



COLORADO ?
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
October 7, 2015, Part 3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on October 7, 2015,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Steven Durham (R), Chairman
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Joyce Rankin (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And now with Item 16,
2 accountability. Is everybody okay with proceeding? You
3 don't need a break? Do we need a break? Going once --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't know. I got to
5 clean my desk up. I've got food.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We can clean and
7 (indiscernible).

8 (Overlapping).

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I can. I'm gifted.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do you want to break?
11 Okay. Let's -- let's start with accountability group
12 update. Dr. Asp, who's in charge of accountability --

13 (Overlapping)

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You're -- you're on.

15 MR. ASP: Okay, thank you. As we bring this
16 PowerPoint up, I just wanted to give you a -- a brief
17 context for this. What we wanted to do is describe the
18 work of the accountability work group, which is focused
19 on providing recommendations to the Commissioner
20 regarding the changes to our existing district --

21 MS. RANKIN: Bless you.

22 MR. ASP: -- performance frameworks --
23 school and district performance framework. And -- sorry,
24 it's a little distracting.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry, I



1 (indiscernible).

2 MR. ASP: It's not your problem. It's fine.
3 I'll wait for that PowerPoint to come up here a minute.

4 (Overlapping)

5 MS. FLORES: (Indiscernible) accountability?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We are.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: 16.01. We don't have any --

8 (Overlapping)

9 MR. ASP: You should. You should've had one
10 put on your -- this is one we had to (indiscernible).

11 (Overlapping)

12 MR. ASP: -- license for two years. There's
13 a piece that says -- (indiscernible) -- the piece that
14 says, "School and district performance frameworks, 2.0."

15 MS. RANKIN: Oh, yeah.

16 MR. ASP: That's the (indiscernible).

17 (Overlapping)

18 MR. ASP: Okay, let's try again here. Over
19 the last year or so, we've had a group of district folks
20 working with us and a group we call accountability work
21 group to take a -- a close look at our existing district
22 and school performance frameworks and to provide some
23 feedback on those pieces. We want to share the -- the
24 gist of those recommendations today. They are not -- the
25 groups is not finished, but they were starting to take



1 these around the state and get feedback from others in
2 the field. Because we've had the opportunity to take --
3 we've had these frameworks in place for about five years
4 and now we have the opportunity to review them. And
5 since we've had a -- some legislation that stopped the
6 accountability clock.

7 But if we go -- so what we would like to do
8 today is provide an overview of that work so you know the
9 kinds of recommendations that are starting to emerge. But
10 we'd also like to discuss the future of the
11 accountability in a more long-term basis. I'd like to go
12 to the next slide, please. Thank you.

13 A way you could think about this, it fits in
14 with some other events that are going on in the state is
15 -- I like to use this graphic to kind of talk through
16 that. We're -- if you could think about the existing
17 district and school performance frameworks as being
18 accountability 1.0, we brought -- we've heard a lot from
19 the field, both formally and informally about some
20 changes that we think we need to make to have those
21 become more accurate portrayals of school and district
22 performance and -- and also set these things up so that
23 the ratings that are made by them are more fair and
24 provide more relevant information to schools and
25 districts for improvement.



1 But at the same time, while we're working on
2 this in a very concrete way -- and -- and these are a
3 group of practitioners who have been helping us -- we
4 also have -- and you are aware of this, those of you who
5 were on the Board last spring know that a group of rural
6 districts has come before you to say we'd like to think
7 about accountability in a different way and we'd like to
8 pilot some ways of bringing other factors into the
9 accountability formula that aren't necessarily student
10 achievement, but are rated -- related to those, things
11 like opportunity learned for all kids or school culture
12 or parent involvement, and so on. This was a group that
13 came before you. They had -- they coined the term
14 Student-Centered Accountability Project. And they're
15 still working on that. In fact, we meet with them quite
16 regularly. We have a meeting with them tomorrow as
17 they're moving ahead to try to get very concrete and come
18 back to you with some ideas about this.

19 They're piloting that. At the same time, we
20 have some districts who'd like to look at assessment in a
21 different way, student assessment, and some of that
22 emerged from the 1323 assessment pilot that was put into
23 statute this spring. And so we're working on a proposal
24 around that piece as well. The 2.5 piece here is we're
25 hoping that we'll have an opportunity to pilot some of



1 these pieces on a small-scale basis and learn about those
2 and say how -- what can we learn about those processes
3 that would inform the future of accountability and what
4 we might call 3.0, which is now a topic for discussion,
5 not something concrete.

6 So what we're going to share with you today
7 is some ideas about that are emerging from the -- the
8 accountability work group that are very concrete around
9 our existing frameworks and then -- and Alisa will take
10 you through that. And then Gretchen will -- Morgan will
11 talk about these pilots that are proposed, particular
12 some of the ones with districts looking at other
13 accountability factors and so on. But we wanted to try
14 to frame this in a way so you could kind of see how these
15 fit together. With that, I'm going to turn it over to
16 Alisa (indiscernible) move this forward.

17 MS. DORMAN: Thank you. Good afternoon. So
18 as Dr. Asp said, over the last five years, we've learned
19 a lot about our performance frameworks. We've had
20 discussions individually with schools and districts as
21 they've gotten their data and seen how the performance
22 frameworks capture their performance or don't capture it,
23 as the case may be. And we've recorded those issues that
24 we've heard come up during those conversations.

25 We've also worked with the Center for



1 Assessment to do some real concrete data analysis of the
2 outcomes of the frameworks to look at the relationship
3 with the demographics in a district's population to look
4 at -- based on end size for how it works with small
5 districts versus larger districts. So we have some real
6 good data and information from that.

7 In the spring of 2014, we did an annual
8 needs assessment with some of our district -- with all of
9 our districts to get feedback really specifically on the
10 points of the frameworks, what measures and metrics are
11 useful for you in understanding our performance and doing
12 your own improvement planning, which areas are not so
13 useful that we could refine and look at differently.

14 We did, based on that survey and other
15 issues we've heard, we did some focus groups around the
16 state to get into more of the -- the things that you
17 can't capture into the surveys, a point this morning, and
18 really thought about going deeper in terms of what is it
19 that we need to look at in the frameworks?

20 All of that information kind of got pulled
21 together into a report that we have from the Center for
22 Assessment that looked at here are the issues that we're
23 hearing from the state about what they would like to
24 address or be considered and then here are some next
25 steps for you as a department for going forward with



1 revisions.

2 We took that as the basis for the work with
3 our accountability work group, and I'll talk about the
4 membership of that in a little bit. And then along with
5 the accountability work group and the technical advisory
6 panel for longitudinal growth, we've really dug into
7 those recommendations and are starting to think about how
8 do we change the frameworks? How do we enhance and
9 improve upon them to make them feel fair and meaningful
10 so that districts can really use the state data that we
11 have well to understand their performance and move
12 forward? So we're using this year to reflect, to learn
13 from the past years, to see what we can do forward to
14 improve upon that.

15 Just as a quick refresher for you, I know
16 the details of the performance frameworks aren't things
17 that are in front of everybody's mind, except for maybe
18 mine, my team's. So the performance indicators are made
19 up of four main indicators performance frameworks:

20 The first one is achievement. That's just
21 how we've known accountability traditionally -- percent
22 of students proficient and advanced is how we looked at
23 it. We look at that for reading, writing, math, and
24 science. At the elementary and middle school, that's
25 weighed 25 percent of the frameworks. At the high school



1 and district level, it's weighed 15 percent.

2 Then we look at academic growth. And the
3 way we look at growth currently has been this normative
4 and criterion referenced way. So how good -- well do
5 students grow compared to other students like them? And
6 then is it enough growth to get them to where they need
7 to be in terms of getting proficiency or maintaining
8 proficiency. We look at that for reading, writing, math,
9 and English language proficiency. And at the elementary
10 level, that's 50 percent of the frameworks, and the
11 middle level. At the high school level, that's 35
12 percent.

13 Then we look at academic growth gaps, which
14 the same indicator as academic growth, or the same
15 metric, except for reading, math, and writing. But then
16 it's just aggregated for all these different student
17 groups -- for English learners, for minority students,
18 for economically disadvantaged students, for students
19 with disabilities, and students who need to catch up.
20 And that's 25 percent at elementary and middle, 15
21 percent at high school.

22 And finally, for high schools and districts,
23 we have the post-secondary and workforce readiness
24 indicator. That's graduation ready, this aggregated
25 graduation rate, drop-out rate, the composite ACT score.



1 And that's 35 percent of the frameworks there.

2 So that's what we're working with now.

3 We've gotten some feedback about those metrics within
4 there, with the waiting, with different components. And
5 that's really what we're looking at and what the
6 accountability work group for the most part has been
7 looking at, providing recommendations around.

8 So the charge for the work group is to
9 provide the Commissioner with recommendations for the
10 next iteration of the performance frameworks. Right now
11 the way current law is written, we're expecting that to
12 be next fall. We've had smaller work groups dive into
13 topics that within the frameworks to look at equity in
14 this aggregation, how we want to handle that, looking at
15 our measures and metrics for growth and improvement,
16 looking at the overall design -- design decisions that
17 are included, looking at communications, how we
18 communicate the frameworks, how the reports are given,
19 and how we talk about them.

20 And then we've had another group that's
21 really wanted to focus on accountability 3.0. So the
22 doctor asked point how do we go further and move forward
23 with accountability, because the pieces are tied
24 together, but to think with that long term in mind.

25 The work group had also worked closely with



1 our technical advisory panel to get feedback for the
2 technical perspective, not so much the policy, but how
3 the data actually plays out.

4 We have 27 members in our work group.
5 They're made up of district representatives --
6 representatives from small district, from large
7 districts, from districts that are struggling, those on
8 priority improvement turnaround, to those that are
9 excelling or districts of distinction. We also have
10 representatives from CASE, Casbee (ph), and CEA, and the
11 League of Charter Schools on the group as well. So we
12 tried to get -- I know we didn't cover everybody, but we
13 tried to get good representation of different
14 perspectives in the state.

15 So the timeline for the work group that
16 we've been meeting real well -- real regularly since last
17 January, starting at CASE this summer and especially this
18 month, a little bit into next month, we're going around
19 to superintendent meetings and getting feedback on the
20 initial recommendations, what we're going to share with
21 you today. We'll go into a little bit more in depth with
22 those groups, because we really want to take, while we
23 have a representative accountability work group, we want
24 to hear all the different voices around the state. So
25 we're talking to superintendents, we're talking to



1 assessment and accountability district -- district
2 leaders. We're talking with the advocacy groups. We're
3 just trying to get a wealth of input right now. We want
4 to have some final recommendations in the next month or
5 so so that we can work on informational reports for
6 districts for the spring. So our goal is April/May that
7 districts are able to get an informational report. It
8 doesn't have a rating. It's just so they can see their
9 new data with the new proposed changes for the frameworks
10 and get a sense of what it looks like. We know that when
11 people see their data in the frameworks, they see things
12 that they didn't see when they just see it conceptually.
13 You notice things that you didn't see before. You just
14 can't see how it all plays out until you see data in it.
15 So we want to get that to them this spring so we can get
16 another round of feedback before we do our release next
17 fall that's a real release.

18 I want to share with you this purpose
19 statement. We've spent some -- quite a few months at the
20 beginning of the work group coming together to really
21 focus in on the purpose of the accountability system and
22 the framework so that when we go to make a recommendation
23 or a decision, there's a basis for that. State law is
24 pretty broad in the purpose of having the school and
25 district performance framework, so we wanted to narrow



1 that down a little bit to make sure that we were clear --
2 real clear on where we were coming from. So I'll just
3 give you a moment to read that, see if it makes sense to
4 you all.

5 (Pause)

6 MS. DORMAN: There's a real desire in the
7 conversation with the group to make sure that the data
8 we're providing is valid and actionable that there's
9 something you can do with it, that you can take it and
10 put it into your improvement plan and really have good,
11 rich discussions with educators, with teachers, and with
12 principals in the classroom to talk about how do we move
13 forward, how do we improve from there, that it's not just
14 number that seems like this number that's there that's
15 set in stone and there's not much you could do about it.

16 And we wanted to share with you just a few
17 of the high consensus areas for recommendation. We've
18 been hearing these very widespread as areas that people
19 would like to make changes to the frameworks. We haven't
20 so far heard any -- any real pushback on them at all --
21 at all. So we wanted to make sure you all were well
22 aware of these decisions, because it seems like we've got
23 good consensus and there are areas that we'd want to
24 change.

25 The first is to think about an aggregated



1 subgroup for accountability calculations. A lot of other
2 states do this. They call it maybe a super subgroup.
3 We've heard lots of concerns from schools and districts
4 over the years that when we disaggregate from all those
5 groups that we talked about earlier, some students fall
6 into multiple of those categories. They may be eligible
7 for free/reduced lunch. They may be a minority student,
8 they may be an English-language learner. And so the
9 schools and districts feel like it's perceived as not
10 fair that they're counted three different times in the
11 framework, whereas the student who isn't in those groups.

12 So the way some states have done it is they
13 have an aggregated group where if you -- if a student is
14 eligible for any of those disaggregated groups, they'd be
15 counted just one time. Points would be given there. We
16 have heard lots of feedback and we feel pretty strongly
17 that we make sure we report the performance of all those
18 individual groups, because that's where it gets
19 actionable and useful for improvement planning. But in
20 terms of accountability, kids were only counted once.

21 The one thing about that -- and we are
22 making sure our small schools and districts know is they
23 may not have met our minimum end of 20 students
24 previously, because they had so many small student --
25 student groups. But when you aggregate them together,



1 they may have accountability there that they hadn't had
2 there before. So we just want to make sure that
3 everybody's aware of that piece. That's another thing
4 that when they get -- see their data, they'll -- that'll
5 help them see it in real life what that means.

6 Another piece that we've heard pretty
7 consistently is to separate that idea of that normative
8 growth, how you grow relative to other kids from adequate
9 growth. Right now adequate growth -- the U.S. Department
10 of Ed talks a lot about ambitious yet attainable targets.
11 Adequate growth are ambitious targets, very ambitious
12 targets, for kids that are not yet proficient and not so
13 ambitious for kids that are already proficient, because
14 the expectation is just that they say -- stay above that
15 proficient cut point.

16 So what that does is is it makes adequate
17 growth the harder target for schools and districts to
18 have more kids that are not yet proficient. And it's
19 kind of created this inequity in the system that I don't
20 know was necessarily intended. So to think about pulling
21 those apart and then also to think about are there other
22 ways to measure adequate growth, that's in statute right
23 now, so that's not something we have purview over as a
24 department. But we're looking at just having
25 conversations, especially when we see the new state



1 assessments.

2 Before we can even do anything with adequate
3 growth (indiscernible) two years of the same assessment
4 data, so we won't be able to do that until we have two
5 years of part data or CMAS data to be able to calculate
6 that out. So we have some time to work on that.

7 And finally, the last area of lot -- that
8 we've had a lot of consensus around is aligning our
9 school and district targets. You all know we have a lot
10 of schools and districts in the state where there's one
11 elementary, one middle, and high school. Targets were
12 norm around the schools versus norm around the districts,
13 but that leads to the situations where there's one school
14 that the school data may not align with the district
15 data. They might get a meets reading at the school level
16 and it exceeds reading at the district level. It creates
17 some confusion, so we just want to make sure we can get
18 those aligned in those situations. Again, so it's
19 actionable data.

20 Finally, in terms of our feedback process,
21 what we're doing right now, so we're sharing. We've made
22 some mockups on what the frameworks could look like to
23 make it a little bit more real to be able to get feedback
24 around. So we're sharing those at superintendent and
25 other stakeholder meetings. We're going to pull that



1 feedback together and the accountability work group meets
2 again on November 22 -- 16th. I think it's the 16th.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

4 MS. DORMAN: I can't remember. One of those
5 two dates. We're going to pull back together with them
6 then and try and make some formal recommendations or have
7 them make some formal recommendations to us at that time
8 so that we can move forward with the informational
9 reports that we give in May. And then we collect
10 feedback from those for release next fall.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

12 MS. SHEFFEL: Yeah, I know you're still
13 working through the presentation, but what would be
14 helpful when we look at this again would be almost some
15 case studies.

16 MS. DORMAN: Okay.

17 MS. SHEFFEL: Here's a district that's on
18 priority improvement. These are their data buckets.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

20 MS. SHEFFEL: If they had just won this way,
21 it improves --

22 (Overlapping)

23 MS. SHEFFEL: Their data points.

24 MS. DORMAN: Yeah.

25 MS. SHEFFEL: And if they had just won three



1 points and another one goes down one point, here's the
2 ultimate outcome as far as their rating. Because this is
3 the general information that's helpful.

4 MS. DORMAN: Yes.

5 MS. SHEFFEL: But what we get of course is
6 calls from districts that say --

7 MS. DORMAN: Absolutely.

8 MS. SHEFFEL: -- hey, if we had, like, three
9 more kids in a small district, here's what could happen.
10 So I think that looking at it psychometrically almost --

11 (Overlapping)

12 MS. DORMAN: Absly.

13 MS. SHEFFEL: -- the various data points
14 would be really helpful. And that's where districts of
15 course want a fairness issue.

16 MS. DORMAN: Yeah.

17 MS. SHEFFEL: Because this is high stakes
18 for them in terms of marketing their district.

19 MS. DORMAN: Absolutely.

20 MS. SHEFFEL: Real estate issues and then
21 there's a lot associated with these ratings.

22 MS. DORMAN: Yes, and we did that. We did
23 some of that at the last accountability work group with
24 some of these different options. We can bring that to
25 you all. We, you know, we pulled some small schools,



1 some larger school, diverse, less diverse schools to look
2 at the data and the -- the work group saw some really
3 important observations from looking at those case
4 studies, just like you said.

5 Once we get I think a more solid
6 recommendations from the work group, we could bring that
7 here and kind of talk about how that plays out.

8 MS. SHEFFEL: Good. And I don't know if you
9 use the -- you know, the margin of error concept. I
10 mean, I'm sure you do.

11 MS. DORMAN: Yeah, we're looking at --

12 MS. SHEFFEL: But I mean, does it --

13 MS. DORMAN: Yeah.

14 MS. SHEFFEL: Does it -- I mean, if they can
15 really just having three kids scoring different, it
16 really shouldn't tip it if there's the error term built
17 in. So I don't know how you think about that in
18 algorithm, but that would be helpful.

19 MS. DORMAN: Okay, thank you.

20 MR. ASP: (Indiscernible). Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, sir.

22 MR. ASP: That's a great point, Dr.

23 Scheffel. What we -- that's why we're working with this
24 technical advisory council, because they'll take some of
25 these concepts and do exactly what you said. And then



1 they'll come back and say here's a way to think about
2 this so that we avoid some of those issues that
3 (indiscernible). So thank you for the suggestion.

4 MS. SHEFFEL: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff?

6 MS. GOFF: Forgive me, but it -- are you --
7 is this under the assumption that we are -- we will
8 continue under the waiver, so that our accountability and
9 our -- our lineup of all of this, our systems, is true to
10 that? Or what if --

11 MS. DORMAN: (Indiscernible).

12 MS. GOFF: What if we came to a point
13 someday where we said let's just forego the waiver and
14 take our chances on open market, whatever that
15 (indiscernible).

16 (Overlapping).

17 MS. GOFF: Well, I'm just wondering how -- I
18 don't want --

19 MS. DORMAN: Yeah.

20 (Overlapping)

21 MS. GOFF: I'm sorry, I feel like I'm --

22 (Overlapping)

23 MS. DORMAN: No, no, no, that's a great --
24 that an important question.

25 MS. GOFF: But it's just I think it's a fair



1 and logical thing to be thinking about (indiscernible).

2 MS. DORMAN: Absolutely.

3 MS. GOFF: And especially -- and if you're
4 talking to various small districts --

5 MS. DORMAN: Yes.

6 MS. GOFF: -- being able to paint a picture
7 clearly that's illustrative of what --

8 MS. DORMAN: Yes.

9 MS. GOFF: -- well, either or both could
10 mean with that.

11 MS. DORMAN: Absolutely. So if we don't
12 have a waiver, if we don't have the ESEA waiver, we go
13 back to having adequate yearly progress as our federal
14 accountability. I -- I don't know, we'd have to talk to
15 Tony, if we could read state law to use AYP instead of
16 what's required in 163. I don't think as a state that we
17 would necessarily want to use APY as our state
18 accountability measure only.

19 MS. GOFF: (Indiscernible).

20 MS. DORMAN: So I think regardless, I think
21 we're going to want our state accountability and I -- I
22 think what we talked about is this is a good opportunity
23 to make sure we move it as far forward as we can take our
24 learning and improve upon the frameworks we have.

25 MS. GOFF: Yes.



1 MS. DORMAN: So waiver or no waiver, I think
2 we'll -- I think we want to improve the frameworks and
3 have this -- some version of the school and district
4 performance frameworks in place.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes?

6 MR. ASP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The reason
7 we don't want to go back to AYP fundamentally is that no
8 one's going to meet the targets there. So every school
9 and district will eventually, if not already, will be
10 declared a failure, which we know that's not the case.
11 And the reason we went to these frameworks in the first
12 place is because we were given these conflicting
13 information apparent. So they get something that says
14 we're a failure and they know by looking at their school
15 that that's not true. And then they get something from
16 the State that says they're doing pretty good and -- and
17 it -- it actually took any kind of power out of the
18 accountability system for improvement, because people
19 couldn't make sense of it.

20 So we'd rather stay with the one that
21 Coloradans have passed then to have to deal with the
22 (indiscernible).

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I -- I just want to be
25 clear, because (indiscernible) I was not even thinking



1 of going back to pre-163 days.

2 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Certainly not that. But the
4 waiver that we have is -- is ESEA waiver that's based on
5 what we were -- had been doing around our own plan under
6 163.

7 MS. GOFF: Yes.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: So when the growth model
9 came into our lives and -- and other things set became
10 part of the accountability system, we had -- we've had
11 two kind of waiver processes. We're in the middle of num
12 two or three right now.

13 MS. DORMAN: We -- we made very minor -- or
14 we made some changes to the state accountability, maybe
15 as a result of the waiver, maybe not. We added English-
16 language proficiency growth into our state accountability
17 and disaggregated graduation rate. Those were the two
18 things that we weren't doing as a state before we got the
19 ESEA waiver. So I think you could talk about if -- if you
20 didn't have a waiver, would you want those in there,
21 would you not want those in there? You could have that
22 conversation, I think.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, yes, Dr. Schroeder.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: So a couple questions:

25 Would we -- are the rules good enough or will we end up



1 changing rule -- any of our rules, 163 rules?

2 MS. DORMAN: I think that depends on where
3 the recommendations come in.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

5 MS. DORMAN: And what we need to do, but
6 we'll definitely --

7 (Overlapping)

8 MS. SCHROEDER: So you're keeping an --
9 you're keeping an eye on it?

10 MS. DORMAN: We're keeping an eye on that,
11 absolutely.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: And did I understand
14 correctly that you are looking at these assessments, that
15 there are folks who are looking at the statewide
16 assessments? Is there somebody who's done the -- the
17 research just looking at some of the recommendations that
18 are out there in the research world and in the education
19 authorship world of what are some assessments that might
20 better measure what it is that we want to know about
21 kids?

22 MS. DORMAN: Do you want to take that? Do
23 you want to take that?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Asp?

25 MR. ASP: Thank you. We're' -- we're



1 working with some other states. In fact, we're going to
2 get to this piece in just a minute, Dr. Schroeder.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, okay, sorry.

4 MR. ASP: Because that -- the assessment
5 idea is again we're hoping to enter into a pilot stage,
6 rather than a full-blown piece. And there's a variety of
7 ways we can look at that. Some existing assessments or
8 ones that we might create are ways to look at what
9 teachers are doing in classrooms is one we'll talk a
10 little bit about today that could be used in conjunction
11 with the state assessment, but to reduce the overall
12 burden of state assessment on both constructional time
13 and on teacher's focus in some sense. If the state has
14 set --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, not just burden, but
16 to get at we want to know --

17 (Overlapping)

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- are the kids fine? Are
19 they meeting standards and what's the best way to
20 determine? I mean, (indiscernible) Hammond a number of
21 people have been writing books on how to do this better.
22 And I'm just wondering what's the process for absorbing
23 or testing some of those notions that are being presented
24 by the -- the research world.

25 MR. ASP: I think we're going to get to



1 that.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, I will be quiet.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

4 MS. RANKIN: I think we should be quiet,
5 yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Proceed.

7 MS. MORGAN: Great. Any other questions on
8 that topic or are we ready to move?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Morgan (ph), go ahead.

10 MS. MORGAN: Okay. So I -- Gretchen Morgan,
11 hi. As Dr. Asp described earlier, we want to have this
12 conversation with you about potentially sort of three
13 phases of thinking about accountability. This 2.0 area
14 that we just discussed with Alisa about what are the
15 changes we can make to the current system that make it a
16 little more effectiveness and having, as you heard from
17 her, significant public engagement about how to do that
18 in ways that are smart and better and -- and feel like
19 it's important to be facilitating those conversations.

20 In addition, as Dr. Asp referred to before,
21 there are these conversations going on that are much more
22 forward looking. And I want to -- this is the transition
23 into that conversation and I just want to emphasize that
24 this idea of 2.5 is the idea that this system is large
25 and complex. And we've seen already from implementing



1 this system that we can anticipate some of the sort of
2 implications of this and there are some that we cannot.

3 And so this idea of piloting I think is
4 important, because it gives us a way to try some things
5 and to figure out at a smaller scale with a little bit
6 more of a managed risk what the implications would be.
7 And -- and so we want to talk about thing that people
8 might want to pilot and -- and how we could maybe help
9 with that.

10 So first I want to share with you a little
11 bit of background about why we started having these
12 conversations with people. So, you know, we started
13 receiving a lot of informal feedback in about 2013. And
14 we received enough informal feedback about assessment and
15 accountability that we thought we should start seeking it
16 formally. And so I had some groups conduct some surveys.
17 We had some focus groups that we've talked with between
18 that point and now. And these themes have sort of
19 emerged from that range of different formal feedback and
20 that we've tried to solicit from the field. And I want
21 to share these with you. This is certainly not
22 everything we've heard from everyone, but this would be
23 like the most common things we've heard in this
24 conversations or through these surveys.

25 So one is still a strong sentiment that



1 accountability and comparability are important. And this
2 is true from different groups. Families want to be able
3 to compare school performance so they can make choices.
4 Educators want to be able to have some way to know if
5 they're holding a bar that's an adequate bar for the
6 students inside their schools. And certainly communities
7 want to know is our school doing a good job? The
8 industry wants to know are the schools doing a good job?

9 So that remains consistent. There's also a
10 strong value of growth. Lots of people feeling that
11 provides useful information and important information.
12 Third, this feeling that the current system relies too
13 heavily on the state assessment and a lot of conversation
14 about there are a lot of other things that make a school
15 a good school. And while we don't want to have a
16 gargantuan, you know, system of accountability with a
17 bazillion measures, could we have something that offers a
18 little bit more broad view than -- than the degree to
19 which we currently rely on state assessment data?

20 And then the last one is that current
21 assessment data isn't sufficiently timely or -- or sort
22 of discreet enough to be instructionally relevant or
23 helpful. And I think actually this could be summarized
24 in sort of statement about return on investment, that for
25 the amount of time that -- that kids spend in the



1 assessments or that schools spend organizing themselves
2 to administrator the assessments, for the time spent,
3 given that results come back to delayed, mostly it's
4 about time, that it doesn't feel like it's worthy, right?
5 For the time spent, that information is not worthy for
6 the purpose of instruction. Whether it's worthy for the
7 purpose of comparability is a totally other question and
8 I think, you know, it is offering good comparability
9 information, but people for that amount of time would
10 like it to offer something that's more instructionally
11 useful.

12 So those have been themes of feedback. The
13 -- these themes you would recognize as sort of familiar
14 to what came up in the 14-1202 test scores, which as you
15 know, last talked about a lot of these issues related to
16 assessment.

17 And finally, we've had a lot of districts
18 approach, right? The rural groups that you've heard from
19 here. There are also some districts very interested in
20 personalized learning who have approached us and have
21 some questions about how this would work. And in the
22 accountability work group, there are some others who
23 were, like, neither in the rural group nor really
24 interested in personalized learning who also have
25 expressed in an interest in looking more forward. We



1 created a little 3.0 subgroup inside the accountability
2 work group to be able to look forward and have those
3 discussions. So this is really why we started to
4 facilitate these discussions.

5 Next I want to talk with you about how we've
6 been doing this. I think it's important that with
7 something as significant as accountability that we intend
8 to process very carefully. I think it matters that
9 people understand what this is about and that they're
10 clear about the processes that are happening for people
11 to give input and participate. And so we've been very
12 careful in -- in sort of stepping into facilitating these
13 conversations to do it in a way that we think is
14 promoting a quality discourse and welcoming a variety of
15 views and also trying to play the role we think we should
16 at the state of helping some expertise. So the question
17 you asked before about, you know, nationally who's --
18 who's researching this right now and writing about this
19 now? We've made some efforts to get ourselves connected
20 to those folks and to bring some of their expertise to
21 bearing those conversations.

22 So we can be in this group of folks last
23 September that were, you know, K-12 educators, post-
24 secondary educators, community leaders, legislators,
25 industry leaders, and we began this conversation with



1 them about really what does post-secondary workforce
2 readiness look like now? And because of that, are there
3 any implications about how we want to look at school and
4 district's accountability?

5 And I think essentially the outcome that day
6 was, wow, this is really important, the accountability
7 part, and, oh, my gosh, it's complex. You know, we got
8 far enough in the conversations with those folks for them
9 to realize that this is not going to be a thing that is
10 going to be easily solved by making a -- a sort of single
11 decision, for example, in the legislature. This is not
12 going to get all better, which in many ways really led us
13 to this idea of piloting, right? That complexity should
14 cause us to be prudent about learning. And so trying to
15 plan for that.

16 We also joined CCSSO, that you guys know as
17 the Council of Chief States Officers. We joined a study
18 group that they have offered with other states who are
19 also thinking in a forward-looking way about
20 accountability. And so we've been able to be close to
21 New Hampshire, who is working a lot on a really different
22 view about assessment and the role it can play here;
23 close to California, who is piloting some things now
24 about some locally-determined measures that also been
25 really interesting and we'd be able to learn a lot about.



1 And so we've joined up with them as a way to really get
2 access to those national experts that you were asking
3 about previously.

4 As you know, we have this little group, the
5 3.0 group, inside the accountability work group who has
6 continued to have these conversations. And -- and I'll
7 be sharing with you some of their ideas in a little bit.

8 We've also tried to make connections between
9 a conversation already going with the AEC group, the
10 Alternative Education Campus group, who also has been
11 looking at frameworks. As you know, they operate under a
12 different framework. And so there have been some
13 parallel conversations there. We've tried to make sure
14 that we are engaged and making connections between those
15 conversations. And then obviously like all of you, we
16 engage frequently with the field on this in -- in less
17 formal ways.

18 So I -- I think the takeaway for us about
19 this is that we don't think it's our job at the
20 Department to determine, you know, like to sit in a room
21 together and engineer and determine what is the future of
22 accountability? But we do think we have a job in
23 facilitating thought leadership about this. And so
24 that's really what we've been trying to do here, as you
25 can see, over the last year, is to bring together groups



1 of people to have the conversations that lead us to all
2 understand how complex this is, to try and find some
3 points of commonality and agreement, so that we might
4 help to organize around that and support some sort of
5 collaborative efforts about that to get this moving in a
6 way that very honestly reflects the interests of people
7 in the field.

8 So that's what we've been trying to play.

9 So what have we learned in all these conversations?
10 Essentially this conversation is sorted out into two
11 categories. One is about better or different or
12 additional indicators of school and system performance.
13 And then there is this other conversation that is about
14 student performance. I'm going to start first with these
15 school and system performance. And again, these ideas
16 are an amalgam, right, of all these different
17 conversations we've had with these different groups.

18 There's a real interest in finding out more
19 about the value of school quality reviews. So this would
20 be akin to things you might be familiar with before in
21 terms of like accreditation visits, where a team comes
22 into a school, there's a set of sort of school quality
23 standards. They're in observing for those things.
24 They're interviewing people about those things. They're
25 reviewing sort of documents and things about the school



1 to determine the (indiscernible) the school is aligning
2 with those quality standards.

3 There's some really good work going on in
4 Vermont right now, where they're trying to figure out how
5 to do this at scale. I realize saying at scale in
6 Vermont is a little different than saying at scale in
7 other places. So I don't mean to be silly about that,
8 but they're, you know, at scale in Vermont style. And
9 they're -- they are doing some things to -- to sort of
10 learn about, you know, really return on investment of an
11 activity like that. You know, when you do that, what is
12 the cost in terms of both time and money and what does it
13 do to both give you better information about the schools
14 quality and its performance, but also to give them
15 information it can use to improve their performance.

16 And I think that has been a theme of these
17 conversations with -- with all these districts and
18 national folks who have talked to you as to what extent
19 can the things used in accountability be things that are
20 actionable in terms of improving quality? And so school
21 quality reviews have come up under that theme a number of
22 times. And so that's one thing that we, you know, would
23 like to find a way to support some small number of
24 districts and sort of trying out and seeing about the
25 impact.



1 A second one is we've listed here as topical
2 endorsements. I don't meant to be confusing with like a
3 -- something we would apply in an ointment manner. I
4 just mean topical in that it is, you know, on different
5 topics. There are schools that, for example, might want
6 to submit to a body to say that they are amazing at
7 internships and they would love for us, you know, through
8 that body, to endorse in their accountability framework
9 somewhere "You are great at internships."

10 And this idea of sort of being able to earn
11 endorsements because of things that you tried to do with
12 quality, that being something which could be reviewed by
13 some group of people using some kind of criteria in some
14 consistent way. Part of what we've heard from local
15 district folks is that, you know, certainly when they
16 bring their school and -- and district performance
17 frameworks to their boards, they talk about these things,
18 right? Like we're really great at internships.

19 But the -- it would change the conversation
20 locally to have that be something that is endorsed by a
21 state body, because sometimes local board members might
22 interpret the sharing of additional information as sort
23 of excuse making against what's in the performance
24 framework. And that's not how it's being presented, but
25 -- but we've had some local leaders tell us that



1 sometimes it's perceived that way, that if I come and
2 talk to you about how great we are at internships while
3 you look at our reading scores, that it doesn't ring the
4 same way as if we endorsed both of those ideas. So
5 that's where that one has been coming from.

6 The third one is a broader range of post-
7 secondary workforce readiness indicators. I think this
8 has been a conversation for quite some time. This
9 actually began two years maybe, even, conversations
10 internally, just because that is a pretty narrow set of
11 measures that we have in our performance frameworks. And
12 none of them really are workforce measures. Kentucky
13 right now is doing something kind of interesting in this
14 regard. Students take, you know, the ACT or SAT or
15 whatever their college prep exam, and then they also do
16 the work keys, which is a more -- a measure of, like,
17 sort of work competencies (indiscernible) that you have
18 those.

19 And in their state accountability framework,
20 if the school is supporting a lot of kids in getting
21 great college entrance test scores, that's like one point
22 in their framework. If they're doing great at getting
23 them ready in the workforce way, that's another point.
24 But then number of kids that they have who are doing
25 both, there are additional points given for that in their



1 state framework, which I think is a very compelling idea
2 in terms of communicating a very clear value of both
3 kinds of preparation, so --

4 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me.

5 MS. MORGAN: Yes?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead, Ms. Mazanec.

7 MS. MAZANEC: So what -- what exactly was
8 that Kentucky work -- did you say --

9 MS. MORGAN: It's called the work keys.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Work keys?

11 MS. MORGAN: Yes.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Standardized.

13 MS. MORGAN: It's standardized assessment.

14 MS. MAZANEC: It's an assessment?

15 MS. MORGAN: Uh-huh, of kind of work
16 readiness.

17 MS. MAZANEC: What does that look like?

18 MS. MORGAN: I don't know the details, I'm
19 sorry.

20 (Overlapping)

21 MS. MORGAN: There are other people --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Mr. --

23 MS. MORGAN: Yeah, you --

24 MR. ASP: It's a -- it's a -- and this is
25 just as an example. There's lots of different ways --



1 MS. MORGAN: Yeah.

2 MR. ASP: -- of assessing work readiness.

3 ACT has had a -- this work key piece available for quite
4 some time. And they've actually upgraded it recently.

5 MS. MORGAN: Yeah.

6 MR. ASP: But it would -- it would require
7 kids to do a task where they might have to actually
8 construct an email or do some writing in a formal way to
9 -- to demonstrate that they could move into some sort of
10 career piece and express themselves well in a -- in a way
11 that's supplied in kind of an office-like setting.

12 That's one piece. They might have to read some sort of
13 technical kinds of pieces and make some sense of those.

14 So they -- they've gone so far with ACT just
15 without belaboring the point, where they've even awarded
16 some kinds of certifications that say kids who are ready
17 to move into particular trainings and so on. But that's
18 just one example. There could be much more applied ways
19 of that than just (indiscernible).

20 MS. MAZANEC: I think that's very
21 interesting.

22 (Overlapping)

23 MS. MAZANEC: Very interesting.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I actually think at one time

25 --



1 (Overlapping)

2 MS. SCHROEDER: In some -- at some level and
3 some way, I don't know. I believe there were some
4 schools adhere now, a couple of in -- in Aurora. And
5 it's really not that long ago (indiscernible).

6 MS. MORGAN: Yeah.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Boy, time flies. A lot
8 happens in a very short time.

9 MS. MORGAN: Right.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So it seems like we've been
11 there forever. But, yeah, I (indiscernible). But I'm
12 pretty sure (indiscernible).

13 MS. MORGAN: Thank you. So and anyway,
14 there's curiosity about that, right, of different
15 measures in those areas that might be explored? There's
16 also this idea of could there be some indicators of
17 quality district operation, you know, indicators of there
18 being a culture of learning, of a culture of continuous
19 improvement. Could there be some ways to find that out
20 and is that something we would want to know and be able
21 to recognize?

22 Student and parent feedback, lots and lots
23 of people do this locally, of course, and -- and they
24 discuss that data locally. But there's been a question
25 sort of raised of, you know, would there be any interest



1 in -- in seeing, again, if that were brought into the
2 conversation as something which was part of the state
3 review. Would that change the nature of the
4 conversation?

5 And finally, this idea of locally determined
6 measures, and especially those that are aligned to post-
7 secondary workforce readiness. So if you, as a district,
8 have placed big bets on concurrent enrollment and you are
9 really feeling like that is a great way to make sure that
10 you're students are post-secondary ready and you would
11 like to set goals around participation and completion
12 rates in concurrent enrollment, can you tell us you have
13 that goal? Could we then report that data back to you
14 inside your framework and could there be some number of
15 points that are available to you for reaching your
16 locally-identified goal is another question.

17 I'm going to turn quickly to the next area
18 here, which is about student performance. And this is
19 where things start to get a little more complex. And I
20 just want to acknowledge we're just really introducing
21 this conversation to you today in hopes of having a much
22 more detailed conversation later. But this is meant to
23 be just a high level view, again, of all the
24 conversations that have been happening with different
25 districts about things that might be good ideas to try.



1 So this idea really is built on the
2 shoulders of New Hampshire. New Hampshire has put in
3 place and received permission from the Federal Department
4 of Education to use a set of commonly created -- so it's
5 a -- it is a single set of performance tasks at different
6 grade levels in language arts and mathematics to use
7 those in place of -- for them, it's Smarter Balance.
8 They are a Smarter Balance state. And so these are
9 performance tasks that are given locally and assessed
10 locally. So this is a pretty different scenario than
11 just direct testing in the state for every student.

12 They are assessed by those teachers. They
13 obviously can be made useful in terms of instruction for
14 teachers. It means they've just, you know, got this
15 assessment. They have scored it. They have the rubric
16 with all the detailed information. They aren't waiting
17 months to get it.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me?

19 MS. MORGAN: Uh-huh?

20 MS. MAZANEC: This would be in place of the
21 Smarter Balance?

22 MS. MORGAN: Yeah, in certain grade levels,
23 not all grade levels. So New Hampshire's doing this.
24 Essentially they are doing Smarter Balance in certain
25 grade levels in language arts and math. And in those



1 years, the students are also doing the performance tasks.
2 And then there are some years where they do the
3 performance tasks and not doing Smarter Balance.

4 And what they're doing is they're using this
5 Smarter Balance to validate the accuracy of the
6 performance tasks. And we're interested actually, based
7 on some learning that we've had from -- from some of the
8 experts, like Linda Darlingham (ph), that we've talked
9 with. We're interested in also adding to that in audit
10 function. So for those grade levels, all of those grade
11 levels periodically having sort of super team of
12 assessors who can look at what teachers determined based
13 on that assessment and give feedback about the degree to
14 which they believe that aligns with the standard
15 described in the criteria in the rubric.

16 And the -- the sort of attraction of this is
17 is that they can -- as a teacher, what you get is
18 information about the degree to which your assessment is
19 accurate. Your accurate against standards is on the
20 right bar, but you get it in a way that's very actionable
21 in your classroom. This, to be totally clear, is being
22 piloted with a very small number of districts in New
23 Hampshire, given that New Hampshire is very small. This
24 is like five districts who did this last year, okay. So
25 in the last testing cycle last spring, five districts



1 tried this. They now have about ten that will be trying
2 this the coming spring. They're in the middle of, you
3 know, their own validation procedures around this. It is
4 -- it is a place of, you know, intense learning for them
5 as a state and for the districts who are participating.
6 And there's a lot of good questions that they are trying
7 to figure out about tradeoffs, right? If you are a local
8 teacher and you are giving these performance tests and
9 you are assessing them, certainly you're spending
10 significant time doing so. And it's not as though, you
11 know, that is, like, not time that students are spending
12 testing, right? It's spending it in a different way.

13 So it is a reduced number of state
14 assessments. It's a reduced time for each student with
15 state assessments, but they are doing these other
16 assessments really in place of were their local interim
17 assessments, right? So locally maybe they were doing --
18 you know, they had a set of district assessments and they
19 start doing these performance tasks in place of that. So
20 it's relieving this sort of double burden in that way.
21 But they're really evaluating what are the tradeoffs of
22 that? Certainly they feel the information is very
23 useful, because they're getting it in a timely way. Is
24 it worth the time spent? You know, these are all
25 questions.



1 And so there are a number of districts here
2 who are interested in exploring that same idea of trying
3 to figure out in what ways is this better in terms of
4 meeting the need of return on investment? In what ways
5 is this harder? And is it worth it? And -- and so the
6 idea again here is to be able to pilot this with some
7 small number of folks to learn about those things and to
8 learn whether this offers the relief that people hope it
9 does, whether it provides the quality information that
10 they hope it does. And so this would be another thing
11 we'd like to support people in being able to try.

12 To be able to do this, obviously we would
13 also need federal permission. And I'm actually going to
14 just hop ahead two slides.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you sure?

16 MS. MORGAN: We've already been through that
17 one. The Feds, as you well know from talking to the
18 waiver discussions, require testing at all these grade
19 levels. And New Hampshire was able to receive permission
20 for a pilot to do this, with some constraints on it that
21 are largely about the degree to which New Hampshire will
22 closely monitor and ensure that they are learning about
23 this and figuring out feasibility of doing this at any
24 kind of scale and determining whether the impact is
25 really better than what they had better.



1 And I think, you know, this is probably the
2 most far out sort of idea that we want to talk with you
3 about in terms of accountability, in terms of far out
4 from the norm. But it would be one that would allow us
5 to learn some very interesting things. And again, our
6 sort of view on this right now is that this topic is
7 complex, there are a number of ways that we can tell that
8 -- that there is, you know, good value in what we do and
9 still question about what we do and that to be able to
10 learn with some precision about different ways to do this
11 that might be better is important before having just
12 large-scale changes to our system. And so this would be
13 one of those things to try, to try a thing that's a
14 little bit different, a little far from normal, actually,
15 but with some constraints around it in terms of
16 qualifications to participate, numbers of people who get
17 to participate, some input from teachers and parents in
18 those schools about whether they would like to
19 participate.

20 And so we can talk a lot more with you all
21 at the next meeting about sort of how that might work in
22 an operational way, like how might we be able to pilot
23 this? What are the guardrails that we know matter? From
24 the Fed's perspective, what are the guardrails that we
25 know matter from New Hampshire's learning? It's great



1 that we are not the first people to have this idea and
2 that we can learn from New Hampshire about what was
3 difficult that they didn't anticipate? And so we'd like
4 to have more conversations with you about that, but for
5 now, I just wanted to introduce the idea.

6 If we wanted to do that, there's a full list
7 up here. We need to get permission from, of course, the
8 Feds. To do that, we of course need permission from you.
9 We don't just go and do that by ourselves. And so this
10 would have to be something that the Board would support
11 at some point. We're clearly not asking for that today.
12 We're just trying to start a conversation.

13 We need to better explore the parameters of
14 1323 from last session and whether if we did receive
15 permission from the Feds to do this, there is room inside
16 1323 to do that without further legislative action. We
17 think that might be true, but we really need to look into
18 that further.

19 And lastly, the -- the pilot in 1323 as --
20 as it was described, as you know, that happened in the
21 very last wee hours of the session. And so there was no
22 fiscal in that process against that legislation. And so
23 it was not funded.

24 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

25 MS. MORGAN: So we would need to talk about



1 what would be the -- the financial support to make
2 something like that happen.

3 In terms of these school and system
4 performance components, things are a little bit
5 different, right? These would be additional measures
6 people are interested in exploring. District obviously
7 can mess around with other measures themselves and have
8 the authority to do that. And we think we have the
9 authority to help, you know, be in partnership with those
10 districts to try those things. Again, we don't -- we're
11 not sitting on a secret pile of money that would help us
12 to do that right now, but, you know, we would like to be
13 able to use the resources we have to help with that and -
14 - and maybe to work with those districts to help raise
15 funds to support them in those efforts.

16 But wanted to just give you a picture today
17 of, you know, what are people thinking about and what
18 might they like to try and what would be required of us
19 to be able to help make some of those things happen?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

21 MS. FLORES: You know, this is not new, the
22 -- the whole idea of -- of having assessments that are on
23 an individual basis. This was happening back in the mid-
24 1990s or so. So, I mean, there's a lot of information.
25 I have a wonderful little textbook that was -- that's



1 very handy. And it -- it's even online now. I mean, it
2 -- meaning you could even take it off. It's free.

3 But so I don't know, it -- you're making it
4 sound as if it's something that's -- that people don't
5 know about. And I mean, I think people are asking for
6 it, because they know that it's there. Alternative
7 assessments have always been there. And I think we were
8 going into that direction during the '90s and late '90s
9 and into the 2000s and such. And then reform came along
10 and we just squashed it, but it's there. And I -- I
11 don't know, I think maybe if we have a new -- new
12 secretary of education who maybe is a little bit more
13 learned on this -- on these issues, there'll be more
14 freedom to do the things that are right for kids, right
15 for teachers.

16 And I -- I think we should be into teaching
17 and learning, as opposed to assessments. And I know we
18 have to do it for Caesar, but it's -- I hope there is
19 change at that level and we should have state -- we --
20 we're a state. We're a local control state and we should
21 have that freedom to do that and not wait around for the
22 Feds to approve this or approve that. We need to do
23 what's right for kids and teachers and schools. That's
24 it.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm somewhat reminded of
2 my own sketchy past, which is that I worked as a CPA.
3 And for some time -- for some time I was involved in
4 audits. And I remember the discomfort that came to the
5 staffs of the organizations that we were auditing, when
6 in fact our belief was that we are here not only -- not
7 necessarily just to attest to the fact that you'd done a
8 good job in -- in a transparent job in your accounting
9 for dollars, but also we're here to help. And so we
10 would have recommendations on how to do that piece
11 better.

12 And yet the stomachaches and the headaches
13 and the anxiety that the folks had, my reflection is that
14 that's what's happening at school districts, that they're
15 -- that for me, accountability is some kind of a
16 sledgehammer, as opposed to an opportunity to, number
17 one, to shine, but also to -- for everybody to shine a
18 light on a lot of things and that the fear factor is
19 sometimes something that we -- that we internalize and
20 it's really not the intent.

21 And I'm so troubled by that, particularly
22 education evaluation too. The whole idea behind that is
23 just to talk about our practice and improve our practice.
24 It's not about hiring and firing. But that's the
25 perception that -- and I don't know how we can institute



1 that kind of an approach to the work we do, but it would
2 be so much healthier. So I'm hoping that through pilots
3 -- number one, with a pilot, hopefully you're only going
4 to get a district that really wants to do that, that sees
5 value in it.

6 And then figuring out some way that all of
7 our districts see a value in going through the process of
8 self-reflection of assessment, of describing the things
9 that we're doing well and the things where we would like
10 to put more effort to see better things for kids. But
11 I'm just sort of reflecting of the same feelings --

12 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that people get when
14 somebody else is looking at what you're doing. And it's
15 seen in a -- often in a negative way. And it -- it ought
16 to be as professionals. It ought to be different.

17 MS. GOFF: I -- I think --

18 MS. FLORES: And -- I'm sorry. And
19 Angelika, I think you worked in an area which was
20 business. We work in an area which has a bell curve.
21 And in a -- on a bell curve, there will always be -- yeah
22 --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, there's a bell curve
24 in everything. In business too.

25 MS. FLORES: The -- the bell curve in our



1 bell in education will always have those five percent. I
2 don't care what scale you use, that -- there will always
3 be --

4 (Overlapping)

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Sure, we're just trying to
6 move -- we're just trying to move the bell, Val. We're
7 not suggesting ever that there won't be a bell curve, but
8 we're trying to move it into a much higher level of
9 accomplishment. Go ahead. You were going to comment?

10 MS. GOFF: I think I was just going to say I
11 think looking at the inputs then to the accountability
12 system and as more comprehensive way can be really
13 helpful. I think a component that is out there that has
14 part of the impact on that anxiety feeling is that we
15 have an accountability clock in the state and --

16 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

17 MS. GOFF: -- no matter what inputs and what
18 measures we look at, if we always have that clock,
19 there's -- I think there may always be that sense of
20 anxiety around the system when you've got this looming
21 deadline.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: For some.

23 MS. GOFF: For some

24 MS. SCHROEDER: For some.

25 MS. GOFF: Exactly. And others, it doesn't



1 even matter, you know.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

3 MS. GOFF: And they don't feel that tension
4 there at all.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. No, I -- I totally
6 understand that.

7 MS. GOFF: But I think the clock plays a lot
8 into it for a lot of -- for those districts and schools.

9 (Overlapping)

10 MS. RANKIN: But I think I -- I --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further -- further
12 discussion of this issue? Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

13 MS. SHEFFEL: So tell -- this is kind of the
14 way my logic path goes. It seems to me that the law in
15 Colorado is vague, as you've pointed out, right? It
16 requires valid and action -- actionable information for
17 the public. So the Feds are required testing, but they
18 don't require what valance we have assigned to that
19 testing. So in Colorado, we have a number of variables
20 and we report that to the public and its accreditation
21 ratings and has high stakes for the districts. So they
22 come to the focus groups and say we think there are
23 issues inside the way the -- this is calculated. And we
24 think if we added some other variables, like school
25 quality, it would create greater fairness and it would



1 attenuate the -- the valance that we've placed on the
2 assessments as far as growth or achievement levels,
3 right?

4 So because of that, they've introduced these
5 variables. So my issue though is if we add a metric like
6 school quality and CDE hosts the pilot, who defines
7 school quality? So we define it as clubs. You
8 referenced clubs, Dr. Flores, as being --

9 MS. FLORES: Yes.

10 MS. SHEFFEL: -- a mechanism for kids to
11 feel included in a part of a larger system. So then
12 we're putting CDE in a position of saying what is school
13 quality? Well, a number of clubs. Okay, now we're down
14 to how effective are the clubs? Maybe they don't really
15 cause -- they don't result in kids feeling a sense of
16 belonging, but they exist.

17 So it seems to me that if we have enough
18 choice in our education system, which I don't think we
19 do, but we have some choice. Then theoretically
20 districts and schools already are motivated to market
21 themselves to the public and include a bunch of
22 variables, including school quality the way they want to
23 define it, the way their parents want it defined.

24 So I think, you know, if CDE hosts a
25 gathering of these additional data points like school



1 quality and other such subjective data points, then CDE
2 is collecting the data, defining what it means to be a
3 quality school, rating the number of club, let's say for
4 example, and -- and then including that in an
5 accreditation system. And I -- I guess I don't think
6 we've fixed the problem.

7 The problem is districts feel that a high-
8 stakes rating is sometimes unfair to them.

9 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

10 MS. SHEFFEL: So they come to the focus
11 groups and begin to generate options which would
12 attenuate their sense of unfairness of the ratings, at
13 least at times. So I feel like we actually open the door
14 to more unfairness, because CDE, I don't think, should
15 play a role in hosting a pilot like this, because of the
16 subjectivity of it. I think if there's something wrong
17 with the way we're -- we're calculating accreditation, we
18 should go back and look at what is the minimum amount of
19 information that's helpful to the public based on the
20 statute for valid and actionable -- actionable data. And
21 I think as we add all these subjective variables, it may
22 give some districts comfort in the sense that their
23 rating is attenuated. But truthfully, they don't need
24 that if the valance is right on our add.

25 So I guess I feel like this just burgeons



1 the problem, perhaps, and also requires more money and I
2 have issues with the pilot, although I appreciate the
3 sentiment.

4 MS. FLORES: But I felt the pilot was going
5 to be at the district level, not at our level.

6 MS. MAZANEC: We are partnering with the
7 district though and we need money to do it.

8 MS. MORGAN: Just to clarify, what we're
9 proposing is that we would be able to help facilitate
10 that so that we could ensure that we learn from what is
11 tried, right? And -- and also to support them in
12 whatever ways they would need to implement whichever one
13 of these ideas they might be interested in. And of
14 course the supports would vary, you know, by the topic
15 that they're interested in and --

16 MS. FLORES: Why would they need our
17 support? From CDE?

18 MS. MORGAN: If -- if the goal is to learn
19 from these in such a way that it could then impact
20 decisions the legislature would made -- would make about
21 statewide things, they need our help in facilitating
22 those things across districts and sort of raising up that
23 learning so that we could describe with some accuracy
24 what's been learned across that entire pilot. It's not a
25 thing that -- districts weren't built to have the



1 capacity to do that, right? And so --

2 (Overlapping)

3 MS. MORGAN: -- it would be a thing that --
4 that we would help in terms of organizing the effort,
5 providing support if they need it, and being able to make
6 sure that we have a way to design the pilot such that we
7 would learn meaningful things from it.

8 And I do think some of -- I just want to
9 respond to some of your questions about addressing the
10 issue of trust. I -- I think in some of these
11 conversations, part of what feels different to folks in
12 these conversations is -- is that they are participating
13 in them, right? And so part of what builds trust is
14 having something that is a genuinely collaborative
15 process.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Until they're caught in the
17 system though. So I mean they're in the focus groups.

18 MS. MORGAN: Well, we would have to see. I
19 mean it -- it would be a pilot where we would learn and
20 try, right? We would have to see. But I -- I do think
21 that's a sentiment that's been expressed from folks in
22 this conversation that I -- I just don't want have it go
23 unmentioned.

24 And I -- I also do think that this question
25 of who defines quality or how that's defined would vary



1 by the different kinds of thing that they want to try.
2 Some would be, like, under the locally-determined
3 measures. They determine about what they think is
4 quality and we're agreeing to just reflect that.

5 Different than school quality reviews where
6 they would clearly have to be some collaborative process
7 about that. Again, Vermont is a good example, if not a
8 small example. They're a good example of ways you can
9 facilitate that conversation and have peers participate
10 in reviews for one another in a way that provides quality
11 information and in -- in some ways actually the
12 conversation in Vermont is about trying to have some part
13 of the accountability system that provides actionable
14 information to high-performing schools and districts
15 that, you know, if someone has, you know, if they're
16 accredited with distinction as the district and they're
17 not feeling the pressure that Alisa described earlier,
18 what happens to help them see places where they also
19 could be focused and growing and what support do they
20 have --

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Pearson --

22 MS. MORGAN: -- in continuing to do that?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- correct me if I'm
24 wrong, but without a waiver, this is a completely
25 hypothetical discussion, correct?



1 MS. MORGAN: The assessment component of it
2 without a waiver is completely hypothetical. The other
3 portions --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Then I'd like --

5 MS. MORGAN: -- are not.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'd like to suggest that
7 we defer this discussion until we get a waiver.

8 MS. MORGAN: Well --

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Because there's no reason
10 to be holding out hope or talking about things or
11 inviting people to discuss that which we have no
12 authority to give. So we could agree with them all day
13 long, but if we lack the authority, there's no reason, as
14 far as I'm concerned, for the discussion.

15 So in particular at this meeting now,
16 which we've spent a very considerable amount of time on -
17 - on discussing a hypothetical, which I couldn't agree
18 more is a good idea. I just wish we could -- we could
19 have a vote and grant it. But until the federal
20 government gets out of the way of progress, we're going
21 to be stuck right where we are.

22 MS. MORGAN: I would just --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So --

24 MS. MORGAN: Mr. Chair, may I just clarify
25 one thing?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

2 MS. MORGAN: Because I feel like I may have
3 led to confusion in the way I responded to your question.
4 The question of whether the Feds will give us permission
5 to do this actually could be considered from the ESEA
6 waiver conversation. So if -- if you all --

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sure -- I'm sure it
8 can.

9 MS. MORGAN: -- wanted us to seek permission
10 --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But until it is, we're --
12 we're still having a -- a esoteric discussion.

13 MS. MORGAN: New Hampshire received
14 permission and I think it's -- it's feasible for us to
15 have that discussion with the Feds. We certainly
16 couldn't guarantee they would say yes, but we would not
17 go have that conversation with the Feds without the --
18 the explicit permission from this Board to do so.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right, do we
20 want to put that on the agenda, Commissioner, for the
21 next meeting --

22 MR. ASP: Certainly, certainly.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- so we can see if we can
24 get permission? Then we can have a -- a good discussion
25 about the prospects.



1 MS. SHEFFEL: May I ask a follow-up question
2 to your --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, (indiscernible).

4 MS. SHEFFEL: I -- I'm not sure -- I don't
5 know if this is lack of -- maybe this isn't just not
6 clear in my mind, but seems to me that the Feds require
7 testing for certain grades at certain intervals. And
8 that's one issue. I think the issue for the people that
9 come to this focus groups -- however, I could be wrong --
10 is that they're looking at our accreditation system and
11 the label that's put on their district and they have
12 issues with that label at times. And that is our issue
13 with the valance we've placed on the scores.

14 So if we're looking for a waiver from the
15 Feds based on federal minimums for testing, that's one
16 thing. But I don't think that's the issue of the people
17 that come to this meeting fully. I think it's rather our
18 school is on priority improvement, we don't think that
19 the data points inside that label are fair, because of
20 whatever -- we're too small or whatever. Therefore, we
21 want to add variables to the calculation and the
22 algorithm that Colorado's using. Therefore, can we add
23 these things?

24 So I -- I don't know that we would really
25 need a waiver to fix the problem if that is the problem



1 for the district. It's the valance of the tests inside
2 the label that districts are identified by, which is
3 different than, hey, asking the Feds to waive how often
4 and what test we get, am I right?

5 MS. MORGAN: Yeah. I would say that there
6 are also --

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Indiscernible)
8 Commissioner, go ahead.

9 MR. ASP: I'd like to respond --
10 (Overlapping)

11 MS. MORGAN: Sure, go ahead.

12 MR. ASP: Thank you. You're exactly right,
13 Dr. Scheffel. We have a -- we have two groups of folks
14 here (indiscernible). We have one group that says we
15 want to look at how can we add this other stuff to
16 accountability?

17 MS. SHEFFEL: Yeah.

18 MR. ASP: Because we don't think the system
19 here is -- is accurate or fair. And we don't need
20 permission from the --

21 MS. SHEFFEL: No, right.

22 MR. ASP: -- federal government to do that.
23 In fact, we're meeting with the folks from the Student-
24 Centered Group tomorrow --

25 MS. SHEFFEL: Yes.



1 MR. ASP: -- their facilitators. So we're
2 just trying to help them (indiscernible).

3 Then we've got another group that says we
4 want to look at assessment much different. That's what
5 we need (indiscernible). So thank you for clarifying.

6 MS. SHEFFEL: Yeah. So that's why I made
7 the point that I think for actually if we were to --
8 let's we agreed with this pilot, we said go forward, we
9 don't need the Feds to sign off on that. But I guess I
10 think that's a mistake, because we're not really
11 addressing this problem. We could address the problem so
12 much simpler by changing the valance of the state test
13 based on the premise that we don't think the tests are
14 fair, we think the language loaded in the tests is -- is
15 disadvantages students who are second-language learners
16 unfairly, whatever. And they can add their own quality
17 measures without CDE being part of that process or
18 defining what school quality is. So I think we're kind
19 of mixing two things here and we probably should clarify.

20 MS. MORGAN: I think there actually are
21 districts interested in all of those things, which is
22 partly why this is a convoluted conversation. There are
23 districts very interested in trying different modes of
24 assessments for reasons they don't have to do it the way
25 they're labeled in our performance framework, but have to



1 do with things that are going on locally in terms of
2 instructional priority.

3 MS. SHEFFEL: So I was just saying --

4 MS. MORGAN: It is -- is complex, I agree.

5 MS. SHEFFEL: Yeah, so I mean, we want to
6 obviously help the districts, but I would disagree with
7 widening CDE's role in defining these subjective
8 variables that would be added to the algorithm for
9 identifying accreditation variables. I would disagree
10 with widening CDE's role in it, because it's very
11 subjective and the districts, though they may like it,
12 they don't need it. They need to do that on their own
13 end and market themselves to the public without CDE
14 helping define those school qualities. That would be my
15 find on the pilot.

16 MS. MORGAN: Yeah, thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, thank you very much.

18 We'll take a five-minute recess.

19 (Meeting adjourned)

20

21

22

23

24

25



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 5th day of February, 2019.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright

Kimberly C. McCright

Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

Houston, Texas 77058

281.724.8600