

## Meeting Minutes – Thursday, November 21<sup>st</sup> 2013 (8:00-10:00)

---

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

### **TAP Members Present:**

Norm Alerta  
Jonathan Dings  
Carol Eaton  
Jill Fellman  
Jacqueline Law  
Joy Perry

### **Audience:**

Dominic Carochi  
Grant Guyer  
Heather MacGillivray  
Donna Neil  
Sean Taylor  
\*Others in attendance but didn't self-identify

### **CDE Representatives:**

Elliot Asp  
Dan Jorgensen  
Alyssa Pearson  
Lisa Steffen

### **Welcome & Minutes Approval**

(Dan Jorgensen/Jonathan Dings)

- The on-line meeting was held via Adobe Connect and hosted from Room 103, 201 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, Colorado. The TAP was convened at 8:05 a.m. and a roll call of members and guests was taken.
- Jonathan presented the October 11<sup>th</sup> 2013 minutes for adoption. Joy Perry made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, Jill Fellman seconded, and all TAP members were in favor, no one opposed.

### **CGM for Teacher Evaluations: Report Update and Feedback**

(Dan Jorgensen)

- Dan provided an update on the Center for Assessment CGM report that the TAP previously discussed. The report will have a delayed release in order for it to be further refined and expanded upon. The report will be shared with the TAP at a future meeting.
- The “CGM and Educator Effectiveness: TAP Implementation Recommendations” report was derived from the May 23<sup>rd</sup> 2013 TAP meeting minutes. The purpose of the report was to provide an immediate and accessible source of information based on the TAPs input to the field as they develop their own analytic approach. The TAP discussed each section of the report and suggested a number of revisions. The revisions will be made by Dan in consultation with Jonathan. Once the document is revised it will be shared with TAP members to allow for additional feedback before being disseminated to the field.

### Using SPF for Educator Evaluations: Discussion and Feedback

(Alyssa Pearson/Dan Jorgensen)

- Alyssa shared the “Using SPF for Educator Evaluations” draft guidance document and requested feedback to a few questions from the TAP. The questions largely concerned the inclusion/exclusion of specific statements. She framed the challenge of creating a document that’s not perceived as prescriptive while containing sufficient detail to support districts that choose to use the document. A number of TAP members emphasized that the inclusion of “guidance document” within its title helps to clarify its purpose. A number of TAP members expressed concerns with the use of the overall ratings. It was also mentioned that a technical study to numerically define small schools will also likely be conducted by the Center for Assessment. In addition, more guidance regarding student learning objectives will likely be prepared for the field in the future.
- A final recommendation, suggested reorganizing the document to start with the broadest possible data “overall rating” challenges and then get finer grained- individual indicators, sub-indicators, and finally just the MGP.

### READ ACT Draft Rules/ AEC in DPF Draft Rules

(Alyssa Pearson)

- Alyssa shared sections of the draft board rules concerning the READ Act and the AEC in the DPF. In regards to the READ Act, she started by informing the group that the literacy office is suggesting that the results be excluded this year from the frameworks until the data is improved. The office would like to see more stable results and better predictive ability. In regards to the rules, language was suggested for a few sections, around both reporting and calculations for the performance indicators. The calculations will still be performed and made public. The TAP expressed support for waiting on the inclusion of this data until it is improved. The READ data will be examined further and provided during the January meeting.
- The draft rules related to the AEC in the DPF were shared. The overall feedback was that the rules are good and provide a considerable amount of leeway in practice. It was expressed that creating a flowchart for this process may be helpful at some point to help people better understand the appeal criteria.

### Public Comment/Action Items

Public, TAP Members

- Audience members were invited for comments. No one chose to address the TAP during this meeting.
- Jonathan raised the possibility of extending our January meeting time due to the possibility of a large number of agenda items. Dan requested that we plan on a 9-4 time frame with the caveat that the TAP will be notified if less time is required (i.e. as soon as the agenda is established).

**Meeting Adjourned at 10:00 a.m.**

**Winter Meeting Scheduled for Thursday, January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 9-4 (tentative time)**