



Meeting Minutes – Thursday, January 22, 2015 (9:00-noon)

State Board Room, 201 East Colfax, Denver, Colorado

TAP Members Present:

Norman Alerta
Linda Barker
Jonathan Dings
Carol Eaton (phone)
Jill Fellman
Grant Guyer
Jacqueline Law (phone)
Joy Perry (phone)
Dwayne Schmitz

Audience:

Brian Fuller (Mapleton)
Erin Loften (CDE)

CDE Representatives:

Elliot Asp
Dan Jorgensen
Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson
Alyssa Pearson (phone)
Josh Perdue
Kelly Stritzinger

Welcome & Minutes Approval

Dan Jorgensen/Carol Eaton

- The meeting was held in the State Board Room, Denver, Colorado and was called to order at 9:10.
- The October meeting minutes were briefly discussed (i.e. at the end of the meeting). A request was made that future minutes be available to the TAP as soon as possible following the formal meeting.

ESEA Waiver Evaluation Discussion – Design Recommendations

Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson

- A brief overview was provided regarding the ESEA waiver renewal evaluation opportunity. The deadline is March 31st. The TAP was asked for feedback regarding two questions. First, should CDE submit a proposal? Second, what should we consider to be included as part of the evaluation?
- The resulting conversation focused on encouragement to pursue an evaluation plan related to SB-191, educator effectiveness. Specifically, interest was expressed in looking at the school level practices associated with implementation. This includes:
 - Examining congruence between evaluations of principals and outside evaluators.
 - Are we training principals? Are ratings consistent? Can we identify/account for any differences?
 - Do we have measures that are accurately assessing teacher performance?
 - Do inequities in training/professional development of teachers exist? What are the different training needs in rural versus urban?
 - To what degree can student characteristics (demographics) impact ratings of teacher effectiveness? If differences exist how can we mitigate these impacts?



- Less interest was expressed in conducting an evaluation of the accountability system. It was emphasized that the evaluation must be high quality as opposed to something just quickly done for funding.
- Jonathan expressed potential interest in supporting this work if it was limited to the professional practices component of Educator Effectiveness. It was recommended that the department consider external oversight from an advisory committee. Dan requested that interested members e-mail him and he would forward their contact information to Federal Programs.
- CDE staff mentioned the need, based on the TAP comments, to include Katy Anthes in a future discussion regarding this topic.

Accountability Work Group: Role & Relation to TAP

Alyssa Pearson

- Alyssa provided a brief overview of the focus of the Accountability Work Group (AWG), its history (i.e. based on the SB-163 group), and membership. Much of the work will be related to providing ‘big’ ideas. Two TAP members, Grant Guyer and Linda Barker, will also serve as members of the Accountability Work group.
- The proposed timeline of work for the AWG was shared. The first meeting occurred in January with a target of August 2015 for final recommendations.
- A question was asked regarding the anticipated availability of transitional growth percentiles. Dan mentioned a one-pager was just released on this topic and our conservative estimate, at this point, is spring of 2016. The availability is contingent on receiving the scores from PARCC.
- It was also asked if we’ve considered combining the reading/writing scores when calculating the growth percentiles. CDE responded that this is open to discussion.
- It was pointed out that it’s important that the TAP stay ahead of technical issues to better inform the Accountability work group. It’s deemed risky to have them proceed and then be told that something isn’t feasible or appropriate due to technical considerations. CDE responded that we will be sure to monitor this possibility and keep the TAP apprised of the work.

Discussion of Technical Issues & Focus for Upcoming Year

Alyssa Pearson, Josh Perdue, and Dan Jorgensen

- A PowerPoint was shared with possible topics for discussion during upcoming meetings (see below). The TAP was asked if they had additional items that should be included.

TAP Expertise Needed For

- Mean vs. median for MGP
- Confidence intervals for growth- esp. for teachers
- Mean scale scores vs. % Strong/Distinguished Command- for achievement
- Growth between non-consecutive grades (8th to 10th)
- AGPs vs. % catch-up/keep-up
- Defining adequate/catch-up/keep-up for new assessments
- Weighting of indicators overall
- Weighting of indicators when not all sub-indicators are available (only dropout for PWR)



- Recommended additions to the list included:
 - The possibility of combining scores for literacy when calculating transitional growth percentiles
 - Involvement with the establishment of cut scores (per Alyssa, would let Assessment know of interest)
 - Examination of data quality and its impact (i.e. especially at 12th grade)
 - Expand categories to include weighted index for performance and analogous growth measures related to multiple standards instead of strong/distinguished only.

Break at 10:05 a.m.

Impact of Federal Minimums on High School Growth

Josh Perdue

- Josh presented analysis of the impact of calculating student growth percentiles from 8th to 10th grade while skipping 9th grade.
- In reviewing correlations between high school level MGPs calculated using SPGs from 9th and 10th graders versus MGPs calculated using only SPGs for 10th graders under the 8-to-10 grade progression, Dwayne noted a consistent pattern of MGPs calculated under the 8-to-10 grade progression moving higher for schools and districts that already had higher MGPs under the current system
 - Members discussed possible reasons for this pattern.
 - CDE staff will investigate whether the pattern remains if 9th grade SGPs are removed from the medians calculated under the current system.
- Alyssa asked the TAP if they have any concerns with the removal of 9th grade growth based on the presented data. No TAP members expressed concerns with the removal of 9th grade growth based on the presented information.

PWR 2.0 – Feedback Session

Dan Jorgensen

- Dan provided an update on the status of the PWR work group. Currently, no changes have been made and/or agreed upon; however, possibilities for change exist. The TAP will be critical for obtaining feedback regarding metrics and design options. CDE is in the process of conducting focus groups with a range of stakeholders. The questions were presented to the TAP to help inform them of the process and to set the stage for future work.
- All feedback, anonymous, will be incorporated into the larger data obtained from all of the stakeholder focus groups.



-
- Future meetings will be looking deeply at the technical considerations related to proposed metrics and indicator design possibilities.

Public Comments & Action Items

Dan Jorgensen

- Dan will be sending a poll out to determine upcoming meeting dates. It was recommended that the TAP convene on dates that are close to those of the Accountability Work Group.
- A question was raised concerning the sustainability of the TAP with terms of membership ending the same time. Dan said he will bring this forward for a quick discussion at a future meeting. He doesn't anticipate issues as current membership have the ability to stay on the TAP and some natural attrition is expected.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:50