Name of Meeting	ADI Subcommittee Meeting
Date	8/7/18
Time	1:00pm CT
Attendees	**SEAs**: Jennifer Paul (MI), Sabrina Read (FL), Susan Beard (AL), Drew Linkon (MO), Tracy Montez Linder (MN), Sandy Greene (GA), Theresa Bennett (DE), Alexis Glick (MA) **WIDA**: Kristen Burton, Mark Chapman, Beth Anderson **CAL**: Jennifer Norton
Note Taker	Jessica Davis

Topic # 1: Board Meeting Follow-ups, Welcome New Members

Information Shared:
• Price Models-WIDA is still working through detail. Will provide updates when they are available.
• Reminder of AMO process
    o 3 sheets of school and district labels in all initial shipments in 2018-19
    o All other processes remain the same
• New meeting date-March 20 10:00-11:30am CT
• New members: Heather Villalobos Pavia (replacing Will) and Theresa Bennett

Discussion Questions • 3 sheets per school? Yes.
Topic # 2: Kindergarten Screener
Information Shared: Development Process and Milestones • Research-Literature review complete. Looked at EL population and general populations to determine the appropriate developmental expectations. Looked at a variety of standards to synthesize common strands for incoming kindergarteners. • Development-Create items/tasks. Item refinement. Jointly undertaken by WIDA and CAL. Focus groups of educators and LEA subcommittee involvement. • Educator/SEA/LEA Review-Joint reviews with CAL. K Screener review in early 2019. Will make revisions based on feedback received. • Cognitive labs and pilot-Small scale field tests. • Field test-2 phases for K Screener. Looking to have several hundred students take K Screener 2 times. • Analysis • Training materials and ancillary documentation-TAM and training course will be drafted throughout test development. Field Test Opportunities • Cog labs, Spring 2019, 20 students Identify content that is not working. • Pilot test, Spring 2019, 100 students Preliminary quantitative data to identify content that is not working. Revisions will be made before field test. • Field test phase 1, Late summer 2019, 600 students Administer all 4 domains.

- Field test phase 2, Winter 2020, 600 students. Administer all 4 domains. Collect field test data from students who are second semester kindergarten. May need to give guidance for interpreting student performance based on when the assessment is administered (prior to kindergarten entrance or second semester).

K Screener Item & Task Types
- K Screener storyline about a family of elephants
- Listening: Total Physical Response (TPR), gesture or non-verbal communication. More engaging for young children to move around. Developmentally appropriate. Help student relax and feel more like a game and less like a test. Will also develop a non-TPR task for students who are shy.
- Writing: Respond by Drawing, students taking this domain will still be preliterate. Literature supports the production of pictures. Need to set items up in a way so students do not spend too much time drawing picture.
- Reading: Concept of Print Items, pre-literacy assessment task. Measures emerging reading skills. See if student understands how to turn pages, where title is, what direction to read in, identify start/end of sentence, word boundaries, etc.

Discussion Questions
What questions do you have about the read-aheads or the content Mark presented?
- MI-It seems like cog labs are late in the development process.
- Mark-Good point. We want K Screener to be as similar to K ACCESS as possible. Will raise this point for internal discussion.
- MO-Will there be an alignment study to align this with other assessments/standard setting?
- Mark-Standard setting is out of scope for this project. When we field test K Screener, we will also be looking to collect students' operational performances on ACCESS. This will allow us to scale K Screener. Psychometrically connect K Screener scoring to K ACCESS scoring.
- MO-Would this pass peer review?
- Mark-Gary believes it will, yes. As long as K Screener is same design as K ACCESS, extending the scale down to K Screener will pass peer review. Mark will raise this question with Gary.
Are the intended test development processes and milestones satisfactory?
- Could same students participate in phase 1 and phase 2 field test?
- Mark-I think it would potentially be helpful. Will need to talk to psychometrician about this though.
- MI-What exactly does late summer mean? July/August would be challenging to recruit students.
- Mark-Targeting late July-early October. Will narrow down as we get closer.
- MN-Can't force LEA to participate in field test, can only encourage.
- MI-Because this is a new assessment, have more motivation to sell this to the districts, more than the other field test opportunities. This is a heavy lift that we will all benefit from greatly. Will spend more time promoting this.
- DE-In the past, suggested a percentage to superintendent. Giving a specific number seems to help with recruitment.
- Mark-Hoping to be able to provide field test participation incentives.
- Will anyone at WIDA present at WIDA Conference on test development and importance of field test?
- Mark-Will check with conference folks.

- MI-Not specific to Screener, but about field testing in general. Promote K Screener field test recruitment.
- MN-Need flyers and recruitment materials sooner than later.
- Mark-Hoping to release information 6 months in advance.
- FL-Do you anticipate a stipend or incentive?
- Mark-Yes. Will be similar to ACCESS Writing field test. Minimum number of students to trigger a financial incentive. Not sure what the number is yet.

Does the subcommittee support the development of the TPR Listening items?

- MI-Understand that this is developmentally appropriate. May be an issue for students with disabilities. Sounds like WIDA is being flexible. Haven't thought about this concept before. Think I can support this right now.
- Mark-Yes, a few folks at WIDA have expressed similar concerns. Motor skills are required with K ACCESS (moving cards, placing cards, writing). Not sure how students with accommodations handle K ACCESS.
- FL-After student attempts, the TA models. Will there be practice items for TA to model for student?
- Mark-Yes, TA models for the student first.
- MN-Awesome that we are looking at innovative item types. Having an opportunity to warm up with a more traditional activity may be important for shy students. May be uncomfortable for some students to perform right off the bat. Great item type, just concerned about it being first in the test.
- Mark-Right, we aren't sure how this will work. It may help students warm-up, but it may have the opposite effect. TA and student read story aloud first. Will take your feedback back for internal discussion.

Does the subcommittee support the development of picture response Writing tasks?

- FL-May need to revisit Writing rubric.
- Mark-Can use K ACCESS rubric. Agree we need to be careful about interpreting scores for pictures.

Does the subcommittee support the development of concepts-of-print Reading items?

- MO-Think we are on the right track. Seems like something I would support. Want to revisit after we see results from cog labs. See if we need to make adjustments. For now, pleased with what I am seeing.
- Mark-If we don't see red flags, we will continue with development, but that does not mean it will necessarily end up on the test.
- MN-What percent of items would be TPR?
- Mark-No more than 20%. A vast majority will be same item type as K ACCESS.
- DE-When is screener typically given?
- Mark-The window for K Screener is wide, close to 18 months (April before Kindergarten to end of Kindergarten year). Biggest challenge with K Screener. Need to determine how far in advance K Screener can be administered to be considered valid.
- DE-Depending on when field test is administered, students may have learned these skills in Kindergarten.
- Mark-We are thinking of what students to include, possibly include 4 year olds. Hope to have an update for committee at next meeting regarding field test population.

Next Steps/Action Items:

- Bring the following questions/concerns back for internal discussion:

- o Cog labs seem to be late in the development process.
- o Will the plan for scaling the K Screener scores pass peer review?
- Follow up with psychometrician to see if students could participate in phase 1 and phase 2 of field test.
- Check with WIDA Conference team to see if a slot is available to discuss test development/field testing to promote K Screener field test.
- Take committee feedback for internal discussion regarding Listening, Writing, Reading tasks.

Topic # 3: Screener data export function

Information Shared:

Screener export requirements process
- WIDA define requirement (June 2018)
- WIDA review requirements (June 2018)
- WIDA/DRC review requirements to determine feasibility (July 2018)
- ADI subcommittee feedback (August 2018)
- Focus group feedback (September 2018)
- WIDA/DRC final requirements (November 2018)

Requirements and Constraints
- Review handout

Discussion Questions

Do the Screener export requirements meet the needs of your state?
- MN-Want to discuss timeframes.
- Beth-These are not the only timeframes available, just examples. Can only export within a given administration. Can identify dates that you want to export.
- MN-Can districts get district- and school-level data?
- Beth-Yes. A district-level user can specify a school to pull a report.
- FL-If a score is invalidated, will we see an N/A or a blank? Is there a requirement for all scores to be included?
- Beth-How would SEAs want that to work?
- FL-Currently, N/A is only present if DNS code is included in WIDA AMS, but this may be very different than WIDA Screener.
- Beth-I don't think there is a DNS code for WIDA Screener.
- FL-You can force submit.
- Beth-Do you want to see the domains, or if it is force-submitted do you not want to see the scores?
- Beth-Will need to see what a force submit looks like right now. Would you want to see that a force submit happened?
- MN-We would want to see a code that shows that the district chose to force submit and see scores from other domains.
- MI-Is there room to talk about order of data export fields?
- FL-Not a lot of opportunities for schools to pull down a CSV file, so they may not know proper procedure for opening a CSV file. Zeroes may drop off. May need to consider providing support for downloading and importing CSV files.
- Beth-Part of the struggle is reimporting the file.
- FL-Need to include language, possibly within Screener export tab, to support downloading file.

- Kristen-We could include hints/tricks to help users.
- Beth-This cannot be opened in WIDA AMS. It can only be downloaded.
- FL-That's good. Would still be helpful to include additional guidance in user guide.

Should all users have permission to export Screener data or should the permissions be delegated from the SEA?

- MN-Would offer to all district-level folks. District people can delegate to users within the district.
- MI-Fine with permissions mirroring what is currently happening in WIDA AMS.
- FL-Make available to DTCs and allow them to assign as needed.

Does the sample Screener export file contain the fields that you are wanting?

- MI-Some people may not know how to use Excel (how to collapse fields). Perhaps list overall score listed first, followed by composite, followed by domain scores. Don't force people to read through irrelevant information.
- MN-Agree with Jen. Overall score should be shown first. Then break up into domain/composite scores. T should become N.
- Beth-Would there be confusion when you are trying to match up printed scores with the spreadsheet?
- MI-Good point. Fields appear differently for me than on the WIDA calculator. Need a user's group for reports. How confusing is this for people?
- MN-Can you take this to focus group?
- Beth-Yes, will gather feedback.
- MN-The person pulling the data file is not the same person looking at the ISR.
- Beth-Is everyone comfortable with A-K?
- MN-Date of birth is not included, which is a concern. Some students don't have SSID.
- Field is not on ISR, which is why it isn't included.
- MI-A field is missing on the Word document. Unique DRC ID is missing.
- Beth-We should look at the spreadsheet. Unique DRC ID should not be included as a field.
- MA-Would also like to see date of birth. Need to comparatively look at Screener and ACCESS scores. Leave subsequent columns as they are since they align with current export format for ACCESS.
- Beth-Are start and end dates important for Screener?
- MN-Are there instances when the test extends over 2 days?
- Beth-Yes, this does happen. May be helpful to filter by start and end dates.
- MN-Need a test date, just not sure we need 2 dates.
- Beth-Maybe we just need start date.
- MN-How many start on one day and complete on another day?
- MO-Leave it. This gives you an example of how long the test takes.
- MI-Leave it as it. If SEA sees gap between start and end date, would follow-up with district.
- Beth-Is everyone comfortable that you only see the last administered score within an administration?
- MO-If scores are corrected, are previous scores erased?
- Beth-You would see last update made to record. Will check with DRC on this.
- MI-SEA wants to accept the first version of the summative assessment. Not sure if this concept holds true for Screener.

- MO-States could make their own decision on this. Why would a student take more than once? I would want every record of the assessment.
- Mark-Students moving across districts within a state may be assessed more than once.
- MO-Would be worried if student was screened twice in same district.
- MN-Agree. If possible, keep every record if it was administered more than once.
- Kristen-Unique DRC ID was an oversight, will not be included.
- MO-Does anyone want to see accommodations or demographics in the data file? These can be captured but are not required to be marked.
- MN-We wouldn't capture this.
- GA-No.
- MI-No.
- FL-No.

Next Steps/Action Items:
- Include guidance for downloading CSV file in user guide.
- Bring order of fields to focus group.
- Follow-up with DRC to see if corrected scores erase the previously submitted scores.