



## Meeting Minutes – Thursday, August 6, 2015 (9:00-noon)

201 East Colfax, State Boardroom Denver, Colorado

---

### **TAP Members:**

Dwayne Schmitz  
Jacqueline Law  
Norman Alerta  
Jonathan Dings  
Grant Guyer  
Joy Perry (call-in)

### **Audience:**

Dave Bahna (AWG Member, Adams 12)  
Connie Bowman (Littleton Public Schools)  
John Cumming (JEFFCO Schools, call-in)  
Elena Diaz-Bilello (CADRE, CU-Boulder)  
Heather MacGillivray (JEFFCO Schools, call-in)  
Patti Turner (Littleton Public Schools)

### **CDE Representatives:**

Marie Huchton  
Jessica Knevals  
Dan Jorgensen  
Alyssa Pearson  
Josh Perdue  
Kelly Stritzinger

### **Welcome, Minutes Approval & Vice-Chair Selection**

Norman Alerta/Dan Jorgensen

- The meeting was held in the State Boardroom at 201 East Colfax Avenue and was called to order at 9:07.
- Norman Alerta, new TAP chair, welcomed members back for the 2015-2016 school year. The May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes were briefly discussed and unanimously adopted. The selection of a vice-chair was tabled for discussion during the scheduled break time.
- Dan Jorgensen welcomed everyone on behalf of CDE. He briefly detailed the purpose of the TAP. Specifically, the TAP exists to provide non-binding recommendations to CDE regarding technical issues primarily surrounding the Colorado Growth Model and the state Accountability System. The group is not involved with making decisions related to data privacy policy. The meeting, while open to the public, reserves public comment at the end of each meeting. The TAP has always appreciated feedback and has made this time available to hear from non-panel meeting attendees that wish to speak.

### **Impact of Parent Refusal on Achievement and Growth Results**

Marie Huchton/Josh Perdue

- Marie Huchton provided an overview of an analysis that examined the impact of assessment opt-outs based on multiple analytic scenarios including variable sample size and performance levels.
- Based on statistical models, once you fall to 65% of the original population, the derived sample tends to no longer be representative. Additional analysis involved examination of the performance levels of students that had opted out on CMAS Science and Social Studies at the elementary and middle school levels. The analysis revealed the tendency for lower performing students to be over represented in opt-out rates. Future analysis will involve examination of opt-out rates within each demographic category and for the PARCC data, when available.



## **Framework Bonus Points (READ)**

Josh Perdue

- Josh Perdue presented an overview of statutory requirements related to awarding additional credit toward accreditation based on READ Act results. TAP members asked if this is to be a bonus or if the points will contribute to the denominator? The statutory interpretation is that it is a bonus and will not be applied to the denominator.
- The group expressed the desire to keep the ‘bonus’ very small and also ensure that schools or districts are not penalized. An incentive may already exist to identify SRD students for extra funding. In addition, we have challenges with the use of different tests in which their meaning may shift over time. The TAP encouraged a study of how the assessments are aligned to each other and academic standards before the application of cut points.
- The question was asked, can we protect against over-identification of SRDs? The link between funding and identification makes this potentially problematic. One recommendation was to explore the calculation of the bonus based on how far students are from the cut point. The expressed goal is to incentivize correct SRD identification.
- One challenge with this work is the assignment of responsibility (thus awarding of point) to districts for performance improvement or declines. The question was asked, does the school that identifies the student get credit for improvement if the student moves schools? A possible point of consideration included using the request to reconsider process to provide additional consideration to districts that don’t receive credit. A challenge would be that the original district that identified the SRD wouldn’t necessarily have a way to know if the student improved. Thus, it could be required that the credit be awarded within a year of identification of SRD status. It’s also possible that credit could be provided retroactively if the district both implements the READ plan and achieves adequate student improvement.
- The TAP Chair requested that the TAP further think about different ideas/possibilities for consideration at the next meeting.

## **AEC Accountability Work Group/HB15-1130**

Jessica Knevals

- Jessica Knevals provided an overview of the newly comprised Alternative Education Campus Accountability Work Group (see attached slides). The charge of the group is to provide recommendations to the commissioner, the education committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and State Board of Education regarding performance indicators for the next iteration of the Alternative Education Campus School Performance Framework (AEC SPF) for release in fall of 2016.
- The AEC AWG will next meet monthly through December. CDE will receive recommendations from the workgroup at that time and bring them back to the Technical Advisory Panel for discussion.

## **PWR – AWG Recommendations & TAP Feedback**

Dan Jorgensen

- Dan Jorgensen provided a brief overview of the recommendations made by the AWG Post-Secondary & Workforce Readiness subgroup.



- HB15-1170 creates an additional PWR sub indicator that captures matriculation of high school graduates into CTE, community college or four year institution during the fall term following graduation.
- AWG recommendations include the use of completion rates, inclusion of ACT scores by content area (if ACT is selected as the 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment) benchmarked to college readiness standards, and the inclusion of no additional measures during high school enrollment at this time (e.g. IB or AP participation).
- HB15-1170 doesn't address what happens while students are in high school – they can be enrolled in some programs before graduation. We are not yet certain how and/or if this will be included within calculations. CDE anticipates having preliminary data available for discussion at the October TAP meeting.
- Additional questions for consideration at the October meeting included:
  - What should the weighting be between the various sub-indicators included within the overall PWR indicator (i.e. the inclusion of a matriculation sub indicator)?
  - Should completion rates be utilized in place of graduation rates? What are the benefits? Limitations?
  - Should a super subgroup for disaggregated graduation/completion rate be included (i.e. for alignment to other possible changes)?
  - Should ACT (if the selected assessment) points be based on separate content areas? Which content areas? What would be the benchmarks? What are the advantages and limitations of this approach?
  - What are the impacts and limitations of the data that will be utilized to fulfill the 1170 requirements?

### **Break & Vice-Chair Selection**

- The TAP recessed for five minutes. Once the group reconvened, the selection of vice-chair for the 2015-2016 year occurred. The TAP chair recommended Dwayne Schmitz to serve in this role; Dwayne accepted the nomination. The chair motioned to appoint Dwayne as the Vice-Chair, Jonathan Dings seconded, and the TAP members unanimously approved his appointment.

### **AWG Design Sub-Group Recommendations**

Elena Diaz-Bilello

- Elena Diaz-Bilello recently transitioned from Center for Assessment to CADRE in CU Boulder. She is supporting AWG work and facilitating the Design Principle work group. She provided background information (see attached slides) and then walked thru a handout to obtain specific feedback concerning AWG recommendations. She pointed out the need for TAP feedback as limitations exist in the AWGs ability to provide technical input. The goal will be to further partner with volunteers from the AWG and TAP to provide more nuanced technical feedback.
- The AWG design group created a table to outline their recommendations (separate document). The AWG needs input mostly on the orange items. Some recommendations are for a 3.0 model of SPF, not 2.0 (2016 release). The group was given time to review the document following an explanation of content. General comments included improving specificity of terms; for example, define performance gaps and post-secondary success. The addition of contextual information was seen as a positive. It was presented that districts priorities should be recognized. CDE representatives expressed that technical capacity at times can be limited to larger districts. Thus, it's difficult to favor a system that allow for highly contextualized approaches. Similarly, CDE may not have the capacity to support a highly differentiated approach to Accountability. It was discussed that more information also needs to be obtained from the AWG concerning what they mean by valuing improvement over time.



- Prior points of consideration were raised by TAP members in attendance. This included, (1) ideally the ability to access various percentages of points on rubrics would not be impacted by district size. It's uncertain how this would be accomplished; (2) keeping growth and achievement measures separated; and (3) keeping subgroups separated, even if not by points.
- The group agreed to remove the blue question on page two. Three other blue items were also discussed.
  - #7. Are there additional factors to determine who is accredited with distinction?
    - Points of consideration included taking into account federal and state legislative requirements. Also, it was pointed out that its value depends on if it tells us anything useful about how schools are best at serving students. It was pointed out as being important to recognize the connection between some of these schools and the socioeconomic status of students served with some uncertainty existing about creating additional incentives for these schools.
  - #9. Should READ act data be included?
    - Most AWG members felt like READ Act data doesn't belong in frameworks, maybe in request to reconsider.
    - TAP concerns were raised about too much focus on grades four and five at the elementary level. Also, the inclusion of READ data can create undesired incentives. It is already within the UIP process so was deemed better to be addressed there than in the Accountability framework. This fits with TAP advice to give READ as few points as possible within a bonus structure. The idea of a 'check-box' was discussed but concerns were raised about a negative connotation.
  - #11. Differentiated cycles for accountability? For example, highly effective schools only evaluated every two years
    - This was mentioned during the meeting but no specific feedback was provided.
- Volunteers were requested to participate in a separate workgroup comprised of a few AWG and TAP members. This group would work between the two groups. It is anticipated they will meet two times (full-day) within the October/November time frame. Both Dwayne and Jonathan expressed interest in participating in this group.

## Public Comments & Action Items

Norman Alerta/Dan Jorgensen

- The opportunity for public comment was provided with no attendees choosing to speak. The next TAP meeting was announced as being scheduled for October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 9:00-3:00 in the state board room.

**Meeting Adjourned at noon**