

Chat from Meeting #5 (Oct 29, 2020)

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 01:14 PM

Is meeting 6 from 1-5 as well?

From Rhonda Haniford to Everyone: 01:14 PM

Yes, Nov. 10th from 1 - 5 pm.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 01:14 PM

Thank you!

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 01:24 PM

Luke, will you drop that in the chat?

The book series you just read

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 01:25 PM

Assistant Principals are the unsung grunts of a school building!! Good on him!

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 01:27 PM

<https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/247576/incerto-4-book-bundle-by-nassim-nicholas-taleb/>

That's a link to the book series. Incredible read, will change your mind on some things!

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 01:27 PM

Thank you!

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 01:27 PM

bahahahaha! love it Carol

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 01:46 PM

Can you put the participant information in the chat? By category?

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 01:49 PM

I'll have to type it in...bear with me.

Educator: 78%; Parent: 8%; Principal: 3%; District Admin: 2%; Superintendent: 2%; Everyone else was below 1%

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 01:57 PM

The survey also didn't have any information on the things we've already reached consensus on - accountability pause of example

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 01:57 PM

Agreed.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:04 PM

how many educators do we have in the state?

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 02:04 PM

Jen, I think that's a misreading of the way the word cloud works. Many of the larger words were directly connected to students, things like mental health and stress are often referring to students.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 02:04 PM

I think it reinforces the idea that these topics aren't always viewed as connected to kids. They are connected to the adults involved in the systems .

From Katy Anthes to Everyone: 02:05 PM

Christina-- about 60,000

From Colleen O'Neil to Everyone: 02:05 PM

Christina, we have just around 60,000 educators in the state.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 02:05 PM

That said, based on the response roles, this is primarily a collective perspective from educators, not the whole community

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:05 PM

thx

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:05 PM

I don't agree Peter, it was a large number of teachers responding specifically on how it impacts them

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:06 PM

So we have a survey of ~2.5% of educators in the state, and they are saying halt state assessments

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:07 PM

I don't believe that data on student performance is about educators

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:08 PM

another way to frame that is, super busy educators took time out of their day to tell us to halt state assessments

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 02:08 PM

Doctors don't make up a huge percentage of our population, yet we don't often dismiss their understanding of medical diagnosis or the afflictions effecting patients.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:09 PM

great point Jason.

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 02:10 PM

My point is simply a statistical one. This is valuable data, but it represents a specific and limited perspective. Not intended to be a controversial point.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:12 PM

Thank you Kym!

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 02:12 PM

Wee said Kym.

*well

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 02:18 PM

Sorry Stephanie! I said I would come back to you. I'll ask you to offer your comment when we come back from break.

Break at 220

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 02:22 PM

I am here!

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 02:23 PM

here

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 02:25 PM

I am hearing some background noise- I think not everyone is muted

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:32 PM

total districts in the state is 181?

total schools is 1887?

From Katy Anthes to Everyone: 02:33 PM

The 181 number includes a few BOCES

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:33 PM

thx

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 02:34 PM

My understanding is that though the feds, under the current administration, are not considering blanket waivers they are open to consider alternative data collection approaches when the state assessment cannot produce trustworthy results. Has that changed?

From B Sanders to Everyone: 02:34 PM

Christina, yes those are the counts.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:34 PM

thx B

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 02:34 PM

B, are you able to answer Michelle's question?

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 02:35 PM

Hi, B!

From B Sanders to Everyone: 02:35 PM

I'm not sure about Michelle's question. We should touch base with our federal programs unit and get back to you.

Hi, Jen!!

From Melissa Colman, CDE to Everyone: 02:36 PM

Michelle, I can check into that, but I haven't heard this. Everything we've seen from the feds is that there is an expectation that assessment and accountability requirements for 2020-21 will be conducted.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:38 PM

how much time does the state review panel spend with any particular school?

From Lisa Steffen to Everyone: 02:38 PM

They will do multi day site visits and document reviews

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:38 PM

so very labor intensive

From Joshua Perdue to Everyone: 02:38 PM

For the current year (2020-21), there are 1,833 schools that fall under the state accountability system, and 184 districts/BOCES.

From Melissa Colman, CDE to Everyone: 02:39 PM

The information we have from the feds last week is an indication that we can submit a streamlined ESSA state plan amendment to address how we will be identifying schools for support in the 2021-22 school year in the absence of 2019-20 assessment data. Some of our indicators for school identification are multi-year calculations (often 3 years of data).

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 02:39 PM

2 days of in school visit and couple days with document reviews

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:39 PM

thx Johann

i knew you were on those panels

doing that amazing work

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 02:40 PM

Thank you

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 02:45 PM

Yes, that's right.

thanks so much.

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:49 PM

Can i suggest we flip that process?

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 02:53 PM

Jen - I'm hoping to use the temp check as a way to wrap up the convo on this rec. That's why I started with brainstorming.

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:54 PM

got it

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:55 PM

which part

the original language correct?

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:05 PM

Why are schools that are improving required to follow a State mandated improvement process? The fact that schools are improving suggests they already know what drives improvement. In our district the UIP is not seen as complementary to our process. It is awkwardly bolted on and culminates in writing and submitting the final plan which is horribly clunky.

How about a never UIP?

UIPs seem appropriate for schools that are not performing.

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:13 PM

Enthusiast should continue to use it.

I think we probably all agree that schools should improve.

I have never found a parent who has looked at our UIP without me holding them down.

From CASE EVENTS to Everyone: 03:15 PM

I think it is great if JeffCo and DPS want to continue it. I would not suggest that any district shouldn't choose to complete it. If there is capacity within the district and usefulness, that is great. If there is not capacity nor value in a district, it shouldn't be required. I suggest leaving this as an option for each district.

From Carol Eaton to Everyone: 03:15 PM

TAP has not weighed in so I will abstain

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 03:15 PM

looking something up

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:16 PM

I am interested in exploring this more with my members, though I am inclined to support the flexibility Paul and Bret have out forward

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 03:16 PM

I support flexibility to use it if it is helpful to a district/school but agree with Brett and Paul that if you have a planning process that works, that should be considered as well

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:18 PM

Is flexibility just for this year or for all future years?

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 03:19 PM

I would clarify that I do believe that everyone needs to use some form of improvement planning..... I just want to recognize that there is no ONE way to do improvement planning in order to get results

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:19 PM

Lisa, didn't the local accountability bill allow districts to submit local plans to the state, even if they weren't part of the grant program?

From Lisa Steffen to Everyone: 03:21 PM

Michelle, the local accountability bill allows districts participating in the grant program to submit local plans in lieu of the state online UIP

It is not our interpretation that it allows that flexibility to all districts

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:22 PM

Lisa Steffen, I read the statute differently. We should discuss

From Lisa Steffen to Everyone: 03:22 PM

Of course

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:22 PM

Though it does just provide for an alternative format so likely doesn't go far enough for this purpose

From Lisa Steffen to Everyone: 03:23 PM

Yes, the submission timelines and review expectations remain

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:26 PM

I appreciate that CDE staff are caught between so many mandates which results in what it has resulted in. Thanks for your work.

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 03:35 PM

The Stakeholder Group

recommends that districts will be responsible for accrediting their schools in alignment with current statute, board rule and state policies to include safety, finance, and accreditation contract assurance.

From Lisa Steffen to Everyone: 03:39 PM

Safety and Finance assurances are not on the School Performance Framework, just Accountability Participation Assurances

From Carol Eaton to Everyone: 03:39 PM

In our district, the safety and finance checks are monitored by our budget and safety offices. Jeffco feels confident we can continue to monitor these assurances for each of our schools.

From B Sanders to Everyone: 03:40 PM

Sorry, everyone! Thank you, Lisa, for the correction.

From Carol Eaton to Everyone: 03:41 PM

I will defer since TAP has not weighed in

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:41 PM

I will need to check in with members to be sure :)

Break at 350

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 03:54 PM

I am here

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 03:57 PM

Here as well (video not working)

Can you put link in chat, please?

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 03:58 PM

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/%E2%80%A2-reporting-for-summative-state-assessment-achievement-growth-and-accountability>

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 03:58 PM

Thank you!

From CASE EVENTS to Everyone: 04:05 PM

Could you expand on why low participation is less of a concern?

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 04:05 PM

We're also going to have Q and A shortly.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:07 PM

here are we talking about the "broncos" report

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 04:08 PM

At the TAP meeting it was listed that 85% participation threshold wasn't needed to calculate individual growth. So isn't it more accurate to say that participation levels are of of no concern?

That's to calculate "baseline growth" in my last question

From B Sanders to Everyone: 04:09 PM

Hey folk, Marie is planning to answer these questions in the Q and A.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:10 PM

Is it possible to add a column in this document that includes recommendations from the TAP?

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:12 PM

Lisa, when you say skip year growth is "theoretically possible", what does that mean? Is it therefor "theoretically not possible"?

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:15 PM

Sorry about that.

No it was in a previous stakeholder meeting.

would love to try again.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:17 PM

Thank you, that makes sense! Not being snarky, just didn't understand that statement.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:19 PM

Where possible, on the document before us, can we include where the TAP has landed on recommendations?

I recall we had a pretty technical conversation during our second meeting and were going to defer to members of the TAP on some of these more technical pieces.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:20 PM

Yes, helps, thank you.

Internet issues, grrrrrr

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:21 PM

Sorry that my mic is not working. Not sure what is happening.

I might try to hop off and then hop back on to see if that fixes it.

It would just be helpful in our decision making.

Thank you Marie.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:26 PM

Is there any worry that the determination of whether the data is appropriate for individual level reporting will be made after the test is given means we could have data that we are withholding from stakeholders?

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:30 PM

Are there additional recommendations regarding additional levels of reporting that we are reviewing later in this meeting?

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 04:30 PM

Yes Chris. Aggregated Reports for Public Release

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:32 PM

I am sorry but I have to jump off this meeting. Take care everyone.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:34 PM

I agree that the statement should specify PSAT and SAT

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 04:35 PM

I agree with Bret's suggestion of clarity around each assessment. I support PSAT and SAT.

From CASE EVENTS to Everyone: 04:37 PM

I'm am interested in hearing the TAP's recommendation prior to weighing in on these. Good start, but would like to hear what TAP has to say first.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:37 PM

agree bret

i'd also like to chat with ACEE membership

From Carol Eaton to Everyone: 04:37 PM

I will know more after next week's TAP meeting.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:38 PM

Yes on PSAT/SAT, No on CMAS

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:38 PM

Not ready to weigh in

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:38 PM

I disagree with this change, the language of "if conditions below are met" addresses these concerns.

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:38 PM

Would love a brief comment about the edit just made

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:38 PM

I do.

My microphone still isn't working.

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 04:39 PM

Agree with the new language and with a caveat that I'd like to know what TAP has to say as well.

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 04:39 PM

If you don't give a test, the results aren't available

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:39 PM

Sorry about my computer not working.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:43 PM

Good call, Lisa!

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 04:45 PM

Tired, and unsure if I can agree

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:51 PM

If the growth data is robust everyone should see it. If it is not robust no-one should see it. The great advantages of growth data are, I hope, well understood.

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:52 PM

Well said, Paul.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:52 PM

Are we assuming status data will be released publicly?

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 04:52 PM

The Sups endorsed the CSAC recommendation to preserve PSAT/SAT

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 04:52 PM

Thanks Peter.

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 04:53 PM

Thank you! I'm really concerned the adding so much confusion into the field about the changes in growth in the different years.

From Carol Eaton to Everyone: 04:53 PM

Great question, Cheri. We would want both growth and achievement available when accountability restarts.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:54 PM

Thanks, folks

From Carol Eaton to Everyone: 04:55 PM

Thanks, all. Home stretch.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:55 PM

Thank you!

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 04:55 PM

Thankyou