

Meeting Minutes – Friday, October 11th 2013 (9:00-noon)

Colorado Department of Education, 201 E. Colfax Ave, Denver, CO

TAP Members Present:

Linda Barker
Jonathan Dings
Carol Eaton
Jill Fellman
Jacqueline Law
Joy Perry
Dwayne Schmitz

Audience:

Randy DeHoff
Brian Fuller
Grant Guyer
Jackie Kapushion
Marcellus Lewis
Sheri Mitchell
Michael O'Moreeadagh

CDE Representatives:

Elliot Asp
Marie Huchton
Dan Jorgensen
Alyssa Pearson
Josh Perdue
Lisa Steffen

Welcome & Minutes Approval

(Dan Jorgensen/Jonathan Dings)

- Jill Fellman was introduced as a new TAP member and CASB representative. She has a background in data and currently serves as a Jefferson County school board member. Randy Black was thanked for serving as the CASB representative on the TAP during the past year. Dan also provided a quick overview of the work of the TAP and thanked everyone for participating in the work. Also, he informed the TAP about the new TAP website: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/tap>.
- A discussion occurred regarding the handling of meeting minutes. For the last set of meeting minutes, some items were removed that CDE requested to have added back in. Jonathan expressed concern about the inclusion as he believed they detracted from the summary position statements that were included. Alyssa voiced the need for more detailed information/minutes for our CDE work. Dan suggested that, when necessary, we have one set of internal, detailed notes, and have an abbreviated summary of decisions/minutes to be posted on the website/publically. Jonathan expressed the need for caution when our documents say, "the TAP said this was OK". TAP would like to remove the bullet discussion under CELA to ACCESS transition within the posted minutes. CDE agreed that this was a good idea for the posted minutes.
 - Jonathan made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, Dwayne seconded, and all TAP members were in favor, no one opposed.

Impact of AEC's on Performance Frameworks

(Alyssa Pearson)

CDE requested feedback from the TAP regarding appeals to allow for the removal of AECs from DPF calculations, per HB 13-217. CDE was unable to share impact data at the time of the meeting, as requests were still in progress. Impact data will be shared with the TAP at the next meeting.

TAP Recommendation:

- Based on technical and practical considerations related to accountability, TAP discourages CDE from pursuing the CDE proposal to allow removal of AECs from DPF calculations to support an appeal only if the AEC campus is in performance. It was expressed that the proposal sets an inappropriately high bar for permitting CDE to consider the various sources of evidence indicating that a district is deserving of a rating higher than Turnaround or Priority Improvement, and has predictable negative consequences for Colorado's accountability system.

Technical Concerns Expressed by the TAP:

- First, cut point setting for AEC School Performance Frameworks did not appropriately take into account differences in types of AECs, with the result that schools serving dropouts are treated as equivalent to special education centers at the same time as there are clearly observable differences in attendance and graduation outcomes. Second, specific decisions in AEC SPF scoring procedures, such as requiring 90% of students to make year-to-year growth to standard for a school to be rated as Exceeds for growth, were made without a defensible technical rationale. Third, AEC SPF cut points and standards were never validated against a high stakes district consequence such as loss of ability to appeal. Fourth, selection of the Performance level may be a catch 22 in that few districts performing near a Turnaround or Priority Improvement level will have their scores sufficiently elevated by removal of scores from an AEC scoring at the Performance level.

Practical Considerations Related to Accountability expressed by the TAP:

- First, it may be considered a mistake to set a high bar and a hard and fast rule for conditions under which appeals will be considered, as this does not allow individual district and school circumstances to be considered in efforts to come to the most appropriate plan type. Second, placing tight restrictions on district accountability on the basis of AECs not making the highest level of performance may serve to ignore the presence of obvious policy levers for improving the performance of all AECs (e.g., annual approval by CDE of district/AEC agreed upon selection of measures) and for lower performing AEC's in particular (consequences associated with Turnaround and Priority Improvement status, and CDE's ability to require that district consolidated grant plans include services to certain AEC's performing at these levels). Third, the selection of the AEC Performance level rather than the Improvement level appears to be entirely inconsistent with the lack of sanctions associated with the Improvement level for any school. Fourth, undifferentiated application of any set level of AEC performance appears to wholly overlook the possibility for substantial improvement by school (from the low end of Turnaround to the upper range of Priority improvement in a single year, for example) or the possibility of relatively high performance or improvement by several AECs within a district where there exists a single AEC with a lower rating. Fifth, if the AEC that is not performing at CDE's criterion level happens to be a charter school, application of severe consequences to a district solely on that basis may not honor the independent charter school board's authority, as it sets up a district incentive to usurp independent charter board responsibility for school improvement that is particularly untenable when the AEC attains an otherwise consequence-free rating such as Improvement.

Recommended Approach:

- CDE is advised by the TAP to conduct specific analyses and make detailed, evidence-based arguments to refute or substantiate each of the Technical Concerns and Practical Considerations Related to Accountability enumerated above. CDE is advised to construct a flow chart in lieu of a hard-and-fast standard that all AEC's must perform at the highest level for a district to even be eligible for consideration for an appeal. In such a flow chart, a preponderance of AEC ratings at the Performance or Improvement level might lead to immediate eligibility for a district to file an appeal, whereas a preponderance of AEC ratings of Priority Improvement would require additional demonstration of growth towards a trajectory of reaching Improvement for the district to be eligible for appeal. A preponderance of Turnaround ratings would preclude district eligibility. CDE's flow chart might also consider charter status so as to honor the authority of charter school boards and minimize the incentives for districts to usurp charter responsibility.

READ Act Inclusion in Performance Frameworks

Marie Huchton/Alyssa Pearson

READ ACT Law requires inclusion of 3rd and 4th grade TCAP achievement data for students formerly identified with a significant reading deficiency in the performance frameworks, for additional credit. Per CDE, it will be included within the achievement indicator section. The TAP is being asked to provide feedback concerning the amount of additional credit to be provided and the method for determining the awarded points. CDE presented preliminary analysis with the caveat that data quality concerns currently exist. Concerns were also raised with comparability of assessments. It was pointed out that significant reading deficiencies were much more likely to be identified for IEP and ELL students. A request was made for additional feedback concerning these groups and if they should be excluded. Also, it was noted that we currently have about half of schools that may be eligible for this sub-indicator next year.

TAP Recommendation:

- The TAP recommended the additional points to be awarded be a half of point or one point. The selected amount should be included within the numerator of the calculations. A reduced amount was suggested due to the signaling impact to districts while not serving to encourage the 'gaming' of the system.

CGM for Teacher Evaluations

Dan Jorgensen/Marie Huchton

The TAP was requested by CDE to provide feedback regarding the draft Colorado Growth Model for Educator Effectiveness report. A decision was reached to hold a supplemental meeting in November for further discussion of the report. Dan will send out Doodle Poll to determine the best time for the majority of the TAP members. The meeting will be via the phone (with an in-person attendance option). Also, feedback was requested concerning the use of the SPF in Teacher Evaluations document. The draft document will be sent to the TAP for discussion at the November *ad hoc* meeting.

- A concern was raised about releasing iterative guidance into the field as it creates confusion. It was also mentioned by TAP members that the release of these reports is not pressing as most districts have already made decisions for the current year.

TAP Recommendations/Feedback concerning each section of the report:

- *Section 1: The State's Model Use of the CGM*
 - A preference to see "taking into account the advice of the TAP". Don't attribute this document directly to the TAP.
 - A concern with cut-points being aligned with SPF cuts was raised, suggesting low 40's high 30s for meets as a typical teacher. It was pointed out that this is discussed as unresolved later in the document. It was recommended that we view percentile ranks/distribution seen in schools to soften cut points. Currently CDE doesn't have enough data for such determinations.
 - It was asked where this sentence refers to for reporting, "the same set of cut points will also be used to report school level results attributed to all teachers in pilot districts and other districts opting to use the state model during the last pilot year." Page one
 - CDE to follow up
- *Section 2: Using the CGM at the teacher/classroom level*
 - A concern was expressed that Median Growth Percentile is the aggregate measure that should/could be used, as CGM is not the same as MGP.
 - "Year to year results using pooled MGP data" table is not year to year, but 3 year to 3 year data.
 - It should be recognized that the higher correlation is likely due to overlap of aggregated data in 3-year. This affects the table results.
 - It is believed that the 3 year data is not informative to teachers, even if N count is affected.
- *Section 3: Confidence Intervals section*
 - Concern of overall lack of context. For example, table one should include a key, counts and categories. Also, the source of the data should be identified and permissions should be acknowledged.
 - It was pointed out that we are making inference from a descriptive statistic- could we use a reliability estimate for inclusion instead of a confidence interval. Alyssa (CDE) requested Dwayne to draft various options.
- *Section 4: Setting Cut Points to Classify Levels of Growth*
 - "Classifying ranges of MGP values into levels of growth also serves to stabilize performance outcomes." Jonathan concerned about classifying ranges- that it may cover up unreliability, and this should be shared in the paper for context.
 - Requested clarification concerning the formula for standard error within the paper? IQR/rootN? Damian's boot-strapping algorithm?

Science & Social Studies Inclusion in Frameworks

Alyssa Pearson/Elliott Asp

CDE requested TAP feedback concerning the inclusion of science and social student achievement and/or participation results in the performance frameworks during the fall of next year. Per CDE, the question of including the assessment results or including participation only is related to the late release of the frameworks (for a small amount of data), the transition to the new on-line assessments and the fact that high school data will not be available. CDE expressed that they have largely received support from the field with the use of participation only.

TAP Recommendations:

- Some TAP members initially expressed concerns with a participation only approach. It was noted that the SPF will be useless for setting targets this year as it will be based on historical tests and content areas that are not well aligned and will have no bearing on PARCC. In effect, if there is a year for us to delay its release, this would be the year. It was asked why participation only this year, when for PARCC we would include everything, thus establishing precedent. CDE replied that the administration of these particular tests reflect the first time with statewide online testing so establishing the administration process is the focus.
- If CDE decides to include participation only in the upcoming year frameworks, it is recommended that the request to reconsider process include an opportunity for appeal by including social studies and science performance data. A possible way to include social studies and science performance before performance levels are set is to base calculations upon scale score means, such as in the manner of ACT scores.

Public Comment/Action Items

Public, TAP Members

Audience members were invited for comment:

- Randy DeHoff, introduced himself, he previously served on the state board and is currently the director of GOAL Academy the largest AEC in the state. He encouraged CDE and the TAP to keep having discussions with the AEC coalition. He said, GOAL has significant impacts on Accountability and he wants experts from AEC community to be involved in the decision-making process.
- Brian Fuller, from Mapleton Public Schools, wants a broader scope for AEC reviews; a narrow scope will not facilitate good reviews. He believes it's important that districts aren't dis-incentivized from having AECs.

Meeting Adjourned at noon

Ad hoc TAP meeting to occur in November, date to be determined

Winter Meeting Scheduled for Thursday, January 23rd, 9-noon