



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO

December 10, 2014, Part 3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on December 10, 2014,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

Paul Lundeen (R), Chairman  
Marcia Neal (R), Vice Chairman  
Elaine Gantz Berman (D)  
Jane Goff (D)  
Pam Mazanec (R)  
Debora Scheffel (R)  
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1                            CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, 191 update. Mr.  
2    Commissioner.

3                            COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you. In accordance  
4    with Senate Bill 191, when that was passed, we were to  
5    provide you with yearly updates for any changes to rules.  
6    And along with the council, any recommendations they may  
7    have.

8                            So, with that, I'll turn it over to Ms.  
9    Katie, (indiscernible) staff. Jill, did you want to make  
10   any opening comments? Okay. Katie.

11                          MS. NEAL: Yes. I'm temporary.

12                          MS. KATIE: Okay, Madam Chairman.

13                          MS. NEAL: Go ahead.

14                          MS. KATIE: Great. Thank you. Thank you,  
15    madam chairman, members of the board. Appreciate the  
16    time to be here. This is our annual review of the  
17    implementation of Senate Bill 131. We're required to  
18    give you all an update on the progress of this work. And  
19    so this serves as that update for today.

20                          So, I believe you have these -- you received  
21    these slides early. They're also up on the board. I have  
22    two little tiny changes. Things have evolved since we  
23    sent these to you three weeks ago, and I'll make sure  
24    that I highlight that, so you know what has changed from  
25    the ones you received in the packet.



1                   This -- the slide back up on the screen is  
2 the current one. So just as a reminder, just wanted to  
3 show this picture of where we are in implementation.  
4 It's always important to remember where we are on this  
5 trajectory. We are in the green box now. We have moved  
6 over the several years. We're now in 2014-15, which is  
7 full state-wide implementation, except for that piece of  
8 legislation that was passed last year giving districts  
9 flexibility in how they use the Measures of Student  
10 Learning portion of the evaluation.

11                  So, given the transition of new state  
12 assessments, given the large challenge of putting  
13 together a measures of student learning system, the  
14 legislature did pass a bill that said districts can  
15 weight the Measures of Student Learning side of the  
16 evaluation anywhere from 0 to 50 percent. So that  
17 flexibility is in place during this year. We still  
18 consider it full implementation, because even if a  
19 district decided to weight that standard lower, the  
20 results of the full evaluation would still stand by the  
21 law.

22                  I also wanted to just mention that it's  
23 important at this point just to talk a little bit about  
24 the phases of our work. I'm going to move into kind of  
25 our year in review. I think at least from our staff



1 perspective, sometimes we get into the mode of thinking,  
2 "Wow, we've been doing this for a long time." Like, but  
3 it's really important to sort of situate this and where  
4 we are, that this is actually our first year of state-  
5 wide implementation of the evaluation law.

6 Our pilots have been added a little bit  
7 longer, but really, state-wide we're still at the very  
8 beginning of our journey and our trajectory on  
9 implementing high-quality educator evaluations.

10 So, we've really -- I sometimes talk about  
11 it as we've been working on the what. And that's what  
12 you see some here in this year in review. You know, what  
13 are the rubrics we're using. You know, what are the  
14 systems that we're putting in place? What are the  
15 processes that we're putting in place? What is the  
16 scoring mechanism that we put in place? We're in that  
17 development mode of all of the many different system  
18 elements. We've been doing that the past two years, and  
19 now we're really moving to the how.

20 And so, you'll see some of this reflected in  
21 the data. But now we can -- now that we have those  
22 systems and tools and processes in place, we can really  
23 work with our districts more closely on how to use those  
24 systems and tools in the most effective manner.

25 So to that point, I do just want to sort of



1 review the overall purpose of the system. So sometimes  
2 we'll get into the ratings and the data and just remember  
3 that the purpose of high-quality educator evaluations is  
4 to give meaningful feedback to all professionals on their  
5 practice. And so that's really the critical piece of  
6 this new law.

7 So, you see in the year in review our team  
8 has been busy. We've created and refined a state model  
9 system, as you recall. Districts can choose to use the  
10 state model system if they'd like. They can choose to  
11 use their own system if they would like as long as that  
12 system meets the legal requirements.

13 We have built now 11 different systems, so  
14 in the past we have been working on the specialized  
15 service professional systems. We now have those rubrics  
16 in place, those user guides in place, and districts are  
17 starting to evaluate those professionals as well. Those  
18 professionals are listed there on the slide.

19 So, one success is we have completed our  
20 first year of implementation, so that's exciting. We are  
21 just getting the data back statewide. So, again, as Britt  
22 shares with you the data today, just remember that's  
23 still a subset of our pilot districts. Because we get  
24 the data sort of a year lag, so that HR window is open  
25 right now for districts to provide that data to us.



1                   We've provided a lot of trainings across the  
2 state on all elements of the system, measures of student  
3 learning, the rubrics, the process, inter-rater agreement  
4 to try to get a consistency. We've been working very  
5 hard on that.

6                   We're also executing our research plan and  
7 making changes to the systems as feedback and research  
8 warrants, and we'll talk a little bit about that later.

9                   One of our biggest successes and biggest  
10 changes from where we were before you last year, was the  
11 launching of the Colorado Online Performance Management  
12 System. This is the one piece that has changed in the  
13 past three weeks from when we sent you these slides. WE  
14 now have 92 local education agencies in the system using  
15 the system.

16                  I think before it said we had 84 in the  
17 system and up to 92 using it. But now -- or in line to  
18 get in the system. Now they're all in the system and  
19 they're using it. I will highlight that we're using the  
20 term local education agencies there, because that  
21 includes districts and BOCES and a few charter schools.

22                  We have -- and that system, just to remind  
23 you, is the full data-management system. So, it's all of  
24 the different processes and tools and data that are being  
25 collected, and how to help a principal manage this system



1 and schedule their observations and collect their data in  
2 one coherent, easy-to-understand place. That's what this  
3 system is about. And we have heard from many, many  
4 districts across the state that this is one of the best  
5 tools they've ever used. That it's very user friendly.  
6 It helps them manage the process and they're very happy  
7 with it thus far.

8 We have also enhanced and expanded the use  
9 of our Elevate Colorado Online system. That's our system  
10 to help with the Inner Rater Agreement. That's really  
11 been in development over the past year, and it's still in  
12 development. We're learning a lot on that every day. We  
13 know we have a lot of work to do still on Inner Rater  
14 Agreement.

15 And we have also per our requirement,  
16 reviewed and approved and worked with 58 approved  
17 training providers so that we are not the only entities  
18 that can train on these systems. And so, we work with  
19 those 58 providers on a regular basis.

20 So, I'm going to turn it over to Dr.  
21 Wilkenfeld now to talk about some of the lessons that  
22 we've learned in our pilot data. But I do just want to  
23 remind you again, that this is -- today we're only  
24 focused on the teacher results. We are in the analysis  
25 stage of the principal evaluation results, and for the



1       first time ever our specialized service professional  
2       evaluation results. Those reports will be coming later.  
3       They'll be individual reports, and we'll make sure to  
4       send those to you in electronic or hard copy form.

5                   Oh. I think I have one more. So, again, as  
6       a refresher just on the system, this is the -- you've  
7       seen this many times, the structure of evaluations. We  
8       have that 50 percent of the evaluation is based on  
9       professional practice. That is, again, what we will be  
10      reviewing today. We have one of our lessons learned is  
11      collecting data on that measures of students learning.  
12      Especially before there was an online system, has been  
13      difficult.

14                  So, again, the data we've -- we have a  
15      research plan in place to look at that data. That has  
16      taken us a little bit longer. So today we are focused on  
17      the professional practice side of this chart, and so as I  
18      mentioned before, that 50 percent student academic growth  
19      will be talking about that in either another  
20      presentation, or when that research is ready to share.

21                  MS. NEAL: Can I ask --?

22                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

23                  MS. NEAL: Oh. I was just reiterate -- so we  
24      have not -- you've not been able to address the student's  
25      regrowth model yet. You -- so this is all on the other



1 side of the --

2 MS. KATIE: Yeah. Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

4 MS. KATIE: Yes. Thank you. Good question.

5 You will see Britt will talk a little bit about doing  
6 some correlations with the student growth that we have as  
7 a part of our school view, and a part of our school  
8 performance frameworks, and a part of our statewide  
9 assessments will let me do a little bit of that. But in  
10 terms of linking the student growth directly to all of  
11 their multiple measures of student learning, that's the  
12 work that we're still gathering from them.

13 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can I also -- can you just  
15 review with us on the student growth thing, since we're  
16 not going to be focusing on it, what discretion  
17 individual school districts have around what makes up the  
18 50 percent.

19 MS. KATIE: Sure, Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

21 MS. KATIE: Yeah, thank you. Good question.  
22 There are four elements that sort of define the measures  
23 of student learning side of the equation. Number one, a  
24 teacher or a -- must have a measure of individually  
25 attributed growth. Meaning that the students that they



1 directly teach must be a part, one of their multiple  
2 measures, their student learning, must be a part of one  
3 of their multiple measures. The second requirements is  
4 that teachers must have a measure of collectively  
5 attributed student growth. Mean -- and that can be  
6 defined very broadly. It's just more than one educator  
7 would collectively contribute to the learning of a group  
8 of students as they define it. Often times that is used  
9 as school-wide measures. So, saying: Yes, we all have a  
10 stake in increasing literacy in our school, so we're all  
11 going to take a 10-percent sort of collective growth  
12 measure from our state assessment. So that's one  
13 example. But you can define that very differently.

14                         The third requirement is when available  
15 state-wide assessment scores must be one of your multiple  
16 measures. So, if you are a teacher in a state-wide  
17 tested subject area, that needs to be one of your  
18 multiple measures, but districts get to define how much -  
19 - what percent that is worth and how that's included in  
20 that side of the pie chart.

21                         The last piece is where applicable the  
22 Colorado growth model. So, if you are a teacher where  
23 you have Colorado growth model scores, that also has to  
24 be one of your multiple measures. And in the same way  
25 from the state assessment they still get to choose how



1       much weight that would count, and how that would be  
2       incorporated into their full body of measures.

3                   MS. SCHEFFEL: So, it sounds like local  
4       school districts have complete discretion on how they  
5       weight the 50 percent, or not?

6                   MS. KATIE: Mr. Chair. That is correct.  
7       Yes. I believe there is a piece in the law that says it  
8       should have a measurable influence, or it should -- you  
9       know, so something about having measurable influence.  
10      But yes, they have discretion.

11                  MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. That's really  
12      interesting.

13                  MS. KATIE: Mr. Chair, one more thing. I  
14      will just make mention that we have been partnering with  
15      the Colorado Education Initiative to do some sort of  
16      research and help us understand what districts are using  
17      the measures of student learning side. They have done a  
18      really nice executive summary up on their website. I can  
19      make sure Carrie and Bizzy get that link. It's a very  
20      nice executive summary. It gives you an overall view of  
21      trends around what districts were doing on that side of  
22      the equation for the first year of implementation.

23                  MS. NEAL: I have -- Oh, I'm sorry.  
24      Angelika.

25                  MS. SCHROEDER: Just quickly, is this



1 something the school board signs off on, and at what  
2 level is that decision made? If it's a district  
3 decision?

4 MS. KATIE: Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

6 MS. KATIE: Thank you. I believe that that  
7 would be up to the district. There are several committees  
8 that have an advisory role to the superintendent and  
9 sometimes the school board as well. So, the -- what we  
10 often call the 1338 council, which was the Personnel  
11 Evaluation Council, is a council that works with the  
12 superintendent to give feedback and advice on the system.  
13 And sometimes the District Accountability Committees do  
14 that too. It depends on how the district structures  
15 that. But I believe that overall the superintendent  
16 would sign off on that.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: And not the board.

18 MS. KATIE: I can double check that for you,  
19 though.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: I have one last just kind of  
22 clarifying question.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: We've developed a model that  
25 school districts can adopt if they choose. What



1       percentage of the school districts have adopted the model  
2       versus what -- how many are doing their own?

3                     MS. KATIE: Mr. Chairman, thank you. We  
4       have over 94 percent of districts that have adopted the  
5       teacher model. It starts to get a little complicated now  
6       that we have so many models. Now that we have 11  
7       different models. I was trying to pull my piece out, but  
8       we have -- woops. Here we go. Um, we have, for the  
9       principal system, we have 159 local education agencies  
10      using the principal system.

11                  For the teacher system we have 172 local  
12      education agencies using the system. So, again that goes  
13      down. If you just focus on districts it goes down to  
14      about 162, but when you include BOCES, but also some  
15      BOCES employee teachers and we also have some charter  
16      schools using the state model system. That's how we get  
17      up to the 172.

18                  And then for all of the different  
19      specialized service professionals we have a varying  
20      number of districts, but very high percentages using the  
21      specialized service model as well. Those numbers very  
22      even more greatly, because some districts don't employ  
23      all of those professionals. So, for example, we have 51  
24      LEA's reporting that they're using the school orientation  
25      and mobility specialist rubric. We know that not all



1 districts or BOCES even have a School Mobility and  
2 Orientation Specialist. So that's why that number is  
3 lower.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: And do you know offhand the  
5 districts that are doing their own? I know DPS is.

6 MS. KATIE: I don't have that particular  
7 chart in front of me, but I can get that to you by the  
8 time Britt's done. If I can pull it up. I could almost  
9 name them all. So, for the teacher, I mean, it's DPS,  
10 Harrison, Eagle, Jefferson County, Douglas. That's five.  
11 I know there's one more I'm missing, at least. So... yeah.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. That's good. That's  
13 fine. Yeah, thank you.

14 MS. NEAL: Go ahead.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right, we move  
16 forward. Is there more presentation?

17 MS. WILKENFELD: Yes, sir.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I thought there was.

19 MS. NEAL: I was feeling guilty because I  
20 thought I'd got them off the track.

21 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

23 MS. WIKLENFELD: Thank you for having me.

24 Um, so now we're going to -- we got a lot of high-level  
25 stuff. Thanks for your great questions. Now we're



1        really going to dig into the weeds a little bit. I'm  
2        going to go over -- I think everyone should have a copy  
3        of the actual report. I also, I apologize, didn't send  
4        them out. But Bizzy handed out, just for quick  
5        reference, a one-pager on the text behind all the teacher  
6        quality standards and elements for your reference.  
7        Because I kind of shorthand them, but it's important to  
8        know what they're really representing. So those are the  
9        materials that you should have.

10                  And the data that we're going to be talking  
11        about come from pilot Year 2 of the state model  
12        evaluation system for teachers.

13                  We piloted the system in 25 districts in the  
14        2013-14 school year, and we're seeing final evaluation  
15        readings from 23 of those districts, which is a pretty  
16        good participation rate for districts who are  
17        participating in a lot of activities. So, we received  
18        ratings for about 3400 teachers, which is nearly double  
19        what we received in the first year of the pilot.

20                  As with Year 1 of the pilot, we find that  
21        the Professional Practice Rubric is capturing multiple  
22        aspects of teaching, which will be illustrated when we  
23        look at some of the graphs, and also differences in  
24        teacher practice. Which you'll see in some of the  
25        distributions. The distributions also indicate that,



1 basically, that the variability in the distributions  
2 indicate that evaluators are assigning ratings in a  
3 meaningful way and differentiating between teachers. So,  
4 there's a lot of evidence, you know, that the -- that the  
5 systems is working the way it's intended to.

6 We also continue to see evidence for certain  
7 kinds of reliability, and we will dig into validity a  
8 little bit with teachers it's -- the analysis related to  
9 validity require teacher-student data links, and I don't  
10 know how much any of you have heard about that, but it's  
11 very difficult for districts to properly and  
12 electronically capture all of their teacher roster and  
13 actually link teachers to students and then get that  
14 information to us. But that -- those data are required  
15 for us to be able to do some of the validity analyses, so  
16 those are usually a little bit lagged, but we do have  
17 some evidence for reliability and fairness.

18 Before I jump into the data, I do want to  
19 kind of give the spiel I always give at the beginning of  
20 this presentation, which is, when we see graphs and  
21 tables it's really easy to jump to conclusions and say:  
22 Well, these teachers are doing this, and it looks like  
23 this. And we're in our second year of the pilot, but  
24 this is all still very preliminary. We have our own  
25 continuous improvement process. You know, we use the



1 data every year to inform and make changes to the rubric  
2 as well as our tools and our processes. And then  
3 districts have their own continuous improvement process,  
4 where they're learning kind of how to -- how to stick to  
5 the evaluation process, how to -- how to give the kind of  
6 feedback that teachers really need to improve their  
7 practice. So, as we're in this learning time, we just  
8 want to be cautious about any jumping to any conclusions.

9                   So here are the distributions across the  
10 five teacher quality standards and the overall  
11 professional practice ratings. And, again, so this is  
12 that half, the professional practice half, that doesn't  
13 include the student growth component. So here because --  
14 basic -- essentially because the graphs look a little bit  
15 different, you can see there's some variability, that's  
16 what really illustrates that we are measuring different  
17 aspects of teaching, and that there are differences in  
18 teacher practice. Meaning we have teachers in the  
19 different performance categories. Not so many in basic,  
20 but we have some in partially proficient, proficient,  
21 accomplished and exemplary.

22                   With regard to the overall ratings, 97  
23 percent of teachers received an overall rating of  
24 proficient or higher, which is up a little bit from 92  
25 percent in Year 1 of the pilot. And I'll talk a little



bit more about comparisons between Year 1 and Year 2 in a minute. You can see that there are some variation in the distributions at the standard level. We'll see that even more at the element level, which will dig into a couple of the standards here in a minute. But before we do, I just want to highlight the highest and lowest rated standards.

15 And something to be clear on, because I'm  
16 not always clear with my team, the distinction of the  
17 highest and lowest rated is based on an average across  
18 all of those categories. So, for instance, if you look  
19 at Standard 4, there are a lot of teachers in the  
20 exemplary category, so that pulls up the average, that's  
21 why it's the highest rated standard.

Okay, so we're going to dig into I think just the highest and lowest rated standard just for illustration purposes. Again, you have the graphs for all of them, and they're also in the teacher report.



1 MS. NEAL: Oh, I'm in the wrong one. Sorry.

2 MS. WILKENFELD: So here are the elements  
3 within Standard 3, all of which pertain to effective  
4 instruction and the classroom environment that  
5 facilitates learning. Although 95 percent of teachers  
6 received a rating of proficient or higher on the  
7 standard, you'll see that it's because most of them are  
8 in the proficient category. There aren't as many in the  
9 accomplished or exemplary category, so that's why kind of  
10 the average rating is lower.

11 We do see three of the lowest-rated elements  
12 in the entire rubric are on this standard. Standard 3b,  
13 which is utilizing technology that's available to you.  
14 Element 3e, having high expectations for all students,  
15 and Element 3h, which is the use of assessment to inform  
16 instruction.

17 You can see more at the element level that  
18 we -- there's basically even more variability at the  
19 distributions. Kind of more use of the basic and  
20 partially proficient categories.

21 Here are the distributions for the elements  
22 within Standard 4, which is Reflect on practice. This is  
23 our highest-rated standard. 93 percent of teachers  
24 receive a rating of proficient or higher, but you can see  
25 most of those are actually in the accomplished or



1 exemplary category. So, some teachers are getting really  
2 high ratings on this. And then two of the highest rated  
3 elements of the rubric are in the standard. Element 4a,  
4 which is Analyzing to Improve, and Element 4c, which is  
5 being responsive to the classroom environment. To get  
6 with both of those you can see where getting a lot of  
7 exemplary teachers there.

8 Any questions before I move on to some  
9 different kinds of graphs?

10 MS. GOFF: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

12 MS. GOFF: Now, a couple, but I'll wait, two  
13 of them, until we were all done here. But the one you  
14 just said, responds to the environment, and I, well, I  
15 have read this document and the rubric a lot, you know,  
16 so I'm aware of what the elements are in that particular  
17 one and what that means. But I'm -- two points: On the  
18 one hand, it's great to hear that you all are seeing that  
19 there's reliability and validity, and that there is a  
20 true understanding and awareness of what each part of the  
21 rubric means. Whatever. And that you can distinguish  
22 teacher style, teach approach based on these elements.  
23 But that word, environment, is an interesting one.  
24 Because, you know, part of -- part of the job, part of  
25 the reality every day in a classroom environment is the



1 physical environment. And how people respond to that is  
2 one thing. Then there's the cultural environment, and  
3 the instructional environment. So I would -- I would  
4 predict that as this develops over the years, whether  
5 it's refining the rubric even further, which I trust  
6 should and will happen over the years, but the  
7 conversation about how do schools -- how does an  
8 evaluator and teacher, in this case, sit down and really  
9 get it right off the hand what it means to talk about the  
10 environment? You know, and we know -- we have a public  
11 that you never can predict how people are going to define  
12 a word, or a phrase, and so when we start talking about  
13 his rubric, or we try to explain based on what our  
14 conversation are and what we are aware of, it's -- I'm  
15 going to be asking, I'm going to be talking more about so  
16 what is the -- not -- don't tell me what to say, but tell  
17 me kind of -- give -- I'm going to be looking for some  
18 real clear guidelines about how to talk to some of these  
19 big issues -- about some of these big issues with people.  
20 So -- but that one is, that -- when I read it the other  
21 day I thought, well, that's -- could be getting into the  
22 weeds. But to me it's a real interesting concept how  
23 somebody takes the word "environment" and goes with it.  
24 So...

25 MS. KATIE: Mr. Chairman.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

2 MS. KATIE: Yes, Board Member Goff, those  
3 are -- those are great points. And I just wanted to  
4 highlight we have heard about that, and we are working on  
5 that. That many of these words can be interpreted in  
6 different ways, and so that's a part of our goal at  
7 increasing reliability. We have some evidence for  
8 reliability, but it doesn't mean everything is perfectly  
9 reliable. And one thing we've done to address issues  
10 like that is to provide a resource guide, and we focused  
11 first the resource guide on issues, words like that, that  
12 could be interpreted in multiple ways, and the field has  
13 really found that to be quite helpful. But that, you're  
14 right, that is going to be a long-term process for us to  
15 find those places that might be confusing, or might be  
16 able to be interpreted in multiple ways.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So, I'm thinking about  
19 elevate the inner (indiscernible) reliability piece. For  
20 example, for the element that Jane just described, will  
21 it have examples of the rubric that helps define what  
22 that means? I mean, I think that's ultimately how you  
23 really get a good sense for what is the definition. Or,  
24 maybe in some cases, two or three examples of each one of  
25 the levels of the rubrics to help explain that.



1 MS. KATIE: Yes. Mr. Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

3 MS. KATIE: Yes. You are reading our mind  
4 here. Actually, the other important thing to realize, is  
5 you -- before you have the standards and the elements,  
6 but the whole structure of the rubric goes even deeper to  
7 the specific professional practices that define what we  
8 mean by, in this case, a complex and dynamic environment.

9 So, the professional practices that explain  
10 that, that you don't have the full rubric in front of  
11 you, coupled with the resource guide and coupled with  
12 some of the work we're doing with master coders, or  
13 master scorers. We're hoping to bring that  
14 understanding, you know, to a tighter place.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: And will that be available  
16 public all, so that a parent can figure out what is the  
17 expectation in the classroom?

18 MS. KATIE: Mr. Chairman.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: What are the kind -- what  
20 are the kind of performances that identify a master  
21 teacher?

22 MS. KATIE: Yes. All of those things are  
23 available publicly right now. The resource guide is on  
24 our website, the rubrics are all on our website with all  
25 of the professional practices, and the Elevate Colorado



1 system is also open and up on our website, so you can  
2 watch videos and see what parts -- see how the master  
3 coders coded those videos and what evidence they saw of  
4 effective teaching.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Great, thanks.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, let's move on with  
7 the presentation.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Yep. You're right.

9 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

11 MS. WILKENFELD: Okay, so since we didn't  
12 have a chance to go through all of the elements and  
13 standards, I wanted to give a highlight of the five  
14 highest and the five lowest. So here we're looking at  
15 the five highest-rated elements. Teachers received the  
16 highest ratings on Element 5d, which is demonstrating  
17 high ethical standards. They also receive high ratings  
18 for establishing a predictable and caring learning  
19 environment, demonstrating leadership in their schools,  
20 analyzing student learning and growth to improve their  
21 practice, and responding to their environment, that we  
22 have been discussing.

23 There are little starts next to a few of  
24 them. Those -- three of those five elements were among  
25 the highest rated in Year 1 of the pilot, as well, so I



1 just wanted to flag that. So, you can see how this  
2 information would be useful for districts. If you come  
3 from a district where you know you really implemented  
4 with fidelity, that your evaluators are kind of normed on  
5 the different performance levels and that then these are  
6 your results, you know that these really stand out for  
7 You. These are -- these are where your teachers do  
8 really well, that kind of thing. So, we're -- this is  
9 information that we do provide back to districts. I  
10 haven't mentioned that yet.

11                   Everything that is in the full teacher pilot  
12 report we've created individual reports for all of the  
13 pilot districts as well, and so we have field  
14 representatives from our team that are going out to all  
15 the districts actually right now to give them their own  
16 report, and also give them some feedback survey results  
17 so that they have a chance to reflect on their pilot  
18 data.

19                   Sorry. Okay, so now we're kind of looking  
20 at the opposite end of the spectrum. These are the five  
21 lowest rated elements. Many of them fall into Standard  
22 3, the lowest rated standard, which I -- we already  
23 talked about. Which having high expectations for all  
24 students, using assessments to inform instruction, and  
25 utilizing available technology to support student



1 learning.

2 Teachers also receive lower ratings on  
3 Element 5(b) which is contributing to the teaching  
4 profession, and Element 1(b), which pertains to  
5 supporting literacy development. And four of these were  
6 actually in the lowest rated group last year as well.

7 So, again, kind of the flip side, you can  
8 see how this information would be helpful to districts  
9 who feel good about their process and feel like these --  
10 if these are their lowest five, whenever they get the  
11 report from us, that that's really a reflection of what's  
12 happening in their district. It helps them to really  
13 target their PD and their resources towards these  
14 particular practices.

15 It's also useful for us at TD to kind of  
16 think about why are these elements the lowest-rated  
17 elements, and not just this year, but look at some long-  
18 term trends. So, for instance, Element 3D utilized  
19 technology is a good example. You'll see it's integrate  
20 and utilize appropriate available technology to maximize  
21 student learning. For us, this could indicate kind of a  
22 training piece. We need to make sure evaluators know  
23 that it -- teachers are supposed to be rated on using  
24 available technology, so you can't use a smart board if  
25 you don't have it in your classroom. Right? So it's



1       what do they have in their classroom, how are they  
2       utilizing it. So, again, these can be used for us.  
3       They're just kind of flags for us to dig into, to make  
4       sure that there aren't any issues with the rubric, or  
5       issues with training, things that we need to readdress  
6       with the field.

7                   UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Would you --?

8                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let me just -- as point  
9       of reference, we've got 10 slides left in a 25-slide  
10      presentation, and we're already 10 minutes over our time.  
11      So, let's keep moving with the presentation if we can.

12                  MS. WILKENFELD: Yes, sir. Mr. Chair, I'll  
13      try to be fast. So here we're just looking at the  
14      difference between Year 1 and Year 2 of the pilot. I can  
15      basically tell you overall where last year the most  
16      common rating was proficient and this year the most  
17      common rating is one up, which is accomplished. That's  
18      the main difference. We did see that for our -- for our  
19      educators for whom we had two years of data, about 90  
20      percent of them maintained or improved their performance,  
21      which is kind of the foundation of the state model system  
22      is that we think that with really good feedback that  
23      teachers can improve their practice, so we have evidence  
24      of that

25                  I may try to maybe kind of try to breeze



1 through these. Here we --

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, no. Get to your  
3 content. WE don't' want to push you out. I was just  
4 trying to let people let you speak, was what I was  
5 looking for her.

6 MS. WILKENFELD: Oh, okay. Thank you, Mr.  
7 Chair. Okay, so now we're going go basically look at a  
8 bunch of group differences, so we've shifted a little  
9 with the graph, so I just want to norm on what the graphs  
10 are. All of these graphs are going to be ordered from  
11 highest rated at the top to lowest rated at the bottom,  
12 and they represent all of the performance categories.  
13 So, you can see in the bottom right there you have the  
14 key, basically, for what their -- what their overall  
15 professional practice rating was.

16 So, what we're looking at here are  
17 differences based on district, which with the district  
18 names removed. And as you can probably tell, like, you  
19 know, the bars look different, so we do have  
20 statistically significant differences in rates based on  
21 the district in which teachers work.

22 So, this again could be a real reflection of  
23 kind of teacher practice and teacher quality of the  
24 state. Could -- across the state. It could also be a  
25 reflection of training and implementation fidelity and



1 understanding the rubric.

2 So, for us I think both years of data have  
3 really been kind of a signal for our team to develop  
4 resources that districts can use. We mentioned Elevate,  
5 which is a resource for innovator agreement, which kind  
6 of helps both give examples of really excellent practice  
7 and kind of a range of practice, and also to help  
8 evaluators norm, right? Across the different performance  
9 categories within and across districts.

10 And then we've also -- we've heard, as you  
11 have probably heard, that, you know, districts are  
12 dealing with a lot of new systems. This is just one new  
13 thing that they're dealing with, and they're under a lot  
14 of pressure, so we've also developed an online  
15 performance management system that kind of creates the  
16 organizational structure to help them get through the  
17 evaluation process and do everything electronically and  
18 capture everything. So, we're providing as many  
19 resources as we can to help districts with this process.

20 Here we're looking at group differences  
21 based on a couple teacher employment characteristics. In  
22 the -- basically in the first chart you can see that  
23 teacher -- early childhood educators received the highest  
24 ratings, followed by elementary, middle, and high school.  
25 This is the exact same finding as year 1 of the pilot.



1       Same with differences based on probationary status, where  
2       non-probationary teachers received the highest ratings.  
3       And we're finding that two years in a row.

4                   So now we're looking at differences based on  
5       teacher experience in education. And, again, similar to  
6       Year 1, we see that teachers with more years of  
7       experience and also teachers with graduate degrees  
8       receive higher ratings than other teachers.

9                   Now we're going to shift gears a little bit  
10      and look at differences in overall perfect -- overall  
11      professional practice ratings based on the  
12      (indiscernible) schools that teachers work in. So here  
13      we're looking at ratings based on their school  
14      performance framework rating, or the SPF rating, which,  
15      of course, is the Colorado School Accountability Measure.  
16      So, you can see just looking at the graph that there are  
17      distributions. The only statistically significant  
18      differences are that teachers in turnaround schools  
19      receive lower ratings than teachers in performance  
20      improvement and priority improvement schools.

21                  We also find statistically significant  
22      differences in ratings based on the demographics of  
23      students in the school. So here just a couple things.  
24      Just a reminder, we're looking at school-level  
25      demographics, not classroom level, because we don't have



1       those teacher-student data links yet. So, this is just  
2       at the school, so it's not quite as fine grain. And we  
3       looked at differences based on the proportion of minority  
4       students in school -- the proportion of students  
5       qualified for free and reduced-price lunch, and also the  
6       proportion of English Language Learners which there no  
7       statistically significant differences, which is why those  
8       -- there isn't a graph here, basically. But teachers in  
9       high-minority schools and teachers in high-FRL schools  
10      receive lower ratings.

11                   Shifting gears one more time. This is --  
12                   this is the hardest one, the last graph. So here we're -  
13                   - again, we're still looking at differences based on  
14                   teacher ratings, but we're now look at -- looking at  
15                   averages based on those performance categories,  
16                   specifically average student achievement and average  
17                   student growth in the schools in which these teachers  
18                   work, using 2014 TCAP Reading, though the findings are  
19                   basically the same for TCAP Math.

20                   So, for student achievement we examine the  
21                   average percent of proficient or advanced students in the  
22                   school, and for student growth we looked at the average  
23                   student growth percentile in the school. And just to  
24                   give a quick explanation what's even in the graph, so we  
25                   know what we're looking at. The yellow lines in the



1       middle depict the mean for that group of teachers. The  
2       gray-shaded area represents plus and minus one standard  
3       deviation, which is really, just to give you an  
4       indication of the spread around the mean, and then the  
5       dark red lines at the top and bottom are the maximum and  
6       minimum for that performance category.

7                   So, just to go through one, if you would --

8                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Again, as an average, not  
9       as an absolute.

10                  MS. WILKENFELD: I'm sorry?

11                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's as an average  
12       still, the max and min.

13                  MS. WILKENFELD: Right. Right. The max  
14       average and the min average. Right, exactly. At the  
15       school level.

16                  So, if you look -- looking at the Student  
17       Achievement Graph, looking at the performance category of  
18       partially proficient, on average 60 percent of students  
19       in their schools support -- scored proficient or advanced  
20       on TCAP Reading. So that's the yellow line in the middle  
21       compared with teachers who received a rating of exemplary  
22       on average 76 percent of the students in their school  
23       were proficient, or advanced on TCAP Reading.

24                  So that's how that could be, or you could  
25       really just focus on the yellow, but whenever you give a



1 mean you're supposed to give a spread, so... but really, if  
2 you look at the yellow, that's kind of the differences.  
3 And you can see just by looking at the graph there's an  
4 upward trend whereby kind of teachers in the school  
5 receive higher ratings, the achievement of the students  
6 in the school is also higher.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So, talk about the other  
8 one, because it has me flummoxed.

9 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Student growth. Go  
11 ahead.

12 MS. WILKENFELD: Right. So, we do not see  
13 the same relationship with student growth. We don't see  
14 the same kind of upward trend, and we basically do not --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Shed effect?

16 MS. WILKENFELD: Excuse me?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Is that the shed effect?

18 MS. WILKENFELD: I don't know what that --  
19 I'm sorry, I'm not familiar.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: When you get to the upper  
21 levels --

22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (indiscernible 00:40:53)  
23 to do with antlers?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: No antlers. When -- I think  
25 this comes out of Sander's (ph) model, the shed effect,



1       is that when you get students in the very higher level of  
2       achievement their amount of growth tends to flatten out,  
3       you know, as opposed to an overall low -- the lower  
4       quartiles who are (indiscernible) growth simply because  
5       the curriculum doesn't challenge, I mean, that's not -- I  
6       don't know why, but the shed effect is that the high --  
7       highest quartile of students don't tend to make -- they  
8       score well. They don't tend to make growth very  
9       significantly simply by virtue of the curriculum, and the  
10      expectations that are set for those high-achieving  
11      students. Or, I guess in Jane's case, they might be  
12      gifted students.

13                  MS. GOFF: It's because there's a  
14                  (indiscernible) maximum. Because the max is --

15                  MS. SCHROEDER: That's another term for it.  
16                  I mean, that's the (indiscernible).

17                  MS. GOFF: No. That's -- I don't remember  
18        how I learned that term. But I know what you're talking  
19        about.

20                  MS. SCHROEDER: I don't know how you peel  
21        this back, but that certainly is something that's been  
22        discussed (indiscernible) the last 15 years.

23                  MS. GOFF: Can I -- I'm sorry.

24                  MS. SCHROEDER: Go ahead.

25                  MS. GOFF: Can I clarify? We're looking at



1 aggregate over school buildings, separate school  
2 buildings, at a grade level, because you had -- there had  
3 to be a measurement. There had to be some test, one of  
4 our assessments, to use as the basis of that. Right?

5 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

6 MS. GOFF: (indiscernible) elementary --  
7 this is an elementary picture of one measure at one grade  
8 level.

9 MS. KATIE: It combines all grade levels.  
10 But, yeah. What's on the right is the Colorado Growth  
11 Model. Is that what -- is -- did -- is that what you're  
12 asking? I'm sorry if I didn't understand.

13 MS. GOFF: Okay, so when student, the  
14 student achievement part is based on all measures, state  
15 measures, at elementary only? Did I hear you say that?  
16 Or just all schools?

17 MS. KATIE: It -- Mr. Chair. Sorry if I'm  
18 not explaining it very well. It's based on -- looking at  
19 the teachers in whatever school they work at, it -- an  
20 elementary, middle, or high. And then looking at the  
21 achievement level of all the students in their school on  
22 TCAP Reading. So regardless of grade level.

23 MS. GOFF: That's what I needed to have.

24 MS. KATIE: Yeah.

25 MS. GOFF: Now that I have that in my head,



1           that helps me (indiscernible).

2           MS. KATIE: Okay, okay. And that's why it's  
3       not as fine-grained as it -- as if it was just the  
4       students in their classroom.

5           MS. GOFF: Got it.

6           MS. KATIE: And to answer your question,  
7       sorry, I didn't know the terminology. I'm familiar with  
8       the ceiling effect, which I think is --

9           MS. SCHROEDER: I think that's exactly --

10          MS. KATIE: I think that's what you're  
11       getting to.

12          MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

13          MS. KATIE: I am not the expert at CDE on  
14       this topic, but I -- my understanding is that -- maybe  
15       Joe could speak to it, but I don't -- I'm not sure the  
16       extent to which that is an issue with the Colorado Growth  
17       Model. I'd have to get back to you. I think that is an  
18       issue with some growth models, but the way that ours work  
19       out since their -- since the students are always compared  
20       against similar peers they're only, you know, you're --  
21       so you're -- so gifted and talented kids had to be  
22       compared against other gifted and talented kids. And  
23       then some of their growth is relative to those students.  
24       So some of them will have high growth and some of them  
25       will have low growth.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: And it has been identified  
2 as a problem with our assessment system (indiscernible)  
3 in the kind of range that we'd like to see.

4 MS. KATIE: Assessments in general.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So (indiscernible) sorry.

6 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes.

8 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think, to Dr.

9 Schroeder's point, that's more of an issue that was in  
10 Dr. Sander's Value Added Model, the shed effect. It's  
11 not as relevant in the Colorado Growth Model for the  
12 reasons that was just described, as we compare to like  
13 students.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, please.

15 MS. WILKENFELD: Okay, so as you can tell,  
16 because I've just breezed through some of it, and there's  
17 even more in the paper, and there's even more that I do  
18 at my desk that I don't bore you with. But we collect a  
19 lot of data from districts and we think it's important  
20 for districts to know, and for you guys to know that we  
21 use all of the data, and we use the quantitative data  
22 I've shared with you today. We also use qualitative  
23 data. You know, as I said, all of our -- my team member  
24 are all -- they're visiting districts all over the state  
25 right now, conducting interviews and focus groups to kind



1       of talk to them about the process, talk to them about how  
2       it's working for them, how it isn't, get feedback on  
3       specific elements. So, we collect a lot of data, and we  
4       really use it to inform changes to the system.

5                   Over the last two years we've made some  
6       pretty large changes, you know, completely revamping  
7       performance categories, and then just kind of, like,  
8       streamlining the rubric. Our -- we would love to make it  
9       shorter as well, so we try, you know, we try to do that  
10      every year while also staying true to the intent, which  
11      is that, you know, teaching is difficult and complicated,  
12      and it encompasses a lot of different practices. And we  
13      want them to all be captured in our rubric.

14                  We have also hired an external evaluator to  
15      basically review what we're doing, to kind of do an  
16      evaluation of our evaluations, you know. Looking at all  
17      the data that we collect, how we're using the data, how  
18      we could make better use of the data, just a kind of an  
19      outside -- an outside perspective on how we can improve  
20      our own processes.

21                  MS. GOFF: And who is that external  
22      evaluator?

23                  MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

24                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, please.

25                  MS. WILKENFELD: It's the Marzano Research



1                   Lab.

2                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Now, last comments  
3                   before we get to a lightening round of questions here?

4                   MR. KATIE: So last -- last slide here is  
5                   just, as you can see, we still -- we're still at the  
6                   beginning of our learning process here. We have a couple  
7                   key focus areas for moving forward that I just wanted to  
8                   highlight. You know, again, we're actually still working  
9                   with our pilot districts for a total of five years,  
10                  because we get that granule -- granular information from  
11                  them that can help us make decisions.

12                  I will say, we have a couple key goals.

13                  It's increasing the evaluator skill set to help increase  
14                  the norming and the consistency of what we mean when we  
15                  say: These are the teacher quality standards. So, we  
16                  have that work. We have increasing evaluator skills on  
17                  the -- the type of feedback they give, and how they give  
18                  feedback. So, all of this is -- is sort of meaningless  
19                  unless evaluators know how to translate that into  
20                  meaningful feedback and actional feedback for teachers.

21                  We also want to increase the skills and the  
22                  process in using the measures of student learning. We  
23                  know that this is the area that districts struggle with,  
24                  and so they -- we are working with districts to increase  
25                  our knowledge and increase all of our skills on that



1 piece.

2 And we know that there's some of this data  
3 in this -- in this report that we want to work on and  
4 look at and track over time. So, for example, that last  
5 student growth chart, we want to see a positive  
6 correlation there. And so, we know that we're at the  
7 beginning of our trajectory here. We've got a number of  
8 actions in place to help us get there, but we're  
9 encouraged at this beginning part of our journey that  
10 we're starting to see some good evidence of the system  
11 beginning it's -- sorry. Beginning to work. So, thank  
12 you for your time today.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Questions. We'll  
14 start down at the end again. Elaine?

15 MS. BERMAN: So, I know your major intent is  
16 the pilot, and putting all the pieces together. I think  
17 I'm focusing more on what we're finding, what we're  
18 learning. So, on page 15 where we talk about the lowest  
19 rated elements --

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Slide 15, or page 15?  
21 (indiscernible) page in our report.

22 MS. BERMAN: Page 15. Page 15 in our hard  
23 copy.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

25 MS. BERMAN: The title is Summary of Lowest



1        Ratings. I mean, there're two here that really, really  
2        jump out at me, which are, I find, really distressing.  
3        And that's the -- under high expectations and literacy  
4        development. I mean, if we don't have high expectations,  
5        we're never going to succeed, and in terms of literacy  
6        development, as my colleague points out all the time,  
7        that's just the core of everything that we should be  
8        focusing on.

9                      Can you -- do -- can you make any comments  
10         on what we're learning here?

11                    MS. KATIE: Mr. Chair.

12                    CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

13                    MS. KATIE: Thank you.

14                    CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Great question.

15                    MS. KATIE: Yeah. Those are great  
16         questions, and we are just starting our process now of  
17         going out to the districts where we got this data and  
18         doing data, sort of, digs with them, to say sort of how  
19         is this reflecting in your district? How -- what do you  
20         see this is? As you saw Britt kind of said, all of -- we  
21         have to be careful of all the reasons we don't want to  
22         jump to conclusions, but when we talk with districts they  
23         know their context better, and this has been, to be  
24         honest, you know, kind of a little: Oh. That's  
25         interesting. And that's -- that's part of why this work



1 can be so exciting. It's uncovering things that we may  
2 have made assumptions about before, but that actually  
3 might show some areas that districts need to focus their  
4 professional learning, their communication strategies,  
5 their learning strategies, to address.

6 So, we are doing intense work with districts  
7 digging into these types of things based on their  
8 districts and saying: Now how could we address that?  
9 Like, how could we think about that in terms of your  
10 professional learning system, or professional development  
11 opportunities.

12 MS. BERMAN: And the only other thing I want  
13 to say is, this is an incredibly comprehensive report,  
14 and I just want to thank you, because it's got a lot of  
15 really, really good stuff in it, so thanks.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Pam? Angelika?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: You didn't even know if I  
18 had any or not, but you assume.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, I'm assuming you have  
20 questions.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Not too -- not very many.  
22 Yesterday we received the announcement regarding National  
23 Board Certification. And I'm wondering if you've  
24 considered looking at the evaluations of our, what, 411,  
25 I mean, I don't know how many of them were in our pilot.



1       But I'm wondering if that might give interesting data.  
2       Simply because some of the national research has not --  
3       has not verified that there's significant difference in  
4       outcomes. So, I think it -- consider it.

5                   I would remind us all that some of the times  
6       we've talked about what's needed in higher ed, what are  
7       the areas that seem the weakest in our new teachers, the  
8       three lowest items, are, in fact, areas that have been  
9       identified for improvement at the higher ed level. And  
10      so, some feedback to our higher ed institutions might be  
11      really helpful at this point.

12                  That what's been said at this table and at  
13       other places about what we really need for new teachers  
14       is, in fact, exactly what's being identified in the -- in  
15       the outcomes.

16                  And then, finally, the comment was made that  
17       this is the first year that you are now receiving  
18       educator effectiveness data from all the districts, and  
19       I'm curious what the districts are sharing.

20                  MS. KATIE: Mr. Chair.

21                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

22                  MS. KATIE: Sure. So, you want to know just  
23       what they're sharing anecdotally and kind of that --

24                  MS. SCHROEDER: Well, officially, and maybe  
25       anecdotally.



1 MS. KATIE: Right. Oh, okay, sure. So,  
2 districts officially share the standard-level data, so we  
3 will not -- if you look at sort of the first chart that  
4 Britt --

5 MS. WILKENFELD: You won't have the  
6 elements.

7 MS. KATIE: Exactly. You will -- and they  
8 have the elements, because that's what's really effective  
9 for them to align their professional development, but we  
10 will have sort of that first chart of data.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

12 MS. KATIE: Standard-level data.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Well things get a little bit  
14 lost in the -- in the aggregated.

15 MS. KATIE: Yeah. It does aggregate things  
16 up.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Particularly because we have  
18 five categories instead of four, maybe. Seems like that  
19 probably skews things. Yeah?

20 MS. KATIE: I don't know if it skews things,  
21 but, yeah.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

23 MS. KATIE: Yeah. And there's --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: So anecdotally are you  
25 hearing this is hard, this is -- I mean, what are you



1 hearing anecdotally?

2 MS. KATIE: Sure, Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

4 MS. KATIE: I think we are hearing -- that's  
5 why I started out the comments that this is, as Board  
6 Member Berman talked about, we -- this is like the  
7 beginning of their journey on this very comprehensive,  
8 complex system. So, it's really, you know, they're  
9 working very hard to implement a complex system with  
10 complex processes. We have been working with some  
11 educators, and we've gotten a few quotes from some  
12 teachers that I think might be nice to hear. This is a  
13 quote from a teacher in, actually, one of our pilot  
14 districts saying: It's definitely helping me. The best  
15 part of the evaluation is the rubric, and I can see where  
16 I fall on the continuum, and I can see what areas I can  
17 improve on.

18 On different -- this is a teacher not in a  
19 pilot district, said: It's led to a much richer dialogue  
20 in my building around pedagogy. We had a great dialogue  
21 about what our common assessments should look like, what  
22 our instruction looks like, and what we -- what we  
23 teachers are responsible for doing. And to help other  
24 teachers with that. So we hear some nice comments that  
25 kind of say: Yeah, this is -- we're on the right track



1       there, but it's not to say that this isn't really  
2       challenging work. And helping evaluators get the skill  
3       sets to be able to provide feedback that then teachers  
4       say: Yeah, this is really great, when I get that type of  
5       feedback. So, I think we're on the right track. I think  
6       there's still work to do.

7                     MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

8                     CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel?

9                     MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you for the report. I  
10          wonder if you could just clarify Slide 22.

11                    CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Slide 22.

12                    MS. SCHEFFEL: Twenty-two.

13                    CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Page 19 on the report.

14                    MS. SCHEFFEL: So if we compare Slide 22  
15          with Slide 6, Slide 6 says that -- it shows pie chart  
16          half of the evaluation has to do with students from --  
17          are these two data points 2 of the 4 that make up that 50  
18          percent on the pie chart? Is that right?

19                    MS. KATIE: Mr. Chair.

20                    CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

21                    MS. SCHEFFEL: Two of the four.

22                    MS. KATIE: That's correct. These are -- so  
23          it's not two of the four measures. These would need two  
24          of those requirements in terms of using a state  
25          assessment.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.

2 MS. WILKENFELD: But we are very clear with  
3 districts that they should be using a range of measures,  
4 including ones that are more local to their context.  
5 Whether it's district measures or vendor measures. They  
6 have a lot of flexibility in choosing the measures, and,  
7 again, this -- the report that our partner agency put  
8 out, we see that some -- some measure -- some districts  
9 are focusing a lot on the TCAP measures, which are these  
10 two, but some are focusing a lot on local district  
11 measures, but it's completely up to them.

12 MS. KATIE: Mr. Chair, just to clarify,  
13 Board Member, I think your question was -- may have also  
14 included if that 50 percent -- if we're tackling any of  
15 the 50 percent on student's growth. All this analysis is  
16 doing is it's just looking at the 50 percent on  
17 professional practice, and it's asking, okay, and  
18 teachers got a rating on that. It's saying how  
19 correlated is that rating with test scores? How  
20 correlated is it with growth?

21 So, it's not tackling it all --

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's not the -- it's not the  
23 data points in (indiscernible).

24 MS. GOFF: No.

25 MS. KATIE: The other data points, yes.



1 Yes.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Got it. Okay, so when we  
3 look at these two graphs, then, can you unpack the  
4 language in the right-hand margin? So, it says: The  
5 relationship between student growth and teacher ratings  
6 is not statistically significant. Should it be average  
7 student growth, or what does that really mean? And then  
8 the language above it: The relationship between the  
9 average level of student achievement, so that's a static  
10 number, not a growth number, and teacher ratings is  
11 significantly significant. Can you unpack the meaning of  
12 those two narrative explanations of the graph?

13 MS. KATIE: Mm-hmmm. Mr. Chair.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

15 MS. KATIE: My apologies if that wasn't  
16 clear. I was just trying to kind of remind the viewer  
17 that these are -- that they're school level measures.  
18 So, it's the relationship between an individual teacher's  
19 ratings and the average level of student achievement in  
20 his or her school. An, overall, across the pilot sample,  
21 there is a relationship between those. There's a  
22 correlation.

23 And then the graph on the right looks at the  
24 relationship between an individual teacher's ratings and  
25 the average level of student growth in the school.



1                   MS. SCHROEDER: So that second set of  
2 language should say: The relationship between average  
3 student growth.

4                   MS. KATIE: Yes.

5                   MS. SCHROEDER: Is that right? Okay. Okay,  
6 thank you.

7                   MS. KATIE: My apologies for the confusion.

8                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane?

9                   MS. GOFF: I really think the others have  
10 addressed it. I, too, tend to go toward the soft  
11 stories, the narrative versions of what's happening out  
12 there. I guess, you know, my curiosity is starting to  
13 really rev up about the conversations that are happening,  
14 the access by particular regions of the state, or certain  
15 districts in the state, whether or not they're doing the  
16 model program or not. The level of taking access --  
17 where do we have some low spots starting the initiative  
18 to contact CDE to say: Here's -- here are some needs that  
19 we're identifying as far as training and professional  
20 development things.

21                   That's -- I'm always curious about that,  
22 because when we all hear, as we do, it feels, most the  
23 time, like an A to Z range of opinion, perception,  
24 interpretation, understanding. Is it -- I start to  
25 wonder about things like that. Are you -- are you



1 getting what you need to be a learner yourself, adults?  
2 Are you aware of where to go to start to look for that?  
3 Are you taking advantage of advantages that you may not  
4 be taking advantage of?

5                         The other part of it is the literacy and the  
6 high expectations. That is -- that's about a 25, 27-  
7 year-old scenario. So, it sure seems like it may be a  
8 time to really start paying attention to that and what  
9 should we all be doing to help each other overcome  
10 whatever is preventing hope for kids. The part about the  
11 facilitation of learning, to me, the first thing that  
12 came to my mind today when I heard that was  
13 differentiation, or in -- customized, personalized  
14 learning. It's really keying into a student based on  
15 what is known about that student whether going -- coming  
16 in, developing relationship, or on the way out.

17                         So, I am -- I find this very helpful in  
18 helping us get together and say maybe -- there are some  
19 key areas, key focus areas, to start with and this seems  
20 to point out pretty glaringly to me at least two of them  
21 and so that we can move ahead with that. But I want to  
22 join in the appreciation for how detailed this was, and  
23 two years under the belt already. My goodness sakes.  
24 Thank you for -- thank you for doing this.

25                         CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair?



1                   MS. NEAL: Probably most of my questions  
2 have been pretty much answered as you've gone along.  
3 I've been curious myself as you go to CASB meetings and  
4 such and made various board members huge difference in  
5 understanding and acceptance. And now that they're  
6 actually -- particularly now that you've moved out of the  
7 pilot program and into the other districts, do you find  
8 big differences -- just informally, do you find big  
9 differences in understanding and in the work that's being  
10 done?

11                  MS. KATIE: Mm-hmm. Mr. Chair. Yes. I  
12 think there is a continuum. One of understanding and of  
13 implementation of it. One of the things we've -- we've  
14 done recently to start to address that is to have some  
15 field support services out in the field going to  
16 districts for every day, and we -- we sometimes talk  
17 about if -- if the continuum is on a scale of 1 to 10, 10  
18 being perfect implementation, those field service staff,  
19 if they're at a two, our goal is to get them to a four.  
20 If they're at a four our goal is to get them to a six.  
21 If they're at a six, our goal is to get them to an eight,  
22 and we have some really good data from those field  
23 services people about that individual differentiated  
24 support for districts.

25                  Because we started to find that those



1 general trainings we were doing, you know, were only  
2 scratching the surface. And we really needed to -- to  
3 work directly with districts where they are in their  
4 context, where they are in their implementation, and help  
5 get them to the next level. So, we've seen some early  
6 success there. But you're right. There is a continuum  
7 of understanding and implementation.

8 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thanks for the report.  
10 I've taken to heart your comment not to jump to  
11 conclusions, but I have a preliminary concern that I'm  
12 going to -- and it comes back to what Angelika was  
13 talking about, and Dr. Scheffel also talked about it in  
14 the report, is there's no general pattern of the  
15 relationship between teachers overall professional  
16 practice ratings and student growth in their schools.  
17 And in Slide 22 in the presentation, and as clarified,  
18 the relationship between average student growth and  
19 teacher rating is not statistically significant.

20 So just talk me off a cliff here. Why am I  
21 not alarmed?

22 MS. WILKENFELD: Do you want to start, or do  
23 you want me to?

24 MS. KATIE: Mr. Chair. So, to be quite  
25 frank, we want to -- we -- in any sort of system like



1       this we want to see alignment with your measures. What  
2       we know from other states and other districts is that  
3       often doesn't happen right off the bat, and it has to do  
4       with the measures, it has to do with implementation  
5       fidelity. As you notice from our ratings, we have a lot  
6       of high ratios, so that means that teachers who aren't  
7       necessarily showing a lot of student growth are also  
8       going to be receiving high ratings.

9                   And so, what we are choosing to do is seeing  
10       this as still part of the learning process, and what can  
11       we do with the districts and specifically with our  
12       evaluators, to help them to really fine-tune the  
13       professional practice side and really fine-tune that  
14       those measures, so that we do have alignment for our  
15       multiple measures.

16                  MS. WILKENFELD: And, Mr. Chair, just to  
17       remind you, we're seeing only half the picture of the  
18       evaluation process.

19                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right.

20                  MS. WILKENFELD: When we're able to do the  
21       Student Growth Measures and add that in and then  
22       correlate that with student growth, the whole idea of  
23       having the 50 percent, which we didn't talk about, is to  
24       get at this very issue of seeing a tighter correlation  
25       with growth. We're only looking at it from the rubric



1 side, not the student measures.

2 So then, when we do have that complete  
3 picture, you'll see ratings of highly effective,  
4 effective, partially effective, and ineffective. When we  
5 look at those ratings and we do some correlation, we  
6 would certainly hope we would see greater connection,  
7 because you'd be seen at inclusive of the student growth  
8 measures that districts have to include.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. Okay. Well, I'm  
10 not jumping off the cliff just yet. We're -- did you  
11 have a follow up, is that -- were you --? Sure. Go  
12 ahead.

13 MS. MAZANEC: I'll just follow up. And  
14 then, at some point, it would be good to follow up the  
15 meaningfulness of statistical significance. Right? Is  
16 that really the best way to determine that  
17 (indiscernible) sizes, other means? I mean, I don't  
18 know. There's been a lot written about how informative  
19 statistical significance really is for looking at true  
20 differences.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And then I guess my final  
22 comment, as I'd come back to it, is since we have an end  
23 point in mind, we have a hypothesis, that we don't design  
24 the system in such a way to prove our hypothesis. I'm  
25 very concerned about that, that we work the challenge in



1       this particular set of data out by changing our model to  
2       give us an answer that conforms with our hypothesis.  
3       That would alarm me that we might head that direction.

4                     With that, I'll say thank you very much for  
5       the presentation, and Ms. Markel, you may announce an  
6       executive session.

7                     MS. MARKEL:      The executive session has  
8       been noticed for today's state board meeting in  
9       conformance with 24-6 (indiscernible) CRS Receive legal  
10      advice and specifically to question pursuant to 24-6402-  
11      320 CRS, in matters required to be kept confidential by  
12      federal law or rules or state statutes pursuant to 24-6-  
13      402-303 CRS.

14                    CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Do I have a motion to  
15       convene an executive session?

16                    MS. NEAL:      I move we convene an executive  
17       session.

18                    CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It has been moved and  
19       seconded. Any objection? Hearing none, motion carries,  
20       we are in executive session. Thank you.

21                    (Meeting adjourned)

22

23

24

25



**C E R T I F I C A T E**

2 I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and  
3 Notary, do hereby certify that the above-mentioned matter  
4 occurred as hereinbefore set out.

5 I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT the proceedings of such  
6 were reported by me or under my supervision, later  
7 reduced to typewritten form under my supervision and  
8 control and that the foregoing pages are a full, true and  
9 correct transcription of the original notes.

10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
11 and seal this 9th day of March, 2019.

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25