

Stakeholder Group Chat Box Notes: November 10, 2020

From Jen Holladay (she|ella) to Everyone: 12:56 PM

My camera died. Apologies to group.

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 12:58 PM

My apologies to the group that my camera is operational.

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 12:58 PM

I don't have a camera either, sorry!

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 01:14 PM

That's right, Marine Core balls are this time of year!

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 01:15 PM

Absolutely!

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 01:15 PM

Happy Birthday!

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 01:18 PM

Thank you for reviewing for me. My apologies to all for being late.

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 01:21 PM

Do you want rationale for each final recommendation?

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 01:23 PM

Agree

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 01:23 PM

Agree with Bret

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 01:23 PM

Agree

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 01:23 PM

Agree with Bret

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 01:23 PM

I agree. No rationale

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 01:23 PM

Agree

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 01:24 PM

good idea, Christina

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 01:25 PM

Like Christina's idea

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 01:25 PM

Agreed Jen

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 01:36 PM

Agree with your read on that language Michelle.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 01:37 PM

Plus, the current RfR process is pretty prescriptive

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 01:42 PM

Is the suggestion that CDE would have authority to determine new process?

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 01:45 PM

CDE will collaborate with field to determine a process that may be used...

From Jen Holladay (she|ella) to Everyone: 01:46 PM

The process needs to be adjusted to reflect realities of COVID-19.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 01:47 PM

Can we just make the note sentence a new paragraph?

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 01:48 PM

The Stakeholder group recommends that school and district performance levels be maintained and rollover with no change in accountability ratings. Any district or school on the accountability clock may use the existing reconsideration process.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 01:49 PM

I don't love that

because the current process is prescriptive and there are measures in COVID world that wouldn't be available to use in the regular process

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 01:52 PM

Thats better

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 01:53 PM

including but not limited to...

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 01:58 PM

that's right Lisa

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 02:02 PM

I would move it to the bottom as a footnote for reference

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:14 PM

could we take a break?

and CDE can work through this

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 02:15 PM

We're on a break, Christina. See you at 2:25.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:15 PM

sorry

i gave myself a break and came back to this

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 02:16 PM

:-)

From Jen Holladay (she|ella) to Everyone: 02:19 PM

I'm back

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 02:21 PM

Do we need to add something about the special considerations in accountability above since that may impact the accreditation process for schools and districts?

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 02:21 PM

Good job, Lisa!

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:24 PM

optional for 2020-21 or 2021-22?

From Me to Everyone: 02:25 PM

It would be an optional submission for 2020-21 (April 15, 2021)

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 02:26 PM

My superintendents and I would support option 3 (far right). They are all rural or small rural and focus more on local school and community driven plans.

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 02:27 PM

TAP is split on this recommendation. Some support Option 2 and some Option 3.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:27 PM

CCSD would support option 3, but ACEE would be more likely to support 2. Again, not a hill to die on

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 02:28 PM

I think this is a good place to signal intent

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:28 PM

I like the note idea

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:28 PM

so if we went with option 3, could districts chose to require uip

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 02:28 PM

to consider more locally designed plans.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 02:29 PM

Can't schools always exceed requirements?

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:29 PM

i think the answer is yes

From Jen Holladay (she|ella) to Everyone: 02:29 PM

Think that opens up districts to tons of lobbying from stakeholders. Believe it's better for uniform approach statewide.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:29 PM

but if districts wanted to actually use the UIP tool, would it be available to them

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:33 PM

would it be possible to do a straw poll on the 3 options?

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 02:35 PM

It sounds like our group is split

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 02:35 PM

Let's make 2 optional

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 02:38 PM

I echo Cheri's comment.

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 02:39 PM

Can we discuss Michelle's suggestion of making column 2 optional? Would this get us to consensus?

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 02:40 PM

Bret makes a good point

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 02:41 PM

Agree that it sounds like consensus will be hard to reach.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 02:41 PM

Agreed Luke.

From Amy Pitlik to Everyone: 02:41 PM

Agree that it's okay to not reach consensus here.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 02:42 PM

Maybe we could just ask if people support the concept before we wordsmith.

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 02:43 PM

I agree with the second column language

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 02:43 PM

combining the options in the second column may meet the TAPs recommendation

From Jen Holladay (she|ella) to Everyone: 02:43 PM

If DPS is only hold out, we can live with it. Not the hill for today.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:44 PM

ACEE would support

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 02:46 PM

I think I heard that folks constituencies didn't reach consensus here.

thought**

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 02:47 PM

Is submission date not April for this school year? The change is to October is for 2021-2022 year.

From Me to Everyone: 02:48 PM

April date is still in effect this school year. We move to the Oct deadline in 2021

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 02:54 PM

There's precedent for how we've addressed that situation though.

From Jen Holladay (she|ella) to Everyone: 02:55 PM

Possible language shift: “to the extent local health orders allow in-person testing to occur.”

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 02:55 PM

What if we are in a stay at home order? Or certain communities are in a stay at home order?

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 02:57 PM

I don't think we need to get too detailed — why local health orders? I prefer the wording on option A.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 02:58 PM

Because it could vary across the state as it is right now- various communities are in different places per local health orders

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 02:58 PM

I would agree with you here Jen.

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 02:58 PM

We might do something different to that which our health officials recommend

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:58 PM

I agree that I like the purple language rather than the red

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 02:59 PM

I'm ok with purple. I think it takes some subjectivity out of who assesses the conditions.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:59 PM

i second that Chris

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 03:00 PM

Purple aligns with how districts are currently working with their local health departments

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 03:00 PM

Love that recommendation, Christina.

From Jen Holladay (she|ella) to Everyone: 03:00 PM

Agree with Christina

From Da'Lisa Hatcher to Everyone: 03:01 PM

Like it Christina

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 03:01 PM

I agree Christina good addition

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 03:01 PM

I also agree.

From Amy Pitlik to Everyone: 03:01 PM

Agree with Christina's edit!

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 03:02 PM

I like Christina's suggestion as well

I apologize all, but I have to sign off as we have a board meeting starting at 5 and I am not quite ready :-)

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 03:04 PM

That's why the flexibility language is included in option B.

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 03:06 PM

@Michelle- I think it's less subjective by naming what authority is evaluating the conditions. My take.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:11 PM

Can we hear TAP recommendations on these? Reporting and growth?

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 03:11 PM

second that

From Me to Everyone: 03:11 PM

Those were shared out in Rhonda's email on Monday

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:16 PM

I would like to hear more about their discussion around the growth options

The information in the email about TAP discussion was very limited. This is helpful

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 03:17 PM

Since we are not calculating accountability measure do we need new growth metrics?

From Jen Holladay (she|ella) to Everyone: 03:19 PM

@Johan, as a parent/guardian, I want to know whether my high schooler is being supported in progressing well or not, and growth can tell me that better than her raw achievement score

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 03:19 PM

Jen

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 03:19 PM

Agree, Jen.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:19 PM

I agree on the importance of growth. I'm concerned with the confusing aspect of the new growth calculation metrics. Thank you.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:23 PM

Does the state board approve growth model?

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 03:26 PM

I agree Carol!

This is for individual reporting.

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 03:27 PM

This is individual growth.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 03:27 PM

Exactly. That was my point. Sorry.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 03:29 PM

You can CORA aggregate data if the PII can be redacted. You can also be required to create a new document under "New CORA" Michelle, can you lawyer confirm?

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:29 PM

I'm good with the red on this one. Thank you.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:29 PM

That is my understanding Peter

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 03:30 PM

I do not think people can be required to create a document under CORA

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 03:30 PM

This discussion then becomes about the system as opposed to the individual student and their growth.

From Me to Everyone: 03:31 PM

Yes are correct, Stephanie. I think people are exploring the responsibility of aggregating data once they have all of the individual level data

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 03:34 PM

Yes

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:34 PM

Our districts use online data warehouses that do all of the removal of PII and aggregate data to make class, school and district reports. Is that CORA requestable?

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:37 PM

Kady, can you post the cite?

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:37 PM

Yes I'm good.

From Me to Everyone: 03:39 PM

Carol -- Is it worth bringing up TAP's convo on TAP's middle ground solution on public reporting at just the state level?

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:39 PM

Carol, I would like to hear about that

From Kady Lanoha to Everyone: 03:39 PM

C.R.S. 22-72-204(3.5)(d)

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:40 PM

Ditto, Peter!

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 03:42 PM

Yes Carol!

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:42 PM

I say again: if the information is robust it is good for everyone to see it; if it is not robust no-one should see it. Being transparent always carries the risk of criticism. Not being transparent always carries more risk.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 03:44 PM

more than half

almost 90% of the students with DASSC support

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:46 PM

The cover up is always what gets you :)

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 03:46 PM

Thanks, Paul. Appreciate this point.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 03:48 PM

Do we feel like we are going to get to an agreement on this today?

From Bret Miles to Everyone: 03:49 PM

The conditions are not just during the assessment window. The conditions date back to the first day of school. We already know that with half of the school year gone, we already vast differences in school experiences.

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 03:49 PM

Don't forget the 4th quarter from the previous year.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 03:50 PM

My kids alone have had 5 different circumstances in learning since the start of the year and a new one just came yesterday. Just one example of the VAST differences in school experiences for all students all across the state.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 03:51 PM

We would be measuring different models, technology access, parent engagement, etc.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:52 PM

I would love to explore Peter's point about alternative ways to measure learning/learning loss

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 03:52 PM

That's right Peter, but wouldn't the information still be useful to help plan appropriate interventions and supports?

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 03:52 PM

Those measurements are worth knowing about Peter, from my POV

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 03:52 PM

If we were using it for accountability I would totally agree. Have already reached consensus that we aren't

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 03:52 PM

We will only measure privilege and not academic growth. Districts do have data right now and we are providing intervention to the best of our abilities.

From Bret Miles to Everyone: 03:53 PM

There is a great deal of data that districts are using now and can continue to use to plan interventions and supports. State level data that is available next August, does not help with interventions and supports.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 03:53 PM

Jen, we agree about progress monitoring, formative, classroom, etc. assessments. CMAS is designed as a uniform summative assessment primarily of program quality, with individual results as a secondary

purpose—that's why the state system delivers results in the fall, when we can't change individual experiences anymore

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:55 PM

I would argue that most if not all schools have already done measurements of 'learning loss', student achievement and student growth. What we are discussing is if people outside a school community get to see and make judgements about the learning loss, achievement and growth.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 03:59 PM

You can't make claims about how these contexts have impacted students on a broader level without assessment that tells us this.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:00 PM

We should work with those districts where parents are saying this to see why data isn't getting to parents. I have received the MAPS scores for all three of my kids and had robust data shared with me at parent teacher conferences (held virtually).

*shared

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:00 PM

That is a great question about why are schools not getting the data out to parents. All schools can be better at getting families in for conferences or sending what we used to call "Thursday Folders".

From Bret Miles to Everyone: 04:04 PM

To Jen's point, it seems like it could be much more efficient and even more effective for our efforts to focus on how to support parents on getting information that is already available rather than putting undo pressure on the system to give a test of which we will not have confidence in the results and cannot help focus instruction within the school year. I truly believe that our focus at the policy level has not come anywhere close to understanding the incredible lift on schools that statewide testing is. Please visit with any tech or assessment director.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:07 PM

well said Bret

thank you for the vulnerability Jen

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:08 PM

Chris, I would gently ask, what data do you not have that you would gain from state testing? Surely you have local data that you, your staff, students and parents value/trust. Those tests are likely also normed so you can see how your students are doing compared to other students in Colorado and other states.

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:08 PM

I think we can all agree that teaching, learning, and testing go hand in hand. You cannot leave any component out in the process. Following that is the communication between teacher student and

parent. Everyone needs to know where the student is on this academic journey. The problem is that you are putting a higher value on one over the other.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:09 PM

Yes, pass.

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:09 PM

I would be very happy to share the information with you Jen. There are many problems but much illumination is provided.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:10 PM

can i have my turn back

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:11 PM

@Jason- we absolutely have local data that we trust, but I do believe the summative state data, PSAT/SAT meets a different purpose. Not better, but different. And as both an educator and a parent, I believe we are a stronger system if we see and share both.

From Katy Anthes to Everyone: 04:12 PM

Yes, I have been listening carefully. This was a very important conversation. Thank you.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:13 PM

Thank you, Chris. I can respect that.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:14 PM

To react to Stephanie's comment, I would say that we do consider the context in which learning is taking place every year. That is what I was wanting to elaborate on, but I recognize the need to just move the conversation so will save it for another discussion.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:21 PM

old hand

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 04:22 PM

TAP supports not releasing broadly/publicly and not in CDE online systems; calculate only at the state level if meets conditions above

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 04:28 PM

The TAP meeting is not public online. Was this not an official meeting? How many members participated

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:31 PM

I second Luke

And Chris

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 04:34 PM

To Carol's point, I would describe it less as a struggle, and more a surrender due to learned helplessness by educators

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 04:34 PM

First I've heard that staffing issues are a consideration

From Bret Miles to Everyone: 04:35 PM

Access is a gigantic concern among districts.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 04:35 PM

I thought we were not providing rationale

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:36 PM

Yep. I have one district that has not even gotten through ACCESS placement tests.

so they aren't even sure how they will get through ACCESS testing

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:37 PM

I have appx 10 district in my BOCES partially or fully remote. Some for a second time already. State testing is not on their radar in the least.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:42 PM

I think that there are lots of us who would like to continue the conversation regarding what other data that could or should be used. Is this something people are willing to continue meeting to discuss collectively (not necessarily convened formally via CDE) or is it just assumed that this point will be hashed out as part of the legislative process?

From Bret Miles to Everyone: 04:45 PM

For what it's worth in regard to our final report... The group was convened to provide input and come to consensus. By trying to explain the differences of opinions where we do not have consensus, it can only lead to hard feelings about words chosen and which rationale was included or not included. It seems counter productive to try to summarize our disagreements. Instead, it should be our own burden to explain to legislators our positions, and not put CDE in the unenviable position of picking and choosing arguments. Just an opinion :)

Heather, not a question - just a thought shared

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 04:48 PM

Amie and Michelle - I'm interested in continuing conversation

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:48 PM

If I can be helpful, me too.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:48 PM

You can add me to that list as well.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:50 PM

@Jen, @Chris, @Stephanie, @Michelle, and others who want to continue that conversation- looking forward to it and I think that it will be a valuable and meaningful conversation.

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 04:51 PM

Yeah, I am also interested in the more creative conversation re Amie and Michelle

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:51 PM

I would cautiously be willing to participate as well. The caution is about the spreading thin that is happening to district and school staff that Carol has mentioned.

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:51 PM

Sounds good Amie!

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:51 PM

Not about engaging with you all

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:52 PM

Thank you, Rhonda, Heather, Lisa and other CDE folks. Well done!!

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 04:52 PM

Thanks to CDE!

From Bret Miles to Everyone: 04:52 PM

Thank you Heather! Toughest job! Thanks, Rhonda for all the prep work too. Appreciate everyone's effort.

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:52 PM

Thank you all for your contributions

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:52 PM

I'm up for continued discussions.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:53 PM

Thank you to all, I truly appreciate everyone's efforts and contributions. Looking forward to continuing the work. Take care, all!

From Me to Everyone: 04:53 PM

So proud to work with all of you!

From Jen Holladay (she|ella) to Everyone: 04:53 PM

TY, all

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:53 PM

Grateful to you all!

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:53 PM

This was fun