arts and math.	
5	Presentation on GED	Martin Kay
	Revised tests were launched in January 2014 to evaluate higher order thinking skills	
	(including problem-solving skills) in reading/writing, math, science and social studies.	
	GED data points compared to ACT: GED with Honors equates to 27 on ACT and GED	
	Passing equates to an ACT score of 21.	
6	Presentation on ACT® (PowerPoint Presentation)	Matt
	The ACT is the only college entrance exam based on student achievement and includes	Pickering and
	an interest inventory to guide career planning.	John Nelson
	The ACT assessment aligns with Common Core.	

	• In 2014, ACT will introduce ACT Aspire TM —a computer-based, longitudinal	
	assessment system that connects growth and progress from elementary grades through	
	high school in the context of college and career readiness.	
	ACT Compass is an untimed, computer-adaptive placement and diagnostic assessment	
	system that measures students' current skill set.	
	ACT also produces the National Career Readiness Certificate® (NCRC), the number one	
	career entry certificate in the United States.	
	ACT WorkKeys: "ACT WorkKeys is a job skills assessment system that helps	
	employers select, hire, train, develop, and retain a high-performance workforce. This	
	series of tests measures foundational and soft skills and offers specialized assessments	
	to target institutional needs." (Taken from ACT website,	
	http://www.act.org/products/workforce-act-workkeys/.	
7	Adding Additional Measures	
	College Board: Accuplacer	
	• GED	
	ACT: WorkKeys, Compass	
8	Add Local Assessments	
	 Need to consider technical "standards:" How could district meet those standards? 	
	 Would add local flexibility. 	
	 Would be a better fit for us and our students with local assessments 	
	Are the assessments valid for this purpose?	
	O Validity: "refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support the	
	interpretation of test scores for the proposed uses of tests.	
	o Three pieces of Validity:	
	 Specification of the construct the test is designed to measure 	
	 Evidence to support that assertion that the test measures the construct 	
	 Evidence to support each intended interpretation/use of the scores. 	
	How could local assessments be phased-in?	
	o What about the cost for a district to bring in a local assessment?	
	o Specify the construct – BOCES working together to help with the cost.	
	Add flexibility to districts, starting point for our work.	
9	Proposal	
10	See attached draft proposal	
10	Assignment for January 22	
	Review the proposal sent by Elliott. Review the proposal sent by Elliott.	
	Send feedback to Margo by close of business January 7. Send comments or specific Was in the sense "	
	edits using "track changes"	
	Elliott will revise the proposal based on feedback and send a second draft Province accord draft The second draft	
	Review second draft Control of the control of	
	Come to January meeting with your "bottom line" – what components of the proposal Output Description of the proposal of	
	can you live with? What components need to be changed for you to support the	
11	proposal? Please have suggestions for change for those things you can't support.	
11	Meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.	