



Meeting Minutes – Thursday, October 22, 2015 (9:00 am-3:00 pm)

201 East Colfax, State Boardroom Denver, Colorado

TAP Members:

Dwayne Schmitz
Carol Eaton
Norman Alerta (call-in)
Jonathan Dings
Grant Guyer
Joy Perry (call-in)
Linda Barker

Audience:

Val Flores (State Board of Education)
Paul Medina (call-in)
Lauren Kaiser (call-in)
Michelle Halgin (call-in)
Marty Lamansky (call-in)

CDE Representatives:

Marie Huchton
Jessica Knevals
Dan Jorgensen
Alyssa Pearson
Josh Perdue
Kelly Stritzinger
Elena Diaz-Billelo (CADRE)
Randy Black

Welcome, Minutes Approval

Norman Alerta/Dan Jorgensen

- The meeting was held in the State Boardroom at 201 East Colfax Avenue and was called to order at 9:10.
- Dwayne Schmitz, vice-chair welcomed members back for our meeting. The prior meeting minutes were adopted.

AEC SPF 2.0: AEC Comparisons

Marie Huchton/Carol Eaton

An overview of AEC work group activities involving comparison groups was discussed. In effect, the discussion concerned measuring impact of AECs compared to non-AECs. Three options were detailed:

- Option 1: include all AEC students/schools into single group.
- Option 2: limiting analysis by particular school types, by buckets of schools.
- Option 3: look at widespread, deep data collection

The various analytic approaches were discussed including: propensity score matching, student fixed effects, interrupted time series, and regression discontinuity designs.

The AEC workgroup will rank all options for consideration.



Suggestions from TAP included:

- Consider ranking based on decision trees when data is limited. It would incorporate vendor cuts adjusted for AEC.
- A technical committee could be formed for vetting of local measures.
- The use of z-scores as part of pre-post comparisons is a possibility. Also, can look at distribution of z-scores. What is the distribution of gains, standardized across the various measures to assess school performance?
- Examine a broad number of measures to best determine AEC effectiveness. It was mentioned that it would be good to have some sort of school quality review process due to the high variability of AEC's in programmatic offerings. It may be worth looking at all of the measures that are being utilized by AECs

PARCC Participation Specifications

Marie Huchton

- CDE shared preliminary information regarding the manner in which PARCC participation rates will be calculated.
 - The data files are increasingly complex so will require the application of a number of rules.
- We will likely have differences in participation rates reported for interpretation of scores versus that used for accountability. The department will work to minimize differences to avoid confusion at the district level.

Resuming the Accountability Clock

Alyssa Pearson

Per statute, CDE has to report at SMART act committee about whether accountability should resume during the fall of 2016. We are requesting feedback from the TAP concerning why they would want to resume? Why hold?

- It was pointed out that growth won't be highly impacted so achievement would just have to be weighted very low.
- It was asked, what should schools/districts be accountable for? It's worth considering that using tests scores beyond need and what other measures could be examined. Also, when high non-participation could we use data from other assessments in request to reconsider process.
- If we're going to push what high schools are doing we need to be able to show evidence in other ways how kids are performing.
- Educator effectiveness work at SLO levels would be good to roll up at the accountability level. As the SLOs are more meaningful. However, it was mentioned that the problem is comparability between systems.
- It was expressed that results should be shared even if 'pause'. In some districts, intervention is before the five year clock so may have less of an impact.
- If underpinning system is not sound then the clock should be paused.

Adequate Growth Definition & Framework Mock-Ups

Marie Huchton/Josh Perdue/Alyssa Pearson

- Per CDE, growth targets need to be ambitious but attainable per Federal requirements. For adequate growth, in some cases, we meet only one criteria or the other. More recently, it has been discussed if we need adequate growth in the frameworks at all. CDE interprets as the law as being at our discretion to include adequate growth. This makes for a four-quadrant approach. During spring 2016 we won't have adequate growth available anyway.
- The challenge with AGP is it sets different targets. For the new iteration of SPF it is desirable to have everyone starting at the same point. AGP is also a hassle for goal writing as it's not an appropriate focus.
- The framework mock-ups were created with assumption that adequate growth would be removed. It includes disaggregated achievement results.
- Josh Perdue from CDE shared PowerPoint and methodology.



- It was expressed that on-track measures are extremely important to be sure appropriately reflect growth. It was asked, could we think of on-track as being a PWR measure.
- Could set cut points and cut scores for students below proficiency cut. Split out with those above.
- Advantage of getting rid of adequate growth is especially true for PARCC data where performance may be very low. Adequate growth shouldn't be included as it creates incongruence between expectations for students, not appropriate for accountability system.
- Exited IEPs should be reflected to show success (like we do for exited ELL). At DPS, view ELL and IEP differently as the target is to move students from groups, not really historically disadvantaged.

PWR Update, Technical Questions, PWR Mock-Ups

Dan Jorgensen

- CDE provided a short overview of Accountability Work Group recommendations concerning the PWR indicator.
- The suggested changes include:
 - Include the 11th grade college entrance assessment results by content area.
 - Utilize completion rates as opposed to graduation rates.
 - Include an 'aggregated sub-group' for disaggregated completion rates.
 - 'In school' measures were discussed but not deemed feasible at this time.
- HB15-1170 was discussed; points will be assigned based on numbers of high school graduates who enroll in CTE, community college, or 4-year institution of higher education.
- The group was informed that they would be shared a FAQ to provide feedback concerning methodology.

TAP Feedback on AWG Design Group Items

Marie Huchton

- CDE requested feedback concerning a number of design issues. Key discussion points included, addressing indicators with missing data; also, should cut-points be reset? If so, should the process continue to be normative or criterion-referenced?
- **Indicators with missing data:** If missing data, it was expressed, that you would still give opportunity to earn points at least through the Request to reconsider process. You shouldn't take something completely off the table if don't reach minimum threshold.
- **The TAP expressed that it was a challenge to know how to shift weighting based on missing data.**
 - This difficulty is uncertainty related to the validity of growth estimates, also, we don't know if we have growth from 10th to 11th grade. It was expressed that a two to one ratio of growth to achievement was preferred for elementary. For HS, it was less certain dependent on data. It was expressed that PWR indicator is the mission so should be valued while recognizing how it may be biased to more affluent districts. It was expressed that PWR weight should be the same at the high school and district levels. This is a priority area and represents the finish line for students.
- **Should cuts be reset? If so, should the process continue to be normative or criterion-referenced?**

The ability to appropriately classify turnaround from other schools was questioned. Cluster analysis was recommended to identify groups and look for shared attributes. An expressed concern was good work is occurring at PITA schools that are not being recognized. The factors impacting these schools linked to the outcomes that are addressed should be examined. No firm decision was reached, additional analysis was requested.
- **Alignment between district and school ratings absent because of alignment of cut points.**

Alternate analysis with confidence interval approach that was demonstrated by CDE isn't preferred. The various criteria applied between districts will create more issues especially with messaging. Alternatively, create a decision rule to reconcile the two cuts while not necessarily being a mathematically based approach. Examine how many cases fall into this category.



AWG Design Group Items

Elena Diaz-Bilello

- Two items were raised for discussion. These items will not necessarily be part of the 2016 framework. First, the AWG would like for CDE to consider alternative pathways for recognizing ‘distinct’ schools and districts. Second, the possibility for utilization of a screening approach. This would provide for an alternate evaluation process to impact ratings.
- The AWG said they were interested in exploring a graduated approach to inform decisions that include: evaluating schools/districts without growth and with sparse data; Applying this process, as an automatic approach, for priority improvement and turnaround schools.
- CDE requested volunteers to help support work related to these two questions. Also, they would like participants that could help look at the data to better inform the selected choices for both issues.
- Related questions on the distinction issue to be addressed include:
 1. Should the ‘distinction’ category remain and if yes, for what purpose does it serve (other than fulfilling a federal requirement)?
 2. Should this distinction category apply to schools or just districts?
 - a. Hard to know without understanding how it’s calculated, for example, is just related to the community served. A better approach would be linked to quality of work. Want to avoid just recognizing those that don’t serve people of poverty or with challenges. Also, AWG recommended that it’s not application based process.
 3. If additional categories or pathways are desired, what are the TAPs initial thoughts on which pathways or categories should be explored?
 - a. Dwayne Schmitz agreed to support analytics in the spring.
- In regards to the possible ‘screening’ approach, CDE agreed to send out the PowerPoint to the TAP for feedback.

Public Comments, Action Items & Adjourn

Norman Alerta/Dan Jorgensen

- The opportunity for public comment was provided with no attendees choosing to speak. The winter and spring TAP meetings will be scheduled by use of a Doodle Poll.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 p.m.