

**DRAFT**  
**VIRGINIA SOL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**CREATED ON OCTOBER 24, 2002**

**DATE:** October 17-18, 2002

**LOCATION:** Richmond, Virginia

**DAY 1: MORNING**

**ATTENDEES**

Dr. Ronald Hambleton, Chairperson  
Dr. Linda Crocker, Member  
Dr. Barbara Plake, Member  
Dr. Barbara Dodd, Member  
Dr. John Poggio, Member  
Ms. Shelley Loving-Ryder, Virginia Department of Education  
Dr. Robert Triscari, Virginia Department of Education  
Dr. Tracy Cerrillo, Harcourt Educational Measurement  
Ms. Cheryl Schiano, Harcourt Educational Measurement  
Mr. Rich Maraschiello, Harcourt Educational Measurement

**OBSERVERS**

Jason Wermers, Richmond Times-Dispatch  
Jonathan Pier, Prentice-Hall  
Roxanne Grossman, citizen  
Mickey Vanderwerker, citizen

**AGENDA**

Linda Crocker opened the meeting with a discussion of the agenda<sup>1</sup>. One of the TAC committee members indicated that the February minutes made a reference to a future discussion of scale drift and diagnostic scores, and that it should be noted for a future discussion.

**FEBRUARY MINUTES**

Linda Crocker asked for a motion to approve the minutes. The panel members had a few minor comments on pages 3, 4, 7, and 8. The February minutes were approved as amended.

**VALIDITY STUDIES**

Linda Crocker asked Shelly Loving-Ryder to give an overview of the status of the impact studies. Shelly Loving-Ryder indicated that contracting with William and Mary did not work out. Instead the VA Department of Education (VDOE) contracted with Standards Work for the first series of studies. VDOE is providing them with the data to be analyzed. Barbara Plake said that the TAC will not be meeting in February, and that this impact study report will be available in January, she would like the VDOE to circulate the report so that the TAC can review it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ron Hambleton was late to the meeting due to a cancelled flight. He arrived at 10am.

**DRAFT**  
**VIRGINIA SOL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**CREATED ON OCTOBER 24, 2002**

**COMPARABILITY STUDY**

There was a discussion that the first comparability study would be used as a template for future designs. Given that, Linda Crocker felt that the TAC needed to attend to the details of the first comparability study document. She added that that the TAC should be looking at the substantive content of the analyses, rather than at grammatical issues etc. The committee took a working break for an hour from 9:30 to 10:30 to review the two comparability studies.

Ron Hambleton arrived and opened the meeting after the break at 10:30. Linda Crocker asked Robert Triscari if he could give the TAC an overview of the study and walk them through it. Robert Triscari began walking the TAC through the study. Ron Hambleton moved on to discuss the goals of the study. He said that the study needed to describe the demographic variables in more detail. The discussion surrounding the methodology and results continued. There was a long discussion about how the calibrations should be done. The TAC adjourned for lunch for 12:15 to 1:15.

**DAY 1: AFTERNOON**

After lunch Ron Hambleton began the meeting with a discussion about the big picture regarding the move from pencil and paper to computer. The basic question of interest is whether examinees are going to advantaged or disadvantaged as a result of this move to the computer delivery. The TAC discussed the calibration methodology at length. The committee reiterated on a number of occasions that detailed information demographics and descriptive statistics need to be provided in the report.

Day 1 adjourned at approximately 3:45.

**DAY 2: MORNING**

Day 2 was called to order by Ron Hambleton at 8:30am.

**PRE-EQUATING**

Ron Hambleton asked Robert Triscari to walk the TAC through his report on paper on pre- vs. post equated item parameters for the Standards of Learning tests. The discussion began with the results of the Algebra II theta estimation analyses. Robert Triscari explained that he looked at pre- and post-equated theta values along with their difference scores, pre- and post-equated scale scores along with their difference scores, and post-equated conditional standard error of theta and post equated standard error of the scale scores. Ron Hambleton acknowledged that differences seemed quite small. The TAC acknowledged that similar results were found for the Biology analyses.

Next, the TAC discussed the item parameter estimations. The TAC commented that there was more variation in the in the item parameters for the older items, but they were generally pleased that they were very stable overall. Ron Hambleton suggested that Robert Triscari add some additional information to this table including: p-values, point biserial correlations, item position, and misfit statistics for both administrations.

The committee then examined some classical analyses of the items. Ron Hambleton noted that all of the point biserials were quite high. Linda Crocker concurred. She indicated that there was no

**DRAFT**  
**VIRGINIA SOL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**CREATED ON OCTOBER 24, 2002**

evidence that there are any items on the test that a large pocket of students have not been exposed to. Linda Crocker said that there was clear evidence that the content is being taught and that kids are learning.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15.