

Meeting Minutes – Thursday, May 23rd 2013 (9:00-4:00)

Jefferson County Public Schools, 1829 Denver West Drive, Golden, CO

TAP Members Present:

Norman Alerta
Linda Barker
Randy Black
Jonathan Dings
Carol Eaton
Jacqueline Law
Joy Perry
Dwayne Schmitz

Audience:

Daniel Archuleta
Derek Briggs
John Cumming
Heather MacGillivray
Connie Zumpf

CDE Representatives:

Marie Huchton
Dan Jorgensen
Sed Keller
Toby King
Bob Snead
Britt Wilkenfeld

Welcome & Minutes Approval

- Meeting minutes will have an initial review by CDE staff then will be sent to the TAP for review and will be formally adopted during the subsequent meeting. Dan Jorgensen will work to have the draft minutes provided to the TAP as quickly as possible following the formal TAP meetings.
- Roberts Rules of Order will be used if discussion becomes too contentious and/or if necessary to maintain order. The goal is to keep the structures flexible enough to facilitate work without compromising meeting objectives.
- The April 28, 2013 minutes were unanimously approved by the Technical Advisory Panel.
- Dan Jorgensen has sent out a Doodle poll for scheduling to establish formal meeting dates for the upcoming year. All TAP members (except for one) have responded so the selection of the formal meeting dates/times will occur within the next week. The TAP will be notified of the selected dates/times as soon as possible.
 - The meetings will likely be scheduled for three hours. However, it has been recommended for the TAP members to reserve an entire day block for meetings.

Adoption of Operating Procedures

- The operating procedures handbook was formally adopted with the consent of all TAP members. The only change from the initial draft reflects changes to the nomination term and procedures for selection of the chair/vice-chair. A new vice-chair will be selected annually with the prior vice-chair transitioning to the role of chair. In effect, appointments are for two-year terms.

Selection of Chair/Vice-Chair

- Carol Eaton (chair pro-tem) is unable to serve as the TAP chair during the upcoming year due to professional obligations. She would be willing to be considered to serve as vice-chair.
- Jonathan Dings nominated himself for chair, Joy Perry seconds the nomination
 - All TAP members voted in favor, Jonathan Dings will serve as the chair during the 2013-14 academic year.
- Carol Eaton nominated herself for Vice-Chair, Jonathan Dings seconds that nomination
 - All TAP members voted in favor, Carol Eaton will serve as the vice-chair during the 2013-14 academic year and transition to chair for the 2014-15 academic year.

CELA to ACCESS Transition – Growth Analysis

- Marie Huchton from the Accountability & Data Analysis Unit at CDE shared a presentation regarding her exploratory analysis concerning the transition from CELA pro to ACCESS for ELLs. The objective was to obtain the recommendations of the TAP in regards to the use of the new growth metric within the performance frameworks and for AMAO determinations.
- **TAP Position Statement:** Due to concerns with consistency and standardization of ACCESS administration in 2013 and differences between CELA and ACCESS, CELA-to-ACCESS growth percentiles do not form an adequate basis for use in accountability without a direct indication that appeals will be permitted based on differences in measures and administration considerations.
 - All members expressed support for this position statement.

Colorado Growth Model and Educator Effectiveness: Work Session Notes

The TAP engaged in a work session to answer a series of questions in regards to the Colorado Growth Model and its application to educator evaluations. The minutes below reflect the official position of the TAP regarding those questions.

- *What are Colorado Growth Model results?*
 - Student Growth Percentiles and Median Growth Percentiles from state assessments.
- *How should the Colorado Growth Model results be used in educator evaluation?*
 - The TAP recommends using the Colorado Growth Model:
 - Only in combination with other measures *this is required by SB191
 - Only in cases where a school district has appropriate evidence of the suitability of the scores underlying the growth model results *see performance targets question
 - The TAP recommends that for group and individual attribution ratings, Adequate Growth Percentiles (Catch Up, Keep Up, Move Up) should not factor into growth or effectiveness ratings.
 - If a district chooses to use School Performance Frameworks and District Performance Frameworks, districts should consider implications of using Adequate Growth Percentiles, i.e. they set unequal growth targets based on prior years' student achievement

- For example, a district might choose to use a state-wide rank percentile of Median Growth Percentiles by level (EMH) and content (ex. Math, Reading) at the school attribution level.
- *How can Student Growth Percentiles be aggregated for use in educator evaluation?*
 - *Educator level median growth percentiles?*
 - The TAP does not recommend using individually attributed Median Growth Percentiles at the educator level at this time.
 - *Multiple years?*
 - The TAP recommends that it is appropriate to use at least 2 years of Median Growth Percentiles, given the research on their stability over time, taking into consideration major fluctuations in data, trends, and student population served
 - *Impact of N sizes?*
 - The TAP recommends that judgments made based on Median Growth Percentiles should be informed by confidence intervals associated with MGPs
- *What should the cut points be for educator level Median Growth Percentiles?*
 - The TAP recommends that districts wishing to adopt cut points are advised to proceed cautiously, and gather evidence supporting the validity of inferences made regarding educator effectiveness associated with proposed cut points.
- *Can/Should aggregated Median Growth Percentiles for different content areas be combined or treated discretely?*
 - The TAP is of the opinion that growth percentiles provide information relative to each content area and therefore content areas should be examined separately.
- *Can Student Growth Percentiles be used to set performance targets?*
 - TAP recommends that Student Growth Percentiles are only used at the aggregate level and not at the individual student level.
- *Can Median Growth Percentiles be used to set performance targets?*
 - Although the TAP does not recommend individual attribution at this time, districts that choose to use Median Growth Percentiles at the individual attribution level should develop evidence to show that scores are aggregated over a sufficient number of students and across an appropriate number of years, and are based on fair measures that are highly aligned to the enacted curriculum, yield scores demonstrated to fairly measure growth over time, and are accurately and fairly attributed to the contribution of individual educators.
 - The TAP recommends that it may be appropriate to use Median Growth Percentiles for group attributed performance targets, as long as scores are aggregated over a sufficient number of students and across an appropriate number of years, and are based on fair measures that are highly aligned to the enacted

curriculum and yield scores demonstrated to fairly measure growth over time and are accurately and fairly attributed to the contribution of groups of educators.

- *Does the Colorado Growth Model communicate gains in learning? A year's growth?*
 - The TAP is of the opinion that the Colorado Growth Model communicates normative information about scale score movement relative to content tested on state assessments. Inferences from results about learning are dependent upon technical properties of tests and test scores being used within a growth model.

Opportunity for Public Comment was provided and Meeting Adjourned at 4 p.m.