

Public Meeting
 Section 610.02
 Revised Statutes of Missouri

October 1, 2018 1:00-1:30

205 Jefferson Street
 6th Floor Commissioner Conference Room
 Jefferson City, MO 65101

TEACHER ADVISORY				
Scott Clithero	St. Louis College Prep		Sara Kempker	Cole Co. R-I
Megan Vallis	Lindbergh Schools		Jordan McGaughry	Rockwood R-VI
Leanne Cope	Aurora R-VIII		Darbie Valenti	St. Joseph
Tracy Brosch	Hancock Place		Deborah Siebern	St Joseph
Linda Glasgow	University of Central Missouri		Erin Nash	North Kansas City 74
Dan Garrison	Raymore-Peculiar R-II		Darren Morgan	Joplin Schools
Ed Kappeler	Meramec Valley R-III			
AUDIENCE				
Melinda Felton	Columbia 93			
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION				
Roger Dorson	Interim Commissioner			
Robin Coffman	Chief of Staff			
Nancy Bowles	Communications Coordinator			
Blaine Henningsen	Assistant Commissioner			
Lisa Sireno	Standards and Assessment Administrator			
Chris Neale	Assistant Commissioner			
Kevin Freeman	School Improvement Director			
Ron Wilken	School Improvement Area Supervisor			
Mike Wutke	School Improvement Area Supervisor			

SURVEY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. Ten kids below basic and I move them to basic, new data will make a more positive results rather than I still have ten kids under basic.
2. Do you feel the process was bias based on income, because some people cannot afford to be off in the summer to participate in the collaboration process?
3. Did we make the top of the scale score high enough?
4. Was there a benefit to the test company under the past administration, current government or past government testing company had some kind of arraignment with them, kick back?
5. Public Image? Need to make it clearer.
6. Environment has had many up's and down's over the few years hold harmless, assessment tools, vendor problems with assessment, cut scores, and realignment, ACT and standards. As an educator, I am concerned that political environment has been very negative of public education. Are we going to throw another wrench in there that is going to degrade how public schools perform? Reports/sides education is doing the worst jobs; public education is failing our kids, and the use for vouchers and private schools. Do you feel like there should be some concerns with that? Now tinkering with cut scores. Afraid there is perception that may result that public education is not looking as effective as it truly is.
7. Do we have a revised timeline?
8. Scale score; will the four brackets be gone?
9. What process did they use to determine what a year's worth of growth on that scale looks like?
10. We will not have that date of growth until next year, right.
11. Do you have a timeline on the release of scores?
12. Government scores counted this year online public items, correct.
13. Does the district have to pay anything for testing?

Public Meeting
 Section 610.02
 Revised Statutes of Missouri

October 2, 2018 11:00-3:00

Holiday Inn Executive Center
 2200 Interstate 70 Dr. SW
 Columbia, MO 65203

MOASSP BOARD	
Keith White	Dallas Co. R-I
Jennifer Strauser	Rockwood R-VI
Robert Bowers	Lathrop R-II
John Faulkenberry	Lee's Summit R-VII
Brandon Harding	Cole Camp R-I
Valerie Todd	St. Mary's St. Louis
Chris Hoehne	St. Genevieve R-II
Marc Spunangle	Lincoln R-II
Ed Gettemeier	St. Charles R-VI
Kevin Lowery	Lebanon R-III
Jeff Meisenheimer	Lee's Summit R-VII
Jim Pritchett	Rolla 31
Andy Croly	Ferguson Florissant R-II
Kathryn Greer	Francis Howell R-III
Dan Hecht	Scott Co R-IV
Scott Daly	Hallsville R-IV
AUDIENCE	
Randy Maglinger	Independence 30
Sherri Bertrand	Wentzville R-IV
John Kitchens	Riverview Gardens
Adam Smith	Ferguson Florissant R-II
Jennifer Kaiser	Ferguson Florissant R-II
Tiffany Besse	Ferguson Florissant R-II
Rebecca Prokopf	Ferguson Florissant R-II
Kevin Voepel	Ferguson Florissant R-II
Dana Clippard	Ed Counsel
Jan Mees	Columbia 93
Katie Roe	Hickman Mills C-1
Ken Bailey	Moberly
David Brothers	Francis Howell R-III
Andy Hall	Platte County R-III
Jeff Klein	Park Hill
Michael Marriott	Morgan Co. R-I
Carter Snow	Parkway C-II
Craig Dierking	Blue Springs R-IV
Scott Spurgeon	Riverview Gardens
Brett Lacking	Park Hill
Kevin Morrison	Willard R-II
Shaun Fischer	Eldon R-I
Kris Harwood	Eldon R-I
Abby Volmer	Odessa R-VII
Scott Gemes	Otterville R-VI
Andy Wright	Belton #124
Laura Gibson	Belton #124
Jennifer Waters	Fort Zumwalt R-II
Chris Marshall	Morgan Co. R-II
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION	
Blaine Henningsen	Assistant Commissioner
Lisa Sireno	Standards and Assessment Administrator
Chris Neale	Assistant Commissioner

SURVEY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. Examine effect or status (i.e. scaled score) regarding the new test and established cut scores and impact data.
2. Opportunity to see changes and support data from FY 2016-17 to FY 2017-18.
3. Still do not know when scores will be out for districts.
4. Teachers English Language Arts (ELA) did not see the impact the new cut scores would have. They did not show a graph comparing 2017 to 2018. Teachers report that they did not listened to then during work session and felt bullied by leaders from Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and Data Recognition Corporation (DRC)/Questar. They did not address any of this.
5. Educators feel as they were not given all the information and going forward are not interested in participating, as they no longer trust the process in our state.
6. Some issues surrounding assessment literacy:
 - a) include item type(s) on Individual Student Report's (ISR's)
 - b) include skills/practices on ISR's if applicable
 - c) Local Education Agency's generally focus solely on content
7. Push back on the forces enacting the changes, which influence the dismay among districts.
8. We need timely and detailed feedback on assessments. Teachers are frustrated with the lack of feedback.
9. Thank you for the meeting!
10. Please continue to listen to the individualized cases we present to evolve our system to serve all students (such as with the attendance data)
11. Please hold steadfast to the commitment to return End of Course (EOC) data within the semester.
12. Please continue to work towards the return of more meaningful IAR data and individualized student data.
13. Thank you for the opportunity to have a voice.
14. Thank you for taking the time to be here with us.
15. Find a way to put transfer students in the second semester of their senior year, consider not counted as data. Give schools the opportunity to reclassify transfer students to a special group that will not count for data.
16. Thank you for coming, sharing, and being transparent. There is no comfort in "we will see what the data looks like."
17. Parents and the board of education for my district specially care about proficient and advanced. The cut scores as presented would indicate that less than half of our students are being adequately prepared for future success. These cut scores as presented are painting Missouri as a failing state. Our students and teachers do not deserve these cut scores as presented.
18. Thank you for being willing and available for the collaborative discussion. I have a better understanding of the process and statutes of ELA. Math cut scores and Missouri School Improvement Program Six (MSIP6) timelines. Please consider the graduation calculation to better reflect the realities of schools (rural specifically) to promote doing what is best for transfer and not hurt schools and districts as disproportionately. We greatly appreciate

this opportunity to learn and discuss this material and direction of our states education accountability system.

19. Educators from my district that participated in bookmarking reported they felt pressured to set cut scores the way DESE/Questar/DRC wanted. They also felt that decisions were being made by educators that did not fully understand the standards and content.
20. Teachers felt pressured to align cut scores to National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). They allowed all teachers to leave. Leaders had to stay and decide on the cut scores.
21. Yes, but sounds as if pressure was applied to increase cut scores.
22. I am concerned about the ability to show growth on "advanced" students from year to year.
23. I am concerned that teachers felt pressured to increase rigger as command to national data when historically they have had that information.
24. I believe we need to go back to bookmarking and establish new cut scores. I feel the educators involved felt pressure to align these bookmarks to NAEP.
25. Information clearly delivered. I am leaving with a lot to consider.
26. Score people claim they felt pressure to set test scores at certain levels. In fact they said when they turned cut scores in they were given them back and told to look at comparison data.
27. The presenters were open and willing to try to address all questions given.
28. Very interested in high school graduation when students move in late and especially in small school. Big effect on graduation rate.
29. Really like the idea of giving credit for student growth through formative assessment provided by school districts.
30. Thank you for your time and explanation.
31. Audience seems confused between current realities vs. possible changes w/ MSIP6. I find the discussion about using growth within a year in mudding the water.
32. Please make the information returned to schools and students as specific as possible.
33. Please address the issue surrounding seniors who transfer schools, which they brought up in the meeting. The issue comes when a receiving school must that a senior who has no chance of graduating. These students end up counting against the schools graduation rate.
34. Much of what was explained regarding
 - a) The return of results,
 - b) revised components of Missouri School Improvement Program Five (MSIP5) Annual Percentage Rate, and
 - c) components of MSIP6 are significant improvements and reflect a great deal of work to continually improve by the department. Job well done.
35. Is there any way to disseminate this information prior to the start of the impacted school year?
36. For MSIP6, If districts internal assessments aligned to Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)/Missouri Learning Standards (MLS), like Galileo, Evaluate, Student Achievement in Reading (STAR), show one year of growth will this or can it be factored into the measure of growth for a district? We understand that the MAP, Grade Level Assessments and EOCs has be given per Every Student Succeeds Act.
37. I want to discuss graduation rate and how it is calculated, When we think about the four year cohort group is it possible to have a graduation rate calculated that does not figure in

the students that move into your district their senior year that are behind on credits? I continually get "move ins" that are enrolled for a few weeks then they drop out and never go anywhere else. I do not feel that a student as described should effect my graduation rate. Thank you for what you do.

38. Graduation rate. I work in a small district and every year we have five-six seniors move in second semester with either no ACT, Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) or like score, along w/no-dual credit classes or Testing Site Manager (TSM), but if I graduate them all of those things count against me. Can we do them like testing and so they are not there all year they do not count against us.
39. "One year's of growth" Is there any way possible to proportional scale scores to have more consistent scores to understand the "years of growth"? (This refers to combos with Board members Mr. Lowery and Mr. Spunangle questions earlier.)
40. Why can we not determine category (cut) scores BEFORE students take exams? Cut score determination, if we wait for completion of exams to be completed then we measure student vs. student. We are to compare student to benchmark levels. Scale scores should be determined and published before exams are given to students. Classroom analogy-do we expect students to perform task without a rubric or even if we create a rubric after they do the task? No, we set a rubric and measure students to the rubric before the student perform the task.
41. Was MAP vs. NAEP performance comparing Missouri to Missouri or was it Missouri vs. National?
42. Discussion about counting graduates. How many move out that would also effect results?
43. Could the state build an online, secure student-level tool so we could see performance levels or other IARs across all districts so we can see previous performance across the state for a single student? Not everyone is skilled in evaluation to see local from IARs.

Public Meeting
 Section 610.02
 Revised Statutes of Missouri

October 3, 2018 9:00-12:00

Jefferson Building 13th Floor
 205 Jefferson Street
 Jefferson City, MO 65101

MARE			
Neal Weitzel	KC	Tim Maddex	Shelby Co. R-IV
Renee Sagaser	Fair Play R-II	Kyle Kruse	St. Clair R-XIII
Roblyn Melton	Farmington R-VII	Alicia Morgan	Mirabile C-1
Wayne Stewart	Glenwood R-VIII	Jessica Smith	Morgan Co. R-I
John Dunham	Macon Co. R-IV	Sam Duncan	New Madrid Co. R-I
Jason Price	Miller Co. R-III		
AUDIENCE			
Lori England	Park Hills	Theresa Christian	El Dorado Springs R-II
Tosha Whitter	Doniphan R-I	Christopher Felmlee	Southern Boone Co. R-I
Michael Neill	Ft. Zumwalt R-II	Molly Roe	Morgan Co. R-I
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION			
Blaine Henningsen	Assistant Commissioner college and Career Readiness		
Lisa Sireno	Standards and Assessment Administrator		
Chris Neale	Assistant Commissioner Office of Quality Schools		
Shelly Aubuchon	Area Supervisor		
Jocelyn Strand	Coordinator		
Norma Anderson	Supervisor		
Kevin Freeman	Director		

SURVEY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. I hate Annual Performance Report (APR) digits!
2. Missouri Educators were involved in the process of helping to determine performance level cut score. Still wondering if cuts are already a done deal before today's meeting I understand that our input is sought, but I may have misunderstood the answer Lisa gave! I appreciate the work you all do.
3. Missouri School Improvement Program Five (MSIP5) is what it is!
4. February is a long time and data is useless at that point!
5. Teacher burn out is a concern because of all of changes and pressures. Teachers are not staying the field.
6. Growth model would be good for assessments.
7. I think we are moving in the right direction. I would like to see all the changes to stop at this baseline so that schools can begin to start working towards solid goals and targets.
8. The idea of moving towards a growth model is so much better and mimics what our schools are already doing. We celebrate growth daily.
9. Cut scores-It would seem that there could be a math based was (standard curve, standard deviation) to set cuts based on annual data. Possibly looking at historical scoring.
10. Discussion made on the ACT (English, Reading, and Math) benchmark. I would like to see Missouri reflect that in our proficiencies and do not see how ACT determine these benchmarks.
11. I understand the process of producing cut scores but would still like to develop a statistical method to set those.
12. The longer it takes to get the results the less valid they become to use for the reason many feel are the only reasons to give standard test.
13. Based on what was presented today, I agree.
14. Very informative
15. Timely data would assist with APR and cut scores. Most people do not understand the process for scores.
16. Interim Assessments could help improve growth and improve instruction they need to be a way to incorporate into the process.
17. Thank you for today's time to do this.
18. Not convinced that National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is an appropriate test to use for alignment.
19. No Commissioner of Education seat has ever determined an achievement levels to be reasonable valid!
20. Not sent by educators
21. Please keep Missouri Growth Model!
22. I was part of the cut score process. We were told that our "bookmark" cuts should be closely matched to NAEP scores (When we were way off we were told to change). Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) staff cut teachers off when we questioned things. Actually became rude and told our group we had one job to do and asking questions was not part of it. I feel the teachers asked to help with cut scores just so DRC and Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) could say teachers had input.
23. Content provided went beyond the understanding of what this meeting would be. That is

- ok, although I was slightly alarmed because of worry about lack of time for questions.
24. Thanks for holding the meeting. Allows us to answer questions for a number of others who are asking.
 25. Fell a bit heavy on CYA (justifying what we have done). Maybe it is as easy as addressing it up front. State why we cannot completely redo the bookmarking process. No need, same result. APR delay until May!
 26. Thank you!
 27. Concerns about students who have to take tests that are not on their reading ability. Is there a way we can access students so they have a fair chance to be successful on the assessment?
 28. Does Missouri School Improvement Program Six (MSIP6) look at monthly assessment such as E-evaluate?
 29. Will DESE release memos to media explaining “Reset” of test scores?
 30. Since we are “resetting” test scores, why aren’t we “resetting” Annual Performance categories?
 31. Will Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) ever look at the impact of schools that have few students and the impact percentage they have on APR?

Public Meeting
 Section 610.02
 Revised Statutes of Missouri

October 9, 2018 9:00-12:00

Governor's Office Building
 200 Madison Street, Room 460
 Jefferson City, MO 65101

MASA			
Chris Fine	Lathrop R-II	Matt Ruble	Farmington R-VII
Curtis Cain	Wentzville R-IV	Brett Reutzel	Fredericktown R-I
Jon Earnhart	Crawford Co. R-II	Doug Hayter	MASA
Kari Monsees	Raymore-Peculiar R-II	Andy Turgeon	Knox Co. R-I
Michael Whittaker	Steelville R-III	Russ Keith	Liberty Utilities
David Russell	Success R-VI	Brian Shindorf	Jefferson City
Cheta Shelton	Success R-VI	Russ Moreland	Monett R-I
Musa Haroon	Liberty Utilities	Craig Carson	Ozark R-VI
Eric Knost	Rockwood R-VI	Troy Marnholtz	Chilhowee R-IV
Richard Asbill	Cassville R-IV	Darin Ford	Centralia R-VI
Susan Crooks	Leeton R-X	Matt Goodman	Pattonville R-III
Allan Markley	Raytown C-2	Jeff Levy	Lexington R-V
Roger Schmitz	Lawson R-XIV		
AUDIENCE			
Nicky Kemp	North Callaway Co. R-I	Mike Schooley	MAESP
Gayle Timm	North Callaway Co. R-I	Tiffany Gosseen	Wellsville-Middletown R-I
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION			
Blaine Henningsen	Assistant Commissioner		
Lisa Sireno	Standards and Assessment Administrator		
Lisa Scroggs	Assistant Director English Language Arts		
Steve Schellman	Assistant Director Assessment		
Chris Neale	Assistant Commissioner		
Tim Ricker	Area Supervisor		
Nancy Greeley	Area Supervisor		
Jill Janes	Area Supervisor		
Michael Harris	Senior Policy Advisor		

SURVEY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. Would have been beneficial to include more leaders and organizational leaders in this process.
2. We have outstanding groups. Involve everyone; communicate so we can help communicate with our communities.
3. It was said “the next time” we will do better. I feel like this means the process is complete.
4. Anytime we share ideas, it is beneficial.
5. There are questions, serious questions and frustration with us getting cut scores. Reconsideration of the cut scores.
6. Purpose of the meeting is clear, but I am not sure it aligns to the concerns represented by school leaders.
7. Efforts to validate the original teacher input (250) seems to be lacking.
8. Remains to be seen.
9. I appreciate the opportunity to attend this meeting. I must say that the policy committee seems to be driving the train much like it did when Nicastro was at the realm. I will say that the transparency is better but I am worried what the results may be the same.
10. We have a chance to help districts help students with Missouri School Improvement Program Six (MSIP6). Let us get this right.
11. You all did a nice job of explaining the process and background and details with the work. I have a much better understanding. I feel like I can explain to others.
12. Thank you for the additional information. I appreciate the effort to open up the process. Given the timing of Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)/End of Course (EOC)/Annual Performance Report (APR) release, perhaps we should suspend the release of APR's for one year. That will allow for both time to clarify the process/impact and provide districts more time to facilitate improvement based on real data.
13. Thanks for the time.
14. I question the 2.5% growth piece. Not sure that we want to go back to the No Child Left Behind stage.
15. Cut scores may need to be re-worked.
16. Needed process time, not sure we could process this quickly enough.
17. Make process transparent for all involved.
18. Appreciate the opportunity to discuss advance plans and goals.
19. Tough process...Thanks for admitting error and taking feedback.
20. Not sure, the next step...Hopefully collaborative steps. Note: I greatly appreciate your effort, sometime disagree but we must collaborate.
21. Would encourage you to get follow up feedback from original workgroup. Do they still support their original findings?
22. Process used to determine performance level cut scores. I am honestly still not sure.
23. I believe the process was rushed. July-August, specifically a short week segment for policy and Technical Advisory Committee appears rubber-stamped.
24. Please set cut scores and keep them unchanged for the duration of the assessment.
25. APR should focus on growth yes, but not with a prescribed target range. Grade & Performance measures should be evaluated locally.
26. Process used to determine performance level cut scores. Not sure if the process was

followed with fidelity though.

27. The information provided was clear and to the point. To the extent it's available.
28. Missouri Educators were involved in the process of helping to determine performance level cut scores. Still not 100% on how consensus was not reached but scores established.
29. This is a complex and difficult topic, which often gets very technical. Please always remember that in your approach to fundamentally educate and provide information. Pretty good today.
30. Agree they were "involved" not sure; they were fully communicated with and fully understood.
31. May need to examine reasonable communication and committee leadership strategies.
32. Appreciate the "honesty points" that is respected and appreciated. We have all been there.
33. Appreciate the opportunity for Missouri Association of School Administrators to be heard.
34. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) needs to focus on support more than compliance.
35. I like the idea mentioned of providing an internal benchmark on percentage of students at each level on previous MAP tests and EOC exams.
36. Everyone would benefit from this presentation.
37. MAP and EOC do not measure the quality of our schools.
38. There is more to the big picture than assessment.
39. I feel there was outside pressure to conform. I do not believe the change in scores is relevant or representation of the opinion of educators.
40. Process for cut scores, is there consideration for a possible re-do of the cut scores? Please consider!
41. Can we have reconsideration of the cut scores?
42. In simplest terms, it seems to be that the rigor has changed/increased with the process that can be shown as to where the bookmarks fell. As an example, say below basic-to-basic fell after item nine on previous assessments but now it is after item 16. I still am not clear as to why that is now the basic criteria. What is different? If you can help myself and others understand that, their fact may go a long way.
43. Is there a consideration for revisiting the process completely setting cut scores with a blank slate or just going to the policy type cuts?
44. Missouri School Improvement Program Five (MSIP5) changes was Missouri School Improvement Program Six (MSIP6) Every Student Succeeds Act.
45. Missouri Educators "were involved", respectfully, this question is easy to answer in the affirmative. The better question how much were they involved, fairly involved, etc.?
46. "Can't compare scores year to year", but we are going to "Don't compare at the kid level": But we need to get each kid to improve and how does DESE measure if each kid improves?
47. Not that I think they need to change, but what is the likelihood DESE may go back and look at the cut scores again?
48. "Honesty Gap". Does DESE believe 25% of all 3rd-EOC are below basic in Math?
49. What percent does 150 teachers represent of Missouri educators? Is this a statistically significant representation?
50. With such a focus on formative assessments, has DESE considered a true growth model for assessments?

51. What percentage of Missouri Students take the National Assessment of Educational Progress assessment at each grade level?
52. Can we use individual student growth assessments to evaluate actual meaningful growth?
(3rd-10th in English Language Arts and Math)

Public Meeting
 Section 610.02
 Revised Statutes of Missouri

October 9, 2018 1:00-4:00

Governor's Office Building
 200 Madison Street, Room 460
 Jefferson City, MO 65101

MAESP				
Kelly Warren	Savannah R-III		Kasi Meyer	New Haven
Rachelle Jennings	Lebanon R-III		Heather Mueller	Sullivan
Michelle Schmitz	Liberty 53		Aaron Burd	Union R-XI
Mary Kleekamp	Rockwood R-VI		Mike Schooley	MAESP
Monica Shane	Fort Osage R-I		Michelle Kratofil	Smithville R-II
Julie Schubert	Windsor C-1		Mond Reid	Appleton City R-II
Jason Steingraber	Springfield R-XII		Joe Dunlap	Appleton City R-II
AUDIENCE				
Carla Moberly	Lebanon R-III		Gary Verslues	Jefferson City
Jay Roth	Lebanon R-III		Mike Schrimpf	Premier Charter Schools
Deann Clawson	Fort Osage R-I			
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION				
Blaine Henningsen	Assistant Commissioner			
Lisa Sireno	Standards and Assessment Administrator			
Joan Jarrett	Assistant Director Assessment			
Chris Neale	Assistant Commissioner			
Justin Thomas	Research Analyst-Data Management			
Nancy Greeley	Area Supervisor			

SURVEY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. It is concerning that the policy level committee only spent one day.
2. Bring the cut score committee back together and give the full picture, have them reset.
3. Do not post scores this year. Just keep them internally.
4. Delay the scores long enough until next year's scores are out.
5. Major concerns regarding cut scores though it is going to embarrass schools and cause public adversities for our school, which we can avoid.
6. Perceived concerns within committee members themselves.
7. I need performance level descriptors far in advance for my staff to see before assessment ever are given.
8. Take back to policy committee.
9. Look at content! All groups! It is important.
10. Three phases of cut scores setting
 - a) Teacher/content determination
 - b) Policy review
 - c) Technical Advisory Committee
11. Remaining concern to explain differences in student cohort performance (potentially gross differences) to 2016-17/2015-16
12. Unknown discrepancies between cut scores of three groups.
13. Hard to judge "reasonableness" not knowing how these differing groups affected cut scores setting.
14. Looking at moving ahead: I felt the policy committee provided thoughtful insight on how assessments are used. What we need from our assessments and the true meaning and impact as assessments. Perhaps reconvene to look at new innovative future needs as a mentoring group. That group also needs equal distribution representation of all building, district and college level.
15. Policy impact was not reasonable to me.
16. Some sort of communication from the state dept. to our stockholders about the process.
17. Missouri educators were involved in the process of helping to determine performance level cut scores but we do not effectively utilize all layers of the process.
18. I feel that some questions were unanswered.
19. Policy group needs more than one day plus more than ten people.
20. What about using local assessments (diagnostic) to show growth and progress.
21. The actual numbers of current public school educators included in the cut scores process is miniscule looking at the actual number of educators in each grade level and content area.
22. Would like to see more bookmark team to be composed off current teachers.
23. Would like to have Performance Level Descriptors as soon as possible!
24. Please reconvene the policy review team and provide more time to consider the benchmark work in addition to emphasizing and educating the team on the merits of criteria-referenced assessments.
25. Thank you for your time plus for allowing us this opportunity to engage.

26. Give the original bookmark groups the percentage of students on previous Missouri tests as another benchmark.
27. Re-examine cut scores as compared to previous Missouri tests.
28. During the meeting, a policy committee member raised questions about the process. If there is so many questions about the process, why do we not revisit the process before we release scores? It is troubling that a committee member questions the process.
29. I want to know how to proceed with educating the students. We give expectations that are to push students into being stronger educationally. Is this what we are truly assessing? Will this make them better leaders in society?

Public Meeting
 Section 610.02
 Revised Statutes of Missouri

October 10, 2018 1:00-4:00

JCK State Information Center
 600 West Main Street Room 139
 Jefferson City, MO 65101

AFT/MNEA/MSTA				
Beth Anderson	Canton R-V		Dee Ann Aull	MNEA
Mike Wood	MSTA		Ann Jarrett	MNEA
Amy Dunn	Ozark R-VI		Don Sutcliffe	Grandview C-4
Marea Hayter	MSTA		Otto Fajen	MNEA
Amelia Fizer	Warsaw R-IX			
AUDIENCE				
Christopher Hand	Liberty 53		Shelly Flippen	Jefferson City
Pam Carte	NE RPDC –Truman			
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION				
Blaine Henningsen	Assistant Commissioner			
Lisa Sireno	Standards and Assessment Administrator			
Debbie Jameson	Director English Language Arts			
Lisa Scroggs	Assistant Director English Language Arts			
Kristen McKinney	Director Science			
Chip Sharp	Director Mathematics			
Chris Neale	Assistant Commissioner			
Walt Brown	Area Supervisor			
Kevin Freeman	Director			

SURVEY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. Cut scores are irrelevant until we have a way to create student buy in.
2. I feel there should have been more educators involved in the cut scores. Maybe two groups of 10-12 to provide more checks and balances. Cut scores are an incredibly important part of the process.
3. Consider at least a two years worth of data to adjust cut scores.
4. This meeting felt more like a formality needed for the state board. In your language used, I do not feel like you intended to change anything.
5. The meeting was informative on the process.
6. Concerned with the level of disagreement in some of the committees. Some had one day to discuss the information put in front of them.
7. The process has a good format, but I feel improvements can be made to insure fidelity.
8. Consider lowering cut scores slightly for first year.
9. Timeline for releasing data is not realistic to positively impact instruction/student performance on the next testing cycle.
10. Ideas for release of data to public in the most positive light. Not focusing on the previous levels of achievement.
11. Please do not assume all districts have implemented an effective assessment program of their own. This is not the reality in all smaller district.
12. Use two years of data prior to release performance levels.
13. Consider three performance levels and do performance levels actually describe where a student is performing.
14. DESE needs to be seen more as a culture of support US compliance. More work needs to be done on this. Getting better.
15. Use previous Missouri Assessment Program performance levels as internal benchmark.
16. Correlate formative assessments with achievement levels.
17. If scores are not released until the spring of 2019, then 2018-19 results should also not be used to change/lower the classification of a school district.
18. The 2/3-1/3 average of historical scores should also apply to 2018-19, and 1/3-2/3 reverse of that be moved to 2019-20.
19. Create a website that keeps updated regarding the process include talking points, process, etc.
20. If questions are numbered highest to lowest. Is it possible that a later reading passage will be easier for a segment of the students? Would this skew the data? Proficient readers may have trouble vs a certain type of writing.
21. Any plans to update the vocabulary book used to check readability of passages.
22. Accountability based on 2018-19 scores will not reflect adjustment of curriculum in relationship to 2017-18 scores due to late release. Can this be delayed as an accountability factor?

Public Meeting
 Section 610.02
 Revised Statutes of Missouri

October 11, 2018 8:30-10:30

JCK State Information Center
 600 West Main Street Room 139
 Jefferson City, MO 65101

DHE and Higher Education Reps				
Rusty Monhollon	MDHE		Tamela Randolph	SEMO
Stephanie VanRhein	UMKC		Lyndsey Strahan	ITC
Kevin Hopkins	SBU		Trisha White	OTC
Erik Anderson	MDHE		Lauren Kieschnick	MAC
Tracy Welch	NCMC		Kim Granger	STLCC
Donna Kessler	MACC			
AUDIENCE				
Mark Basi	University City		Dustin Belt	University of MO Columbia
Sally Newell	Center 58			
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION				
Blaine Henningsen	Assistant Commissioner			
Lisa Sireno	Standards and Assessment Administrator			
Chip Sharp	Director Mathematics			
Chris Neale	Assistant Commissioner			

SURVEY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. My time was well spent attending the meeting. Only because I have become better informed.
2. Please take care to communicate to counselors, students, and families what scores mean.
3. Let us continue to monitor cut scores to ensure they honestly communicate student readiness for college.
4. Personally, I think the purpose of the exam should be well defined. I do not think it should have anything to do with college readiness or predict student success. I feel like the exam should focus on bettering our teachers and schools. I love the idea of growth model.
5. I was under the impression that I was invited to discuss and give feedback on the performance levels and definitions sent prior to the meeting. However, the meeting was very informative as far the process that was used to develop these levels and labels. Ultimately, students end up in my classes if they are college graduates and they expect to succeed. Clarify of communication should be priority as stated in the meeting. In other words, will students understand how to interpret the scores?
6. I thought we would have more discussions on the subject matter. Where to include those scores.
7. I do agree that the cut scores of proficient should indicate the college success rate and preparedness.
8. I was glad to see that students are being encouraged to consider career choices/options early in their high school career. If that information were paired with proficiency levels, used to counsel the student and encourage them to adjust their approach to education, it would be beneficial.
9. Please look at evaluating the effectiveness of the bookmark method of ready standards.

Public Meeting
 Section 610.02
 Revised Statutes of Missouri

October 11, 2018 11:00-1:00

Conference Call 573-526-5808/866-630-9351

MSBA LEADERSHIP AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS				
Susan Goldammer	MSBA		Dr. Charles Taylor	Springfield
Brent Ghan	MSBA		Lori Prussman	St. Joseph
Gerry Lee	MSBA		Patti Mansar	Kansas City
John McConnell	Kirksville		Amy Clenenmen	Webster Groves
AUDIENCE				
Julie Esquivel	Kirksville R-III		Melissa Lampe	MO School for the Blind
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION				
Blaine Henningsen	Assistant Commissioner			
Lisa Sireno	Standards and Assessment Administrator			
Chris Neale	Assistant Commissioner			
YaYa Badji	Supervisor, Quality Schools			

SURVEY COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. I really appreciate being invited to this conference call. I learned a lot about the process, which helps me to explain it to others. School board members focus a lot on these numbers. It helps to understand where they come from.
2. I did not answer the question about Missouri educators being involved in helping to determine cut scores because I do not have personal knowledge of this. That said I do believe that Missouri educators were extensively involved in the process.
3. Good job on the conference call today. Very informative.
4. The call was instructive and we appreciate being included.