



Meeting Minutes – Thursday, May 19, 2016 (9:00-noon)

201 East Colfax, 4th Floor Atriums A & B, Denver, Colorado

TAP Members:

Norm Alerta
Grant Guyer
Elena Diaz-Bilello
Dwayne Schmitz
Carol Eaton
Linda Barker
Jonathan Dings
Jacqueline Law (call-in)

Audience:

Janeen Demi-Smith (call-in)
DJ Laurzel (call-in)
Paul Medina (call-in)
Brian Fuller

CDE Representatives:

Marie Huchton
Dan Jorgensen
Jessica Knevals
Alyssa Pearson
Josh Perdue (call-in)

Welcome, Minutes Approval, New Members Update & Vice-Chair Selection

Norman Alerta/Dan Jorgensen

- The meeting was convened in Atrium A & B, on the 4th floor at 201 East Colfax Avenue and was called to order at 9:05.
- The March 24th meeting minutes were briefly discussed and unanimously adopted. The selection of a vice-chair was tabled for discussion and will occur during a meeting to be scheduled for July/August of 2016.

Update on 2015 Informational Reports (Templates/Changes)

Dan Jorgensen/Alyssa Pearson

- Dan Jorgensen provided a short overview of the work that followed the release of the Informational Reports including training sessions and other opportunities to provide feedback. The TAP members were asked for any additional feedback that they had regarding the reports.
- Concerns were raised by some TAP members about how they believed the results could be potentially misleading. For example, the comparison of students with disabilities to all students. It was discussed that a comparison of the scores of students with disabilities to the overall populations fails to appropriately represent the subgroup performance with the displayed percentiles. It was expressed that the mean score and participation rate may be sufficient. The first percentile along with the ‘does not meet’ rating raises a lot of questions from stakeholders that requires clarification. It was said that the percentiles could create an excessive focus on a singular disaggregated group at the expense of the other groups.
- A related issue is that districts are unable to celebrate successes in regards to students with disabilities, since it doesn’t reflect students that exited their IEP. It would be worth seeing how many of these students are exited



across state. We don't have strong data currently and the frameworks serve a different purpose. It was also mentioned that it's not just exited IEP, but is also related to having specific kids that are in separate disability categories that never leave. It was pointed out that adding growth for students with disabilities will offset some potential issues. It was pointed out that this could be an important discussion for a larger group convening.

- Members expressed concerns with the possibility of missing data related to the matriculation indicator. In addition, concerns were expressed regarding how the military and other options aren't included in the sub-indicator.
- Additional discussions occurred regarding the weighting of the various content areas. Specifically, it was asked if an area such as science be weighted as high given the fewer number of kids. Related feedback included, possibly weigh science less due to lower numbers of participants. It was also said that to give a lower weighting may signal to science teachers that their work doesn't matter as much. It was mentioned that 11th grade participation could be very low so weighting matters
- It was pointed out that we have to be mindful when thinking about the relevance of various subgroup comparisons. If you're just making comparisons to the same subgroup you may reduce the relevance of these children to some individuals. Both views are perceived as valuable. CDE mentioned that they're thinking about ways to calculate at both levels.
- It was raised by TAP members that the use of the school distribution is problematic for determining percentile rankings. The distributions are not seen as behaving in the same manner and lead to differences in classification. Thus, the indicators become less meaningful. CDE pointed out that feedback from the field was strong that a single set of targets be used. As an alternate approach, the possible use of business rules was raised.

Indicator Ratings/Cut-Scores (graduation/dropout rates)

Marie Huchton

- Marie Huchton presented an overview of how cut-points are now being set along with concerns raised by stakeholders in regards to the graduation and dropout targets. It was pointed out that moving from the previously utilized criterion method to the new best of rates probably account for the changes. Per CDE, in the past the bar could be considered as low, thus, the new targets may be experienced as more punitive.
- Members expressed that it could be helpful to have CDE personnel discuss the details of graduation rate calculations with the TAP. This is also important from the TAP advisory role in that it could impact other work.
- The possibility of a more gradual ratcheting up of expectations was discussed. Concerns were raised regarding the public relations challenges the new cuts could bring to districts. If a ratcheting up occurred it is important that the percentiles are obtainable. It was also pointed out that how some of these systems arrived at 100% or 0% should be explored. Other recommendations included using the four and five year distributions and give the higher distribution of points. Also, maybe allow for 6 or 7 year rates within the request to reconsider process.

Request to Reconsider Considerations

Jessica Knevals

- Jessica Knevals provided an overview of possible areas of appeal based on the 2016 request to reconsider process. Feedback from TAP members included:
 - Could non-approved assessments be used? Response, it will depend on comparability of assessments.
 - The challenge of participation rates was reflected especially when local data may have higher participation rates. We want to be sure all students are reflected in calculations.
 - CDE is not sure how/if social studies will be included given that it's only tested every three years.



- CDE staff pointed out concerns with a creating system that overemphasizes the local assessments at the expense of the state summative assessments. The assessment pilot bill will need to take into account this relationship and how you define quality assessments. Also, will have discussions about alternate ways to build local assessments.
- At an upcoming TAP meeting the request to reconsider process will be further discussed and additional feedback will be solicited.

Performance Framework Considerations (1 yr., 2 yr., & 3 yr.)

Marie Huchton

- Marie Huchton led a discussion concerning how many years of data should be included in the fall 2016 performance frameworks.
- Two options were presented:
 - Include only one one year of data with other data being made available for possible request to reconsider. The resulting problem is no ratings would be generated for so many schools/districts due to small n-size.
 - Produce one and three year frameworks. More likely to address minimum n-count concerns. Inconsistent interpretation for different data points (based on number of years available).
 - The TAP was asked for their recommendation on how many years of data to include in the fall 2016 performance frameworks?

The TAP requested that the official decision be recorded as producing both one and three year rates. The three year rate would be used automatically for request to reconsider.

An additional item was presented discussing how alternate assessment results could be incorporated within future performance frameworks. The question was asked, how should COALT/DLM results be included in the achievement indicator given that the assessments are not based on scale scores.

- CDE presented multiple possibilities for inclusion of the required data.
 - One presented possibility is to convert EE to overall raw score and align to PARCC scale scores using linear-equating. We do find that they don't fill in the full range of scores on PARCC assessments with some clustering. TAP members pointed out that the method assumes same distributions of scores between two assessments. This won't impact state results just school results on average.
- CDE asked, what should we do about grades 10 and 11 given that Coalt/DLM are serving as alternate assessments for PSAT and ACT/SAT?
 - Response: hold them at the district level to protect privacy given that if it's one child change then can derive score.
- Questions were raised concerning the appropriateness of using the results for the proposed purpose since it wasn't designed in this manner. Also, potential challenges associated with explanation were raised. It was suggested that the explanations surrounding inclusion need to be kept simple.

The consensus from the TAP was to use the derived estimates while recognizing concerns to be in compliance with law. Factor in minimum n of one and caveat with limitations of methodology.



PARCC Growth Discussion (paper/on-line)

Marie Huchton

- Marie Huchton provided an overview of impact of paper/online administration on PARCC growth discussion. The TAP was asked, what analyses would the TAP recommend CDE conduct to ensure the 2015 and 2016 online and paper results are comparable and can appropriately be used to calculate growth?
- The TAP recommended first exploring how testing changed, paper to paper, paper to online, etc. and what the extent and nature of impact is on results.
- CDE representatives were told that the differences between administration modes would be addressed in the current year. If 2016 data is not corrected then it will be a large concern moving forward.
- An analysis suggestion was to identify the different groups from the past two years, identify all of the transitions and then use student growth percentiles from 2016 as dependent variable, run regression to determine average impact for each group. Use electronic to electronic as baseline group and should be able to determine the level of impact (adjustment coefficient). Based on that data we could then determine what we're going to do with each growth percentile and if we need to make adjustments within the accountability system. Also, propensity scores were raised as an analytic possibility. Pending the results it's possible that at some point a recommendation may occur for growth data to not be utilized.
- CDE indicated that they will solicit more feedback on this topic and that of participation rates during a summer meeting that will be scheduled.

Public Comments & Action Items

Norman Alerta/Dan Jorgensen

- The opportunity for public comment was provided to all audience members.
- It was asked if middle school dropout rates are included in the percentile determinations based on the school distribution. Per CDE, middle school students were excluded from these calculations.
- A call-in question asked if it would be possible to use the request to reconsider process for the inclusion of assessment scores that are believed to be valid but not included due to technical issues. The response was that CDE could discuss this possibility; however, the problem is that the department typically doesn't receive these scores. It was mentioned that if a district generates calculations based on suppressed scores they may be considered for inclusion with no guarantees at this point. It will require conversations with the CDE assessment office.
- A speaker indicated that they believed it is appropriate to support students to the age of 21 in some cases the seven year graduation rate would also make sense. This is true for Alternative Education Campuses that receive students later.
- The next TAP meeting will occur late July or early August. A doodle poll will be sent to members.

Meeting Adjourned at noon