Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium:
Work Group Structure & Governance
Overview of Smarter Balanced Work Groups
This document provides important information related to the work groups that support and oversee the development of the Smarter Balanced assessment system. Work groups are a fundamental part of the program’s development and implementation approach and leverage the expertise, leadership, and resources within the Member States. True to the philosophy driving Smarter Balanced, State Education Agency (SEA) staff, and members of the higher education community comprise the work groups; participation of all states is essential to the success of our Consortium.

The information contained in this document is intended to explain the work group structure and provide high-level descriptions for each work group. As launched, each work group, with the support of WestEd as Project Management Partner (PMP), develops and maintains its respective work plans, deliverables, meeting schedules, status tracking, and issue management.

The following sections of the document are:

I. Work Group Structure and Governance
   a. Composition
   b. Overall Responsibilities
   c. Communication
   d. Decision-Making

II. Work Group Master List

III. Individual Work Group Definitions

Appendix A: Work Group Change Process
I. Work Group Structure and Governance

a. Composition

The work groups are composed of representatives from all Member States and may include chiefs, assessment directors, assessment staff, curriculum specialists, professional development specialists, and other specialists as needed. Governing States are committed to participate in **two or more work groups** based on skills, expertise, and interest within the State to maximize contributions and distribute expertise and responsibilities efficiently and effectively. Advisory States are strongly encouraged to participate as fully as possible. Each work group is led by two Co-chairs from Governing States, approved by the Executive Committee. A time commitment of approximately two hours per week is expected of each work group member, which may be consolidated into longer, less frequent meetings, as deemed necessary by the work group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Number Serving in This Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Co-chair                    | Organize and lead work group to accomplish the responsibilities of the work group | • Set the agenda and meeting schedule for work group and lead the work group meetings  
• Assign tasks within the work group  
• Represent work group at Consortium meetings, either in-person or virtually. | From Governing State*               | 2                             |
| Executive Committee (EC) Liaison | Brief EC on work group progress, risks, and issues to support achievement of the responsibilities of the work group | • Bring requests for budget changes in excess of $1,000 to EC  
• Brief EC on progress, issues, and risks  
• Bring recommendations to EC regarding the core system components (i.e., adaptive summative assessment; adaptive interim assessment; formative tools, processes, and practices; and professional capacity building)  
• Serve as the work group’s liaison to other work groups | Executive Committee Member          | 1                             |
| Member                      | Accomplish the responsibilities of the work group                           | • Participate in all meetings  
• Complete assigned work  
• Contribute to overall goals of the work group | Governing or Advisory State representative | 4-6                           |
| Higher Education Member     | Accomplish the responsibilities of the work group                           | • Participate in meetings  
• Complete assigned work  
• Contribute to overall goals of the work group | Higher education representatives from Governing or Advisory States | 2                             |
## Work Group Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Number Serving in This Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Project Management Partner** (PMP) | Provide project management support and coordination | • Facilitate and coordinate meetings  
• Monitor and track work plan status  
• Identify and coordinate necessary resources  
• Capture and support issue resolution and risk management  
• Track dependencies between work groups  
• Monitor vendor work  
  – Work plan review  
  – Status tracking  
  – Issue escalation  
  – RFP and contracting support  
• Support RFP development and vendor contracting | * Must be from different Governing States than each other and the EC Liaison. | 1            |
b. Overall Responsibilities
   All work groups, led by the Co-chairs, are charged with the following tasks:
   - **Define specific scope and time line** of the work group to accomplish the deliverables and milestones identified in the Master Work Plan. As appropriate, define risks, assumptions, and constraints.
   - **Develop work plan and resource requirements** to guide vendor and work group activities.
   - **Oversee and direct Consortium work** in assigned content area and oversee and direct vendors, if applicable.

c. Communication
   The primary means of communication for work groups is through virtual meetings, status reports, and in-person meetings if deemed necessary. Work group Co-chairs provide regular updates to the Executive Committee to coordinate activities and decisions across work groups.

d. Decision-Making
   Work group recommendations are facilitated by the Co-chairs. Recommendations affecting the activities of other work groups are communicated to and approved by the Executive Committee via the Executive Committee work group liaison.
## Work Group Master List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Group Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transition to Common Core State Standards (CCSS)</td>
<td>Support states in implementation of CCSS in ELA/literacy and mathematics for grades K-12, and with transition to CCSS-based instruction and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technology Approach</td>
<td>Review technology plans, serve as a requirements resource and deliverable review group for all technology development/procurement, and provide technology implementation guidance to member states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Item Development</td>
<td>Address system design and development: summative and interim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Performance Tasks</td>
<td>Monitor and review the drafting and pilot/field testing of performance task specifications and development processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Test Design</td>
<td>Monitor and review the development of the summative and interim assessment test designs and related test design documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Test Administration</td>
<td>Support states in the planning and development of procedures and ancillary materials necessary for test administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reporting</td>
<td>Address all areas involved with designing reports and interpreting data produced from the interim and summative assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Accessibility and Accommodations</td>
<td>Address accessibility and accommodations for Consortium summative, interim, and formative instruments; provide definitions and background information on target populations; create supporting documents and guidelines for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Validation and Psychometrics</td>
<td>Address all areas involved with scoring, field test design, standard setting, psychometrics, and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Work Group Structure & Governance

III. Individual Work Group Definitions – Refer to the work group members roster for key work group leadership personnel.

### Transition to Common Core State Standards (CCSS)

**Role:** Support states in implementation of CCSS in ELA/literacy and mathematics for grades K-12, and with transition to CCSS-based instruction and assessment.

**Key Responsibilities:**
- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to the development of requests for specific proposals.
- Review responses to requests for proposals and contribute to the vendor selection process.
- Review the implementation plan for the CCSS that includes interim strategies for state assessments through 2015, establishes the Consortium’s position on managing change, and provides clear strategies for supporting states each year.
- Monitor findings from analyses of the CCSS, including crosswalks to existing state standards, to identify key differences that need to be highlighted during CCSS implementation.
- Evaluate options for augmenting the CCSS with supplemental content.
- Monitor assessment framework development processes, including monitoring the “unpacking” of the CCSS in each content area.
- Monitor independent alignment studies to examine the degree of linkage among items in the preliminary item pool to the CCSS at each grade level and make recommendations to the Executive Committee about development targets.
- Review criteria, protocols, and rubrics for vetting emerging curricular materials associated with the CCSS or for developing Consortium-specific tools.
- Evaluate existing professional development tools and materials for teachers in ELA/literacy and mathematics, including research-supported recommendations for differentiating CCSS-based instruction.
- Support setting of meaningful and defensible achievement standards.

**Major Deliverables:**
- CCSS implementation plan and final recommendations about augmentation strategies and supplemental content
- Professional development activities related to CCSS implementation available to teachers in Smarter Balanced states
- Consortium developed or endorsed CCSS-based instructional materials available for use in Smarter Balanced states; achievement standards set
- Administration of CCSS-based assessments in all Smarter Balanced states

**Yearly Milestones:**
- **Y1:** Framework development
- **Y2:** Analyses of preliminary item pool
- **Y3:** Full CCSS implementation in Smarter Balanced states
- **Y4:** Long-term studies of impact of CCSS implementation

**PMP Involvement:**
- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor management

**Vendor Involvement:**
- Crosswalk studies
- Alignment studies
- Professional development tools and materials
Technology Approach

Role: Review technology plans, serve as a requirements resource and deliverable review group for all technology development/procurement, and provide technology implementation guidance to member states.

Key Responsibilities:

- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to the development of requests for proposals.
- Review responses to requests for proposals and contribute to the vendor selection process.
- Coordinate with the Technology Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to determine:
  - Approach and solution (with assistance by vendor(s), as appropriate) for using open-source and other technology
  - State technology infrastructure needs
  - Technology communication plan and documents (implementation guidelines, technical requirements)
  - Lessons learned document
  - Implementation/deployment barriers and help troubleshoot
  - Cost efficiencies and re-use strategies for using technology during the four development years and beyond
- Review, and monitor technology vendor statement of work, project plan, and project deliverables.
- Serve as a resource to vendors for requirements gathering and specifications approval.
- Maintain cross-workgroup communication and collaboration (e.g., reporting, assessment design).

Yearly Milestones:

Y1: RFP development, establish Technology TAC, review High-Level Technology Work Plan
Y2: Vendor review and selection; requirements gathering; lessons learned document; item authoring application operational; scoring engine, dashboard, and technical infrastructure in Design and Build phase
Y3: Oversee testing of scoring engine, dashboard, and technical infrastructure in Design and Build phase; implementation guidelines and technical requirements document
Y4: Oversee final testing; application development revisions; finalize/review implementation guidelines and documentation (including anything needed to ensure interoperability)

Major Deliverables:

- RFP development
- Vendor review and selection
- Item authoring system operational
- Scoring and testing engine designed and built
- Testing of scoring and testing engine
- Design and build reporting
- Revision of testing and scoring engine, test reporting
- Testing and revision – after small-scale pilots
- Rollout plans and final application revisions locked down

PMP Involvement:

- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor management

Vendor Involvement:

- Item authoring system development
- Hub development
- Scoring engine (all item types)
- Reporting engine and interface
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Item Development
Role: Address system design and development: summative and interim.

**Key Responsibilities:**
- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to the development of requests for specific proposals (e.g., Test and Item Specifications vendor).
- Review responses to requests for proposals and contribute to the vendor selection process.
- Review selected vendor item development plan.
- Review sample items of Item Development vendor (in collaboration with the Validation and Psychometrics Work Group).
- Provide technical oversight and review of vendor deliverables (e.g., translation of CCSS to assessable content, item writing and editing training materials).

**Yearly Milestones:**

**Y1:** Vendor selection: assessable content translation document, item specifications and development

**Y2:** Teacher training and item writing and review (including small-scale pilots), content and bias review, item exemplar development

**Y3:** Data review and item editing

**Y4:** Field test support

**Major Deliverables:**
- Assessable content translation document
- Item specifications
- Teacher training modules
- Approximately 80,000 items
- Data review and revision

**PMP Involvement:**
- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor Management

**Vendor Involvement:**
- Assessable content translation
- Item specification development
- Item writing and editing modules
- Item development
- Professional development and formative processes and tools
Performance Tasks
Role: Monitor and review the drafting and pilot/field testing of performance task specifications and development processes.

Key Responsibilities:
- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to requests for proposals for the design, development, scoring, and reporting of performance tasks for summative, interim, and formative measures.
- Review responses to requests for proposals and contribute to the vendor selection process.
- Review, and monitor vendor statement of work, project plan, and project deliverables.
- Monitor performance task development processes to ensure technical adequacy and quality control of emerging performance tasks.
- In collaboration with the Validation and Psychometrics and Test Administration Work Groups, review vendor guidelines for the administration, scoring, and reporting of performance tasks for each assessment type.
- Serve as a resource during small-scale pilot testing and field testing of performance tasks.
- In collaboration with the Validation and Psychometrics Work Group, develop recommendations for weighting performance tasks with a student’s CAT score to create the summative assessment composite score.
- In collaboration with the Validation and Psychometrics Work Group, develop policy recommendations for timing of performance task administration for each assessment.

Yearly Milestones:
Y1: Selection of vendor to develop performance task specifications
Y2: Performance task writing and review, including small-scale pilots; development of scoring rubrics
Y3: Field test; data review; finalize items
Y4: Set achievement levels for performance tasks

Major Deliverables:
- RFP for performance task vendor
- Item specifications for performance tasks
- Guidelines for administration, scoring, and reporting of performance tasks
- Weighting formula for summative composite score

PMP Involvement:
- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor management

Vendor Involvement:
- Performance task specification development
- Performance task development and/or facilitation of teachers as developers
- Validation of alignment of performance tasks to CCSS
- Scoring and reporting
- Professional development tools and materials
Test Design

Role: Monitor and review the development of the summative and interim assessment test designs and related test design documents.

Key Responsibilities:
- Collaborate with the Reporting and Validation and Psychometrics Work Groups and TAC to determine test design requirements to meet reliability, validity, and reporting requirements for the summative assessment.
- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to the development of requests for specific proposals (e.g., test specifications/test blueprints).
- Review responses to requests for proposals and contribute to the vendor selection process.
- Review the proposed content and structure of test designs and test blueprints.
- Monitor vendor scheduling and provide technical oversight and review of vendor deliverables (e.g., test specifications/test blueprints).
- Collaborate with the Formative Assessment Practices and Professional Learning Work Group to determine interim assessment test design requirements that will support instruction and student learning.
- Monitor vendor development of test design to support a vertical scale.
- Collaborate with TAC and the Validation and Psychometrics Work Group to monitor, review, and approve of CAT content constraints and termination criteria.
- Monitor test design activities to be consistent with PARCC comparability activities, as appropriate.

Yearly Milestones:
- **Y1:** Vendor selection: test specifications and test blueprints
- **Y2:** Item writing and review (including small-scale pilots)
- **Y3:** Psychometric data review and revision
- **Y4:** Field test support

Major Deliverables:
- Test specifications
- Test blueprints

PMP Involvement:
- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor management

Vendor Involvement:
- Test specifications development
- Test blueprints development
Test Administration

Role: Support states in the planning and development of procedures and ancillary materials necessary for test administration.

Key Responsibilities:

- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to the development of requests for specific proposals (e.g., test specifications/test blueprints).
- Review responses to requests for proposals and contribute to the vendor selection process.
- Review and monitor vendor work plan and provide technical oversight and review of vendor deliverables.
- Serve as a resource for states regarding administration requirements of computer-based testing (e.g., scheduling testing sessions, test security policies).
- Work with the Technology Approach Work Group to support states in developing technology infrastructure to support technology-supported assessments.
- Review item development processes to ensure implications for administration have been considered (i.e., how each item type will be delivered).
- Support small-scale pilot and field testing of items in states to verify administration protocols.
- In collaboration with the Validation and Psychometrics Work Group, develop policy recommendation on key administration issues (e.g., frequency and timing of administrations, feasibility and comparability of paper-pencil adaptation, language translations, use of calculators).
- In collaboration with the Technology Approach Work Group, serve as a resource to states for troubleshooting test administration issues.
- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to test administration documents.

Yearly Milestones:

Y1: Dissemination of infrastructure requirements to states
Y2: Administration policies disseminated
Y3: Small-scale pilots
Y4: Field testing

Major Deliverables:

- Guidelines for state-level test administration
- Small-scale pilots and field testing
- Policy recommendations

PMP Involvement:

- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor management

Vendor Involvement:

- Test administration support (CAT)
- Technology platform development and support (at state level)
- Professional development
- Small-scale pilot testing and field testing of items
- Development of paper-pencil form at each grade
### Reporting

**Role:** Address all areas involved with designing reports and interpreting data produced from the interim and summative assessments.

#### Key Responsibilities:
- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to the development of requests for proposals.
- Review responses to requests for proposals and contribute to the vendor selection process.
- Review and approve the approach and strategy for developing the reporting system.
- Confirm that each reporting component is developed:
  - Individual student achievement and growth report (summative, interim)
  - Class, school, district, and state reports of student achievement (summative, interim)
  - Consortium-level report for Title I accountability (summative, interim)
  - Data Mining Tool (summative, interim)
  - Human Scoring Accuracy and Reliability Report (summative, interim)
  - Content Cluster Learning Progression Visual Report (interim).
- Verify that the intended use, target audience, and key data are represented in each report.
- Serve as a resource to vendors for requirements gathering and specifications approval.
- Coordinate with key advisory groups and constituents to ensure report usability (including dashboard display of available reports).

#### Yearly Milestones:
- **Y1:** Vendor selection
- **Y2:** Pilot delivery, scoring, and reporting applications
- **Y3:** Revise reporting application in preparation for field test; field testing
- **Y4:** Operational administration; operational results reported

#### Major Deliverables:
- Pilot version of database hub/CPU reporting application and central archive database application
- Field test of database hub/CPU reporting application and central archive database application
- Fully operational database hub/CPU reporting application and central archive database application

#### PMP Involvement:
- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor management

#### Vendor Involvement:
- Database hub/CPU reporting application
- Central archive database application
- Reports on each component
- Professional development tools and materials
Formative Assessment Practices and Professional Learning

Role: Support states in planning and implementing professional development initiatives, creating formative tools and processes, and constructing practice guidelines and assessment frameworks.

Key Responsibilities:
- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to the development of requests for proposals (e.g., Professional Development vendor).
- Review responses to proposals and contribute to the vendor selection process.
- Review vendor plan for building teacher resources (formative tools and instructional/curriculum support materials).
- Collaborate with IHEs to identify professional development resources, such as recommended readings; focused group discussion topics; online tools; and sharing of annotated examples of best practices and exercises.
- Support states through SCASS and train-the-trainer model in their implementation of new assessment system and standards.
- Provide technical oversight and review of vendor deliverables (e.g., training materials, training strategy, curriculum support materials).

Yearly Milestones:

Y1: Professional Development vendor selection; CCSSO contract in place
Y2: Capacity building professional development to State Networks; formative tools content review and tryout
Y3: Teacher/content expert committees’ evaluation of the alignment of available curriculum materials, classroom-based assessments, and instructional strategies; scoring tryouts for AI and hand-scoring
Y4: “Consumer report” awareness training to State Networks; formative tools scoring implementation; use of formative processes and tools training to State Networks

Major Deliverables:
- Professional Development framework
- Formative tools exemplars and related source materials
- Scoring guides for formative tools
- Curriculum maps; model lesson plans; data use to support differentiated instruction for professional development
- “Consumer report” for state networks

PMP Involvement:
- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor management

Vendor Involvement:
- Professional Development: strategy, materials, and implementation
- Formative Processes and Tools: content, scoring guides, and Professional Development tools and materials
Accessibility and Accommodations

Role: Address accessibility and accommodations for Consortium summative, interim, and formative instruments; provide definitions and background information on target populations; create supporting documents and guidelines for implementation.

Key Responsibilities:

ACCESSIBILITY
- Review a summary of the access needs of English learner (EL) students, students with disabilities (SWDs), and 504 students. Include description of similarities/differences in access needs across groups vis-à-vis task presentation, engagement, and response.
- Provide upfront input on test and item specifications to embed accessibility features/strategies in test/item design, especially in the reusable design templates.
- Review items and test content and format throughout the development process to ensure adequate and appropriate accessibility for both ELs and SWDs.

ACCOMMODATIONS
- Review a summary of definitions of ELs, SWDs, and 504 students, including related state policies, practices, and research on accommodations for these students. Similarities/differences across groups should be highlighted.
- Review eligibility criteria and related guidelines for identifying ELs, SWDs, and 504 students who will receive accommodations on the assessments.
- Review accommodations and related protocols and/or manuals for the accommodations that will be used/allowed, particularly in a technology-based assessment environment.

OTHER
- Review modifications to be made to the assessments for the small subgroup of students for whom accessibility features and accommodations do not suffice.
- Review the consensus process for finalizing accessibility features/strategies and accommodations.
- Monitor the evaluation of the use of technology for delivery of accessible test items and formats on a regular basis, collaborating regularly with the Assessment Design and Validation and Psychometrics Work Groups.

Yearly Milestones:
Y1: Summarize current and emerging research/practice on access; summarize current state accommodations and related research; definitions for access and accommodations
Y2: Test and item specifications with embedded accessibility features/strategies; eligibility criteria for accommodations; Accommodations Manual; accessible reusable item templates

Major Deliverables:
- Report summarizing the definitions of ELs, SWDs, and 504 students, and criteria and guidelines for identifying and including these students in regular content assessments
- Report summarizing access features/strategies for SWDs and ELs
- Comprehensive list of accommodations, the frequency of use of each, analyses of potential responsiveness of each for ELs and for SWDs, and differences in policies, practices, and rationales for the use of specific accommodations
- Webinars on assessment, Title III, English learners, special education, and curriculum
- Final consensus on access features/strategies and accommodations for the Consortium
- Summary of the consensus process and agreements reached
- Report on the barriers to the use of technology for access and potential threats to validity
- Recommendations for an annual review process
- Accommodations manual

PMP Involvement:
- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor management

Vendor Involvement:
- Embedding upfront and ensuring throughout the development process accessibility features/strategies into the structure and delivery of the assessments
- Computer Adaptive Testing (CAT) development
- Accommodations studies
- Review and summary of research
## Validation and Psychometrics

**Role:** Address all areas involved with scoring, field test design, standard setting, psychometrics, and evaluation.

### Key Responsibilities:

- Review and, in limited cases, contribute to the development of requests for proposals.
- Review responses to requests for proposals and contribute to the vendor selection process.
- Provide technical oversight and review of vendor deliverables.
- Serve as a technical resource to work groups regarding research and evaluation issues.
- Serve as a liaison between the TAC and work groups regarding research and evaluation issues (e.g., implementing TAC recommendations, assisting work groups in formulating questions for TAC consideration).
- Review and monitor progress of PARCC/Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Comparability Study.
- Review and monitor research and evaluation vendor plans and deliverables.
- Evaluate and monitor progress of standard-setting plan and activities.
- Review vendor-written Technical Manuals.

### Yearly Milestones:

**Y1:** Vendor selection

**Y2:** 4-Year research and evaluation plan; PARCC/Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Comparability Study Plan; Evaluation Plan; ongoing support to work groups as needed

**Y3:** PARCC/Smarter Balanced Comparability Study Plan; evaluation study

**Y4:** Standard setting; concurrent and predictive validity studies

### Major Deliverables:

- Technical Manual
- Standard-setting plan
- Smarter Balanced/PARCC Summative Assessment Comparability Study
- Research and evaluation studies
- 4-year research and evaluation plan

### PMP Involvement:

- Meeting facilitation and coordination
- Status and dependency tracking and monitoring
- Identification of resources
- Issue and risk management
- Vendor management

### Vendor Involvement:

- Research and evaluation studies
- Standard setting
- Item development
- Smarter Balanced/PARCC Summative Assessment Comparability Study
Appendix A: Work Group Change Processes

The purpose of this document is to outline the processes that shall govern changes to the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Work Groups. This document will be amended as necessary.

Document Overview:

I. **Fundamental Principles** – This section lists the fundamental principles underlying all work group changes.

II. **Replacing/adding co-chairs** – This section describes the process for replacing or adding work group co-chairs.

III. **Replacing/adding members** – This section describes the process for replacing or adding new work group members.

IV. **Increasing/decreasing work group size** – This section describes the process for changing the size of a work group.

V. **Creating a new work group** – This section describes the process for creating a new work group.

VI. **Dissolving a work group** – This section describes the process for dissolving a work group.

VII. **Expectations** – This section describes expectations for work group members and co-chairs and describes processes for resolving concerns.

Appendix A: Summary Figures

- Figure 1 – Summary of Process to Replace Co-chair
- Figure 2 – Summary of Process to Add Co-chair
- Figure 3 – Summary of Process to Replace or Add Member
- Figure 4 – Summary of Process to Increase/Decrease Work Group Size
- Figure 5 – Summary of Process to Create a New Work Group
- Figure 6 – Summary of Process to Dissolve a Work Group

I. **Fundamental Principles**

All work group changes will be guided by the following fundamental principles:

- Work groups exist to support and oversee the development of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium comprehensive assessment system.
- Work group co-chairs and members have the requisite expertise, experience, and skills to perform in the designated role.
- Work group membership reflects a balance of state representation but is particular to the individual and not to the state.
- Work groups and their members may be adjusted by the Executive Committee as need dictates.
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II. Replacing/adding co-chairs
Work group co-chairs may need to be replaced or added for various reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-chair</th>
<th>Example Reasons for Replacement or Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Replacement | • Temporary replacement due to leave of absence  
                   • Required time commitment no longer feasible for co-chair  
                   • Change in employment or job assignment  
                   • Performance does not meet expectations for co-chair |
| B. Addition | • Cannot recruit suitable co-chair from among work group members  
                   • New work group is created and need to identify co-chairs |

A. Process for Replacing Co-chair
To maintain the momentum of the group, it is preferable to replace a co-chair with an existing member of the work group, provided that an existing member possesses the requisite experience and skills for the co-chair role.

1. Inform group of co-chair opportunity – The work group leadership (e.g., co-chair) informs existing members of the work group that a new co-chair is needed. Existing members who are interested in serving as co-chair indicate their interest to work group leadership.

2. Look within group – The co-chair and EC liaison discuss appropriateness of existing work group member(s) to fill the position. Does existing work group member(s) have the requisite experience and skills to serve as co-chair?
   • YES—the EC liaison informs the EC of recommendation(s). Go to step 3.
   • NO—the Project Management Partner issues a new work group solicitation to all Governing States. (Only representatives from Governing States are eligible to serve in the co-chair role.) Go to “Process for Adding Co-chair.”

3. Preliminary reviews – The EC conducts a preliminary review of recommended replacement(s). The EC confirms the recommended replacement(s) has the requisite experience and skills necessary for the co-chair role. Simultaneously, the Project Management Partner reviews whether the recommended replacement would maintain balance in (1) states represented across work group co-chair roles, and (2) states represented on work groups.
   • YES—go to step 4.
   • NO—go to “Process for Adding Co-chair.”
   • If the EC review is positive and the Project Management Partner review is negative, then the EC weighs the options of accepting a slight imbalance in state representation versus searching for a new member.

4. Contact proposed replacement – The Project Management Partner or EC liaison contacts the proposed replacement and asks the following questions: (1) Is the work group member willing to fill the co-chair role? (2) Does the work group member have the requisite time to serve in this role?
   • YES.
   • NO—go to “Process for Adding Co-chair.”

This process for replacing a co-chair is summarized in Appendix A (Figure 1).
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B. Process for Adding Co-chair

1. Solicitation to GS – The Project Management Partner issues a solicitation to all Governing States. (Only representatives from Governing States are eligible to serve in the co-chair role.)

2. PMP preliminary review – The Project Management Partner gathers all state responses to the solicitation and reviews responses based on the following criteria:
   a. Experience and skills to serve as co-chair,
   b. Overall balance in GS representation across co-chair positions,
   c. Work group co-chairs and EC liaison are from different states, and to the extent possible its members are also from different states,
   d. Overall balance and continuity in state representation in work groups, and
   e. Availability of proposed member.

The Project Management Partner prepares recommendation(s) for EC review.

3. EC review – The EC reviews the recommendation(s). The EC confirms the recommended individual has the requisite experience and skills necessary for the co-chair role.
   - YES.
   - NO—review all responses for potential candidates. If none are considered appropriate, EC discusses alternate plans for recruiting particular individuals whom they believe would be suitable. EC leadership/PMP discusses with any new candidates. Once an appropriate individual has been identified, EC leadership/PMP confirms (1) willingness to serve as a co-chair and (2) availability (requisite time commitment).

This process for adding a co-chair is summarized in Appendix A (Figure 2).

III. Replacing/Adding Members

Work group members may need to be replaced or added for various reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Example Reasons for Replacement or Addition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Replacement     | • Temporary replacement due to leave of absence  
|                 | • Required time commitment no longer feasible for member  
|                 | • Change in employment or job assignment  
|                 | • Performance does not meet expectations for member                                                         |
| Addition        | • Not all member positions were filled when work groups were created                                           |
|                 | • Work group does not currently possess requisite expertise                                                  |
|                 | • Size of Consortium and/or work load supports more than six (6) members                                     |
|                 | • New work group is created and need to recruit members                                                      |

Process for Replacing or Adding a Member

1. Solicitation to all states – The Project Management Partner issues a solicitation to all CONSORTIUM states.
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2. **PMP preliminary review** – The Project Management Partner gathers all state responses to the solicitation and reviews responses based on the following criteria:
   a. State’s preference, based on rank order (if multiple work groups are being solicited at the same time),
   b. Relevant experience of proposed member,
   c. Governing States maintain the required participation on two or more work groups
   d. Work group co-chairs and EC liaison are from different states, and to the extent possible its members are also from different states,
   e. Overall balance and continuity in state representation on work groups, and
   f. Availability of proposed member.
   The Project Management Partner prepares recommendation(s) for EC review.

3. **EC review** – The EC reviews the recommendation(s). The EC confirms the recommended individual has the requisite experience and skills necessary for the member role.
   - YES.
   - NO—review all responses for potential candidates. If none are considered appropriate, EC discusses alternate plans for recruiting particular individuals whom they believe would be suitable. EC leadership/PMP discusses with any new candidates. Once an appropriate individual has been identified, EC leadership/PMP confirms (1) willingness to serve as a member and (2) availability (requisite time commitment).

This process for adding a member is summarized in Appendix A (Figure 3).

IV. **Increasing/decreasing work group size**

The size of work groups may need to be increased or decreased for various reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Example Reasons for Changing Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase or Decrease</td>
<td>● Content expertise is lacking in current group membership (increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Current size does not facilitate maximum efficiency (increase/decrease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Current size is not appropriate for current work load (increase/decrease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Consortium membership cannot support default size of 6 members (increase/decrease)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process for Changing Work Group Size**

1. **Increase/decrease request** – A change in work group size may be identified by the work group leadership or by the EC. Once a need to increase or decrease the size of a work group is identified, a written request containing the following information is sent to the Project Management Partner:
   a. Work group name,
   b. Identify whether the request is for an increase or a decrease,
   c. Reason for the increase/decrease of the work group, and
   d. Proposed work group roster after increase/decrease (Note: if an increase is being requested, you do not need to identify anyone for the proposed new member; however, you should indicate content expertise needed if specific knowledge is being requested).
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2. **EC review** – The EC reviews the request. If necessary, the EC works with the EC liaison and co-chairs (as appropriate) to answer any outstanding questions. The EC acts on the request.
   - **APPROVE**—go to “Process for Adding Member” if this is an increase request. If this is a decrease request, inform work group.
   - **REJECT**—the EC liaison for the group explains to the co-chairs why the request was rejected and provides guidance to the co-chairs as they move forward.

This process for changing the size of a work group is summarized in Appendix A (Figure 4).

V. **Creating a New Work Group**
A new work group may need to be created if new/unidentified scope is required to support and oversee the assessment system.

**Process for Creating a New Work Group**
1. **Creation request** – The Project Management Partner, with support from the EC, creates a name for the proposed new work group, brief description, and definition. Work group definitions will be in the format of current work groups, as documented in the “Work Group Structure & Governance” document.
2. **EC review** – The EC reviews and finalizes the work group name, description, and definition. The EC votes to approve the new work group.
   - **APPROVE**—go to “Process for Adding Co-chair” and “Process for Adding Member.”
   - **REJECT**—the EC continues to work with the Project Management Partner to address any outstanding concerns.

This process for creating a new work group is summarized in Appendix A (Figure 5).

VI. **Dissolving a Work Group**
A work group may need to be dissolved for various reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Reasons for Dissolving Work Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● A change of scope has made the existing work group no longer needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Work group has fulfilled its purpose and is no longer needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Work group is not performing and its responsibilities need to be assigned to another group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process for Dissolving a Work Group**
1. **Dissolution request** – A request to dissolve a work group may be identified by the work group leadership or by the EC. Once a need to dissolve a work group is identified, a written request containing the following information is sent to the Project Management Partner:
   a. Work group name, and
   b. Reason for dissolving the work group.
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2. **EC review** – The EC reviews the request. If necessary, the EC works with the EC liaison and co-chairs (as appropriate) to answer any outstanding questions. The EC acts on the request.
   - **APPROVE**: notify work group and thank them for their service.
   - **REJECT**: the EC liaison for the group explains to the co-chairs why the request was rejected and provides guidance to the co-chairs as they move forward.

This process for dissolving a work group is summarized in Appendix A (Figure 6).

VII. **Expectations**
Responsibilities for work group co-chairs and members are outlined in Section I (“Work Group Structure and Governance”) and summarized below. Due to time constraints of work group co-chairs and members, Smarter Balanced recognizes that all work group participants may not be able to participate in every call/meeting. However, due to the intensity and technical nature of the work, it is critical that any absent participant obtains missed information from other members of the work group and meeting materials so that s/he remains current and the progress of the group is not negatively impacted. Arranging for a substitute for a missed call or meeting is not appropriate.

A. **Expectations of Co-chairs**
   1. Prepare agenda topics
   2. Lead the work group during meetings
   3. Assign tasks with the group
   4. Represent the work group at Consortium meetings, either in-person or virtually

B. **Expectations of Members**
   1. Participate in meetings
   2. Complete assigned work
   3. Contribute to overall goals of the work group

C. **Concerns**
When expectations of co-chairs or members are not being fulfilled, the work group’s ability to accomplish its goals could be negatively affected. If this occurs, a resolution process should be discussed. Also, if the work group is not accomplishing its goals, a concern should be brought to the attention of an appropriate person. The following table provides guidance on identifying an appropriate person to discuss various types of concerns, depending on the role of the individual bringing the concern.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Type of Concern</th>
<th>Appropriate Person with Whom to Discuss Resolution Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Performance of another member</td>
<td>Co-chair(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance of a co-chair</td>
<td>EC liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality/timeliness of the work of the group</td>
<td>Co-chair(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work group not accomplishing its goals</td>
<td>Co-chair(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-chair</td>
<td>Performance of a member</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance of a co-chair</td>
<td>EC liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality/timeliness of the work of the group</td>
<td>Co-chair, EC liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work group not accomplishing its goals</td>
<td>Co-chair, EC liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC liaison</td>
<td>Performance of a member</td>
<td>Co-chair(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance of a co-chair</td>
<td>Co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality/timeliness of the work of the group</td>
<td>Co-chair(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work group not accomplishing its goals</td>
<td>Co-chair(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Process for Resolving Concerns
The resolution process will depend on the situation; however, the general process for resolving various types of concerns is described below.

1. **Member performance** – If the concern is with the performance of a work group member, the co-chairs may discuss the concern with the member. If the concern continues, the co-chairs may discuss the concern with the EC liaison. After EC review of the concern, the EC liaison may be directed to contact the state to discuss the concern. If the concern continues, the co-chairs may request the member be replaced.

2. **Co-chair performance** – If the concern is with the performance of a work group co-chair, the EC liaison may discuss the concern with the co-chair. If the concern continues, after EC review of the concern, the EC liaison may be directed to contact the state to discuss the concern. If the concern continues, the EC liaison may request the co-chair be replaced.

3. **Quality/timeliness of work or work group not accomplishing its goals** – If the concern is with quality or timeliness of the work of the work group or with the group not accomplishing its goals, if appropriate, the co-chairs may discuss with the EC liaison and/or the PMP to determine improvement processes. If the concern continues, the EC will determine appropriate next steps.

4. **Other concerns** – Other concerns, such as the performance of the EC liaison, PMP liaison, or communication/performance of the work group, may be discussed with the co-chairs (if appropriate), or a member of the EC.
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Figure 1: Summary of Process to Replace Co-chair

Step 1: Inform group of co-chair opportunity
Existing members indicate interest

Step 2: Look within group
Does an existing work group member have requisite experience & skills to serve as co-chair?

Step 3: Preliminary reviews
EC reviews for experience/skills & PMP reviews for state balance

Step 4: Contact proposed replacement
Is WG member willing to fill co-chair role? Does WG member have requisite time to serve in this role?

NO - See “Process for Adding Co-chair”

YES

Figure 2: Summary of Process to Add Co-chair

Step 1: Solicitation to GS
Governing States respond to an open call to serve as co-chair

Step 2: PMP preliminary review
PMP gathers responses, reviews options, and prepares recommendation for EC

Step 3: EC review
EC reviews recommendation and determines whether recommendation is appropriate

YES

NO - EC works with PMP to identify appropriate candidates
Figure 3: Summary of Process to Replace or Add Member

Step 1: Solicitation to all states
SBAC states respond to an open call to serve as a member

Step 2: PMP preliminary review
PMP gathers responses, reviews options, and prepares recommendation for EC

Step 3: EC review
EC reviews recommendation and determines whether recommendation is appropriate

YES

NO - EC works with PMP to identify appropriate candidates

Figure 4: Summary of Process to Increase/Decrease Work Group Size

Step 1: Increase/decrease request
Work group name, reason for increase/decrease, proposed new roster

Step 2: EC review
EC reviews and acts on request

APPROVE - Go to "Process for Adding Member" (increase); or inform work group (decrease)

REJECT - EC liaison supports co-chairs with next steps
Figure 5: Summary of Process to Create a New Work Group

Step 1: Creation request
Proposed work group name, brief description, & definition

Step 2: EC review
EC reviews the new work group and votes to approve new group

- APPROVE - Go to "Process for Adding Co-chair" and "Process for Adding Member"
- REJECT - EC and PMP address outstanding concerns

Figure 6: Summary of Process to Dissolve a Work Group

Step 1: Dissolution request
Work group name, reason for dissolution

Step 2: EC review
EC reviews request and acts on request

- APPROVE - Notify work group
- REJECT - EC liaison supports co-chairs with next steps
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