



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO

June 8, 2016, SPDF Weightings, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 8, 2016, the  
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

Steven Durham (R), Chairman  
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman  
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)  
Jane Goff (D)  
Pam Mazanec (R)  
Joyce Rankin (R)  
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The State Board will try  
2 and come back to order here, please.

3 (Pause)

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. (Gavel banging)  
5 Okay. A lot of work left. All right, let's see. Board  
6 Members, if we can all return to the dais here. It's not  
7 really dais here.

8 (Pause)

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Okay. All  
10 right. Commissioner, if you'd like to introduce this  
11 section. It's one we haven't heard anything about or haven't  
12 had any commentary. So we could just treat it to kind of  
13 this information item and proceed and, Dr. Anthes.

14 MS. ANTHERS: Mr. Chair, thank you. Yes, I'll  
15 just turn this directly over to our -- Ms. Pearson and Ms.  
16 Hutcheson. Thank you.

17 MS. PEARSON: Okay. As the Chair said, this  
18 is nothing you all have heard anything about feedback on,  
19 excuse me. So, today we're going to talk about a handful of  
20 topics that are pretty key to --

21 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me. Excuse me, Allyson.  
22 They're telling us in the audience they can't hear, again.

23 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Can't. You -- you have to  
25 get very close.



1 MS. PEARSON: Thank you. Okay. It can be  
2 like, we need a mirror in the back wall.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, I'm getting the hand  
4 signal.

5 MS. PEARSON: Thank you. I look to you, Pam.  
6 Okay. So we want to talk about quite a few decisions that we  
7 need to make around the school district performance  
8 frameworks, in order to be able to release the 2016  
9 frameworks next fall. So, we have been doing -- oh were did  
10 that go -- okay -- we've been getting a lot of stakeholder  
11 feedback around those informational reports we released at  
12 the beginning of May to schools and districts. So we want to  
13 share some of the feedback we've been getting on that, how  
14 that's kind of informed any further conversation. And then  
15 what we need from you all today is a recommendation around  
16 three things. And I forgot, we made you a little note  
17 catcher, I printed really small so I'm passing it. So feel  
18 free to use it if it's helpful, if it's not helpful because  
19 it's so tiny just you can ignore us.

20 We were just trying to structure out, because  
21 there's three main recommendations or three recommendations  
22 we need from you all today. The first, we figured we just  
23 dive in on the -- the -- the most difficult topic to talk  
24 about or to work through is the combined subgroup. So we'll  
25 talk through that and give you kind of the grounding of the



1 background on that. And then, the latest developments around  
2 that work and then some criteria for making a decision. And  
3 we'll also need a recommendation from you all on the  
4 performance indicator -- indicator weightings, so how much  
5 achievement, growth and Postsecondary Workforce Readiness  
6 should be weighed.

7                   And we'll walk through that. We'd had that  
8 conversation quite a few months already. And we'll summarize  
9 where we've heard from you all where you're at. And then  
10 finally, we need recommendation on the distribution of the  
11 final performance plan type ratings. And again we've talked  
12 about that quite a bit. So you'll see on those little note  
13 catchers, there's this three main areas that we need  
14 recommendations on today.

15                   But first, we want to just start just to  
16 share a little bit of the other information or -- or  
17 feedback we've received from stakeholders from those  
18 informational reports. We really know it's valuable for  
19 schools and districts when you see your own data in the  
20 framework. You see things in there that you don't see when  
21 you're just talking hypothetically. So we took that, having  
22 them provided with those information or populated report is  
23 a real, a good opportunity to get some feedback so we can  
24 learn some things before we go forward with our reports.



1 Susan Murray talked about before, we did an  
2 online survey, we conducted quite a few regional trainings  
3 and meetings around the State this last month to collect  
4 feedback to roll out and show people the changes and then  
5 collect feedback, and lots and lots of individual phone  
6 calls and emails back and forth with our district staff. We  
7 received approximately 100 feedback from about 100  
8 individuals, 27 on the online respondents. The majority of  
9 the feedback was really questions. It was really a good  
10 opportunity for us to learn about what new things on here,  
11 causing question, what all things were causing questions, so  
12 we can develop training materials for the fall. And so those  
13 will start coming out July, case in August. But it's a great  
14 opportunity for us to be able to better serve and meet the  
15 needs of our districts and schools.

16 In terms of the reports themselves, we kind  
17 of redesign, high-helped redesign the cover page of the  
18 reports. People liked it. They thought it was clear and  
19 concise liked the new layout. Some people were concerned  
20 about the loss of the growth gaps indicator, and that's  
21 really been moved in both -- actually all three of our major  
22 indicators now have disaggregation -- included in them. And  
23 so I think it's just going to be a training point to talk  
24 about where the different data has gone, and kind of do a  
25 crosswalk from before. And then we had questions related to



1 calculations of participation rate and the impact on  
2 calculation. So, people liked the new layout, it was really  
3 clear to understand how participation was on there, but  
4 there's just questions about all those impacts. So we're  
5 working through that.

6                   In terms of the achievement indicator, the  
7 feedback we got. We got some feedback of not to show the  
8 individual ratings for the individual groups, so we'll talk  
9 about that further because you know we're hearing things on  
10 either side. We got some questions about the use of mean  
11 score, and so again that's another training point to talk  
12 about. In terms of academic growth, we had lots of comments  
13 related to the importance of weighting grows heavier than  
14 achievements. So, we'll talk about that when we talk about  
15 the indicator weightings later. But just know that that's  
16 something we heard very loud and clearly. And then as you  
17 well know, there is a lot of feedback on the combined sub-  
18 group for points there. Mostly, district stakeholders  
19 express support for that and we've been hearing a lot of  
20 advocacy groups and other groups concerned about the use.

21                   And so that said, we're just going to jump  
22 into that topic. Now, so the way we want to structure this  
23 conversation today, is just to start with a little bit of  
24 grounding of where the recommendation came from, why we  
25 landed, where we landed in the spring reports, what happened



1 there. And then to talk about some updates. Because since  
2 those spring reports were -- were released, a few things  
3 have happened. ESSA proposed regulations have come out. And  
4 then we've heard -- had a convening of the different  
5 perspectives -- perspectives and had a conversation there.  
6 So we want to give you an update from those different  
7 events.

8                   And then we'll talk through recommendation  
9 and we'll talk about some criteria that we think might be  
10 helpful for you all. Again of course, you don't need to it  
11 and you're -- in making a recommendation but it just maybe  
12 some helpful ways to think about. And then what the  
13 different options are that we've seen right --- right now,  
14 okay. So in terms of grounding, I think you've heard a lot  
15 in public comment about the Accountability Work Group and  
16 we've talked about this in prior meetings. But the work  
17 group started convening last January made up of district and  
18 school staff, case, CASB, CEA, League of Charter Schools, and  
19 CSI. And we had small districts and large districts, and  
20 urban districts and sub-urban districts, and rural districts  
21 and districts with students that are really struggling in  
22 terms of academic performance, and districts with students  
23 that are excelling in academic performance.

24                   So we had wide representation there. That  
25 said, we did not have advocacy groups outside of those



1 groups that do advocate for children in their day to day  
2 lives. But we didn't have them at the table and that's  
3 something we are working on going forward. We will  
4 absolutely amend that Accountability Work Group and make  
5 sure we have these different perspectives at the table. We  
6 have important work to do with the ESSA State Plan  
7 Implementation, and so we want to make sure we have  
8 everybody in the room. So that was really important learning  
9 for us.

10                   But that Accountability Work Group spent time  
11 together at the beginning of the first few months we met,  
12 and really wanted to make sure we were grounded in a purpose  
13 statement. What it is -- what is it that we're trying to do  
14 with accountability as a State. Statute list everything  
15 possible that accountability could do. But we really wanted  
16 to narrow in terms of the recommendations coming from that  
17 work group, what that grounding was in terms of purpose. So  
18 this is the purpose statement, we've shared that -- it's  
19 been shared in lots of other places. But I think it's just  
20 helpful for you all to take a moment and look at, and just  
21 see this is -- this is the philosophical place people were  
22 coming from.

23                   Okay. So let me talk about what the -- the  
24 description of the combined subgroup. What that really was,  
25 what the recommendation coming out of the Accountability





1 Work Group -- Group was, and what was on those in spring  
2 informational reports. So in that, the performance  
3 frameworks will continue to report on the performance of  
4 individual subgroups. They're right there on the report and  
5 I'll show you a picture in a moment. For English learners,  
6 minority students, students eligible for free reduced price  
7 lunch, or students with IEPs. And that's how we've always  
8 disaggregated since 2010 on the State -- School Performance  
9 Frameworks.

10                   The points used to determine that overall  
11 rating at the very end when you roll it up are based on the  
12 use of the combined subgroup. That's how -- how the spring  
13 report came out and what the recommendation was. The  
14 combined subgroup would represent a distinct count of  
15 students falling into one or more of the individual groups.  
16 So, so much of the concern we have heard from educators over  
17 the years is of students counting multiple times. This would  
18 count students once, but then students in all the groups  
19 they're in would be included on the reporting.

20                   So this is what it looks like, and I just  
21 want to take a little bit because I think this is something  
22 that's been a little bit confusing for people. But this is  
23 comes from a spring report. What we were just -- what we  
24 just released. And so you'll see at the top, see if that  
25 works up there, but at the top this is so -- this is English



1 Language Arts, this is the achievement section. You have all  
2 students, just like we've always done in report, the  
3 performance of all students. We've got the count of  
4 students, their participation rate right there, because we  
5 think that's a really important information to have right  
6 next to the achievement data, knowing what some of our  
7 participation rates are, the mean scale score, the  
8 percentile rank, the points earned, and then the rating  
9 afterwards.

10                   So in this example, overall for English  
11 Language Arts, a meets rating was earned, okay. And then  
12 here, you'd have the combined subgroup. Again the same data,  
13 that count of students, participation rate, mean scale  
14 score, percentile rank, points earned, and the rating. Then  
15 after that, the performance of the individual groups is  
16 right there. Again count of students, participation rate,  
17 mean scale score, percentile rank, not the points earned but  
18 the color coded rating is right there, to be able to direct  
19 attention, okay. So that's what was on the spring reports  
20 and that's for achievement. Growth is proposed to be the  
21 exact same thing. We did not have growth data to populate  
22 for the spring reports because of the transition from TCAP  
23 to Park, but it would mere how achievement looks.

24                   MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me, Commissioner. I'm --



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, ma'am. Or rep -- I'm  
2 sorry, Ms. Mazanec.

3                   MS. MAZANEC: I just made you the  
4 commissioner, sorry. Can I ask a question though? This --  
5 this is information provided to the districts and schools,  
6 correct?

7                   MS. PEARSON: Yes. Uh-huh.

8                   MS. MAZANEC: Parents don't see this, the  
9 taxpayers don't see this, do they?

10                  MS. PEARSON: They -- they absolutely do.

11                  MS. MAZANEC: In this detail?

12                  MS. PEARSON: Yeah. So these reports are  
13 posted publicly once you all approve the district --  
14 accreditation ratings and the school plan types. They are  
15 all posted publicly on the website. We also have the data  
16 afterwards in a much easier and more accessible format for  
17 parents and the public to use than just these -- these come  
18 out in PDFs for an individual school and an individual  
19 district.

20                  MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

21                  MS. PEARSON: But it's all very public. We  
22 also do a flat data file. So like an Excel file that has  
23 every single data element in each of the reports for every  
24 school and every district that's available on our website.  
25 So that always easily -- so researchers or people who want



1 to analyze the data can get the -- file instead of going  
2 through the individual reports.

3                   So just to show you in 2014, this is what the  
4 previous frameworks looked like. The achievement section is  
5 up top. Sorry it's a little small. (Inaudible) little red  
6 dots all over the place. So the achievement section is up  
7 top. We did not disaggregate achievement from 2010 to 2014.  
8 That wasn't a part of the frameworks. Growth was reported,  
9 and then the academic growth gaps indicator was where we  
10 disaggregated growth. And again, growth was a little bit  
11 different because we had the adequate growth component.  
12 Whether or not that growth was enough for students who are  
13 not yet proficient or to maintain proficiency of students  
14 already were proficient.

15                   So that was kind of a component of how things  
16 were scored. But disaggregated achievement wasn't on there.  
17 So we looked at the impact of using the combined subgroup.  
18 It does a few things, it increases the number of schools  
19 that meet the minimum end, count required to be held  
20 accountable for disaggregated student groups. So you could  
21 go back and look at this report in the past. And for a lot  
22 of our smaller systems which are the majority of our systems  
23 in the state, they may not have met the minimum end count  
24 for free reduced lunch, English Learner, students with  
25 disabilities. Individually, when you do a combined group,



1 they may then meet the minimum end count. You've got an  
2 accountability in a way that you haven't had before. It's  
3 not a huge amount of schools but there are definitely 20 to  
4 60 schools depending on the content area and the grade span  
5 that have now are included in the system than previously.

6                   It also ensures a consistent way -- is  
7 assigned for students who are classified in more than one  
8 group. Which is a concern that we had heard from educators  
9 especially over the last six, seven, actually even longer  
10 than that because I heard it under the AYP System for all  
11 those years. And finally, it results in overall indicator  
12 ratings that are pretty consistent with ratings based on  
13 using the individual disaggregated groups. We looked at the  
14 data. There's a small percentage of schools that would have  
15 earn that does not meet rating that moved to approaching,  
16 and a small percent that more than now will earn meets, like  
17 one percentage point more. So there is a little bit of  
18 movement there. But it's not a tremendous change in -- in  
19 ratings that schools and districts are getting.

20                   So along with this both Accountability Work  
21 Group and CDE, I've been thinking about how do we ensure if  
22 -- if you go with a change like this, that attention isn't  
23 diverted. Because I think you heard a lot of that in the  
24 public comments in the letters, and that was an absolute  
25 concern for the Accountability Work Group and CDE. We never



1 wanted to make a change if it meant that the needs of  
2 students would be diminished in this process. So, some of  
3 the things that we know that we'll have in place if we go  
4 with this way is that, with unified improvement planning,  
5 that there's clarity around the data analysis and the  
6 strategies that they're looking at the individual  
7 disaggregated groups, okay.

8                   So where -- where we really see, somebody  
9 earlier said the assessment itself can't make change. You've  
10 got to lose the assessment results in order to see improved  
11 performance. It's the same thing with the accountability  
12 reports, right? With their information, it shines light.  
13 It's like a cholesterol test, it gives you information but  
14 it's actually see change as a result of that, people need to  
15 act and do something. And that's the Unified Improvement  
16 Planning Process where that happens. So in that process, the  
17 guidance is going to be really clear that look at your  
18 disaggregated groups of students.

19                   ESSA and Statute requires targeted  
20 identification of schools. And that's based on individual  
21 disaggregated groups that are consistently underperforming.  
22 So with ESSA implementation, we will be looking at another  
23 identification for schools. So a school may earn a  
24 performance plan through the State system. But if their  
25 English learners are struggling and meeting this -- whatever



1 we as a State define is consistently underperforming, they  
2 will have a performance plan and a targeted identification  
3 for EL's.

4                   And that's something we haven't had in the  
5 State before. But it really brings up that conversation, I  
6 think we've as a Board -- you all as a Board and with you  
7 have had those conversations about those higher performing  
8 districts that have smaller numbers of students that need,  
9 with high needs, that maybe English learners or students  
10 with disabilities, and how that sometimes gets lost in  
11 there. And so with that ESSA targeted identification really  
12 will help make sure that we don't lose attention on -- in  
13 systems where it's easy to kind of hide the performance of a  
14 small group of kids.

15                   And then finally with reporting. We're  
16 working to enhance the public reporting in terms of  
17 disaggregation and trends. We've talked a little bit with  
18 you all before about having a high-level more apparent  
19 public friendly report than what the school and district  
20 performance frameworks are. And then really building out  
21 that dish tool that we've shown you, that shows even more  
22 disaggregations, that shows the trend level data, so that  
23 data is really accessible and usable.

24                   As you know, with some of the data privacy  
25 concerns, we've had some challenges with getting some of



1 that data out in terms of a way that ensures data privacy  
2 for student results. And so we're working through that. We  
3 have some U.S. Department of Education staff that are helping  
4 us with the privacy rules. But with the accountability data  
5 using the mean scale score, we're able to put a lot more  
6 data out there and that's what we're really working to build  
7 so that the public, tax payers, researchers will have easy  
8 access to the data that does not violate student privacy,  
9 but can really dig in and understand what's going on in our  
10 systems.

11                   So since all of that there have been a few  
12 updates on what's happening. So on May 26, the U.S.  
13 Department of Education released proposed regulations around  
14 accountability, data reporting, and the consolidated state  
15 plan. And those are posted and we put the link there to  
16 where the proposed regulations are. There's a 60 day comment  
17 period right now. So comments are due by August 1.

18                   Pat Chapman will talk about this process more  
19 tomorrow with you and some of the things and the proposed  
20 regulations, but we really wanted to let you know or to  
21 discuss this section of the proposed regulations regarding,  
22 with regard to the combined group -- group. Because it's  
23 really specific in the proposed regs, the combined group  
24 will not be allowed. So that -- that came out we will not  
25 know about the proposed regulations and those being final





1 until sometime probably September or October. Because once  
2 public comment comes in U.S. Department of Education has to  
3 go through and address every single piece of public comment  
4 they got, and then make a determination if the regulations  
5 stay as they are or change.

6                   There are quite a few things in the proposed  
7 regulations that don't give states as much flexibility as  
8 was shared about the law passing and so I think there's  
9 gonna be a political process about this, so I don't know  
10 where things are going to land. If we wait for the proposed  
11 regs to be final for the school and district performance  
12 frameworks, we're gonna be months down the line, we can do  
13 it, but then all the work that you all need to do with the  
14 schools on the clock, with those schools that are hitting  
15 the end of year five that we need to probably start in  
16 December, January, I don't wanna wait too much longer than  
17 that, that will be bummed out and -- so there's just a  
18 ripple effect to it. It's an option but just there's  
19 consequences to doing that.

20                   So that's what we know about the proposed  
21 regulations right now. We've also had a lot of conversations  
22 in the -- the last month or since the last Board meeting. So  
23 we convened that. We have seen civil rights groups that had  
24 concerns about the combined group at the Board's request to  
25 have that convening together along with accountability work



1 group members and technical advisory panel members on May  
2 31. Our goal with that was really just to help ensure that  
3 there is understanding of the different perspectives from  
4 different people, to really help people also understand that  
5 everybody wants the same outcomes for kids and that we live  
6 different lives and so our perspectives are very different  
7 on how this policy plays out, because we have very different  
8 experiences in how we spend day to day trying to reach those  
9 schools for kids.

10 CDE staffs we're there to listen, we had  
11 Board members there and those of you who could attend we  
12 would really appreciate you being there because I think you  
13 can add a lot to this and what you've heard in the room. I  
14 don't think we got to go deep -- deep compromise or anything  
15 like that, but I think there is some dialogue and some  
16 conversation about it. Based on, I'm sorry, what we -- we  
17 had heard in the room, there's some root issues that came  
18 out of the conversation, there's a few different things. One  
19 was around the small in size, so the idea of using a  
20 combined group when you don't have enough students to report  
21 on an individual groups, that was something that were there  
22 was a lot of consensus about, that made sense to do.

23 I think everybody kind of said, yes. That  
24 increases accountability and increases transparency and  
25 reporting that makes sense to us. But then we get into root



1 issues around perception, and this is where people's  
2 experiences and perspectives lead to very different --  
3 perceptions of what's going on, and very valid perceptions  
4 of what's going on. So in terms of the combined group, there  
5 is a perception of fairness there, of why people want the  
6 combined group in terms of students counting only once. This  
7 has been something that I've heard. I've worked on Adequate  
8 Yearly Progress which was that accountability under No Child  
9 Left Behind since the first year of AYP, which was my entry  
10 into CDE, was with AYP.

11                   And since then I have heard just concerns and  
12 concerns and concerns about students counting multiple  
13 times. Districts, I feel -- feel this very deeply as a sense  
14 of fairness of what they're being held accountable for. And  
15 I think it's important to think about how those people being  
16 held accountable feel because they're the ones again,  
17 accountability only works if people take action as a result  
18 of it. And so there is something to that, at least I  
19 believe, to that need for those being held accountable to  
20 feel like they're being held accountable to something that  
21 they can impact, and that is fair to them. So I think that's  
22 one -- one perception around combined group.

23                   There's also a perception for schools and  
24 districts. And I think you all as a Board have heard this,  
25 around those serving high needs students that there was a



1 penalty for serving those high needs students. I think some  
2 of the appeals that we've gotten on accreditation ratings  
3 since those districts have communicated that perception or  
4 feeling of being penalized for having the students that they  
5 have. So again, that's just one -- one side of perception.  
6 Again, I think all people on that side feel very committed  
7 to wanting outcomes for students and we heard that loud and  
8 clear in the room on the 31st, but it's what it feels like  
9 in the process in terms of accountability.

10 In terms of those supporting the  
11 disaggregated groups, again I think there's a perception on  
12 feelings around fairness as well. Groups of students have  
13 different types of needs, that's very true. And even  
14 students within those individual groups have different types  
15 of needs. Not all English learners are the same, not all  
16 students with disabilities are the same, we see a wide range,  
17 but we know that English learners and student disabilities  
18 and students eligible for free reduced lunch and minority  
19 students do have very different needs. And so, that  
20 perception of pull -- pulling all those groups together is a  
21 challenging one.

22 The concern that individual groups need to be  
23 seen is something that we heard very loudly and clearly, and  
24 I think the accountability work group felt very committed to  
25 that as well. There's also this perception around directing



1 attention that people pay attention to the points. We heard  
2 that in the room that day, and I think that's a really  
3 important consideration to think about.

4 MS. ANTHERS: I'm sorry, say that again.  
5 People don't pay attention?

6 MS. PEARSON: That people -- they do pay  
7 attention to where the points are. So if you don't put  
8 points somewhere, there's a perception and a concern that  
9 you won't put the attention there, if you're not getting the  
10 points there. Does that make sense? Yeah. So even though  
11 that it's reported, if the point is there that that's a  
12 concern. And then again, the alignment with funding, if get  
13 funding students for all their different needs then the  
14 accountability should line with that. So these are just the  
15 different perceptions of fairness. It's just really  
16 interesting to me watching this and seeing it's so much  
17 about how people live day-to-day and their experiences with  
18 students and the work that they are doing.

19 So in terms of a recommendation, we all -- we  
20 need a recommendation from you all, we've put out a few  
21 things. Approach A would be to assign the framework points  
22 using the combined subgroup, but to report and rate the  
23 performance of the individual disaggregated groups, so like  
24 you saw in the spring reports. Approach B would be to assign  
25 points separately for each disaggregated group, and just do



1 that kind of like we used to do for growth but do it for  
2 achievement as well, go that way. Approach C we talked a bit  
3 about this -- at the work group is a kind of a hybrid using  
4 the disaggregated groups when a minimum end count is met,  
5 and we'd have to decide how many disaggregated groups would  
6 be enough to report on or if you didn't have enough then  
7 going to a combined group.

8                   We have some concerns not about doing that in  
9 the long run but in doing that in the short term in terms of  
10 our ability to really investigate and talk about impact with  
11 schools and districts, and with stakeholders too, but I  
12 think it's a pretty big change to go from the conversations  
13 that we've had to this and to really see what the impact is  
14 and how it plays out for different types of schools and  
15 districts. And then also just the programming time to make  
16 sure we get the rules all right and put together.

17                   So again, we could do that and may delay the  
18 frameworks so if we went that way, and I think we just  
19 really wanna make sure we spend some time with our educators  
20 to really understand before we went with approach C. But we  
21 think that probably would be a better one for future years,  
22 not for this year. So in thinking about this, because I've  
23 been thinking about this pretty constantly for the last  
24 month as I'm sure a lot of you have been too, what's some of  
25 the criteria we can use for decision making.



1                   So in talking with you all and talking with  
2 other stakeholders, one of the questions that's come up is  
3 what will best serve students? So that might be a way to  
4 help thinking about this decision. And I think the question  
5 about what will best serve students really will depend on  
6 what your theory of action is around school and district  
7 accountability. Where -- where do you believe school  
8 accountability really works? Do you believe it's the point  
9 to drive attention? Or do you believe that the educator buy-  
10 in and having that sense of fairness by those being held  
11 accountable is required for that continuous improvement? Or  
12 maybe you believe both of them, and then -- and then it's  
13 what do you do next? Which is kind of where I've landed.

14                   If we go with combined, and then we have to  
15 think about if we don't go with combined. If we go to --  
16 with combined, we really we've -- we've built into one of  
17 our contracts with external research organizations to really  
18 study the impact of this. I heard a comment about, that  
19 there is gonna be an impact on attention to the -- to an  
20 impact to the attention that different groups of students  
21 receive, if you went with combined, and I think I don't know  
22 that, there may be research done that's said that in other  
23 places, I don't know what will happen. Because I think  
24 there's a trade off like you might get more buy-in that  
25 might give more attention or it may not. But it -- if we



1 went with combined, that something we'd really wanna make  
2 sure we study as a department and find out what has the  
3 impact been so we can revisit it in a year or two years, if  
4 it's something that's allowable under ESSA to go forward  
5 with, so we'd actually learn that.

6 MS. FLORES: I have a question.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

8 MS. FLORES: Is it possible, may I ask a  
9 question at this point?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

11 MS. FLORES: If -- if it's because of 20  
12 districts on one side and 20 districts on another side,  
13 would it be -- would it be valuable to say to those  
14 districts where we're -- we're gonna disaggregate and -- but  
15 we know that it's better if we combine it so that you can  
16 get the benefit of that. Could we segregate it? Could we  
17 give districts the ability to have it for their own and not  
18 make it available to every other district? In other words,  
19 they know their -- their groups, that's the -- that's the  
20 second part, but disaggregated, but integrated for those  
21 districts where it does make a difference. I mean, it's  
22 kinda having it both ways.

23 MS. PEARSON: So I think kind of like that we  
24 got a letter from Superintendent Gdowski from Adams 12. And  
25 I think he was talking about running the data both ways as





1 combined and disaggregated and then giving the best of, is  
2 that what you're saying?

3 MS. FLORES: Right. You were saying that  
4 there may be like one percent of the school districts who  
5 would rate approaching if we combined it?

6 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

7 MS. FLORES: So if the data can do that and if  
8 it's true, then we should give them that, we know that  
9 ability. So -- but, and for the other group that, would it  
10 be negative for the other group, the other 20? No --

11 MS. PEARSON: I just doesn't change --

12 MS. FLORES: -- still the same?

13 MS. PEARSON: -- yeah.

14 MS. FLORES: Or I think we could -- unless  
15 other districts thought it, that was unfair. But I mean,  
16 truly if you, this -- this whole thing of this data is for -  
17 - seriously for large systems. And it's not for small  
18 systems and we should not penalize small systems just  
19 because of what, you know, this -- what the data is -- is --  
20 is -- is for. And it's for a very large -- large systems and  
21 not for small systems.

22 MS. PEARSON: And I -- I think --

23 MS. FLORES: And so we shouldn't pen --  
24 penalize small systems that this whole thing was meant for,  
25 it wasn't meant for them.



1 MS. PEARSON: I think -- I think that's a good  
2 point in terms of the role of disaggregation. I was thinking  
3 that during public comment earlier about disaggregation and  
4 -- is a way to look at kind of system functioning, right? We  
5 can see how our English Learner Program is doing, how our  
6 students with disabilities are doing. It's kind of like a  
7 big snapshot. It's when I talk to districts about the role,  
8 the performance frameworks in relationship to UIP.

9 The performance frameworks are kind of a  
10 super high level map and they give you some flags about  
11 places where you might be doing really well, and you may  
12 wanna dig to see why you're doing so well there are places  
13 you might be struggling in and dig in there to see why --  
14 see why you're struggling there. But it's super high level.  
15 It's not gonna direct individual instruction for kids, it  
16 can't, right? And you don't want it to, there's better  
17 information we have for individual students but it will tell  
18 us some system information. And when you're small, where you  
19 -- while we don't have the ability to disaggregate those  
20 systems usually have a better ability to be able to dig in  
21 and look at individual students. So there is a, you know,  
22 you got to think about the role of disaggregation, and all  
23 of these children and I think that's another part of theory  
24 of action and what will best serve students.



1                   And then in terms of another criteria around  
2 decision making, I think you could also look at what the  
3 state and federal requirements are. It's hard right now as  
4 we don't know where those federal requirements will land, we  
5 know where the U.S. Department of Ed is directing, and we  
6 don't know well -- where they'll land. State law requires --  
7 compliance with the federal requirements, then our state law  
8 doesn't say exactly like that but it says we will -- we will  
9 follow the federal requirements and how we do our  
10 disaggregation reporting. So what's hard is that we're kind  
11 of in a wait and see right now, or we could be in a wait and  
12 see. We could go with their proposed regs that's -- that  
13 will be up to you all, okay.

14                   So just kind of to recap the -- the approach  
15 A of the combined group that was based on the accountability  
16 work group and the technical advisory panel for longitudinal  
17 growths, their recommendations, which are definitely based  
18 more from an educator perspective, they're consistent with  
19 what went out in the spring informational report in schools  
20 and districts. There's additional accountability for schools  
21 and districts for those that are small that wouldn't have  
22 reporting at the individual group level. This transplants  
23 see through the reporting and the color coded ratings, but  
24 there are not points there. It relies on the UIP process for  
25 further attention on disaggregated groups and data analysis



1 and, then we've got that targeted identification role under  
2 ESSA.

3                   So in terms of approach B of using just  
4 disaggregated groups and not using the combined group, the  
5 points would be assigned to each specific disaggregated  
6 group if they are large enough, it values the unique needs  
7 of individual disaggregated groups and meres the funding.  
8 It's consistent with the previous performance frameworks. It  
9 would again work in tandem with UIP process for furthering  
10 the disaggregation and figuring out, you know, the  
11 implementation there, and it's aligned with the proposed  
12 regulations for ESSA. So then we --

13                   MS. FLORES: And then -- so if we do this, but  
14 not for those small groups that would be penalize. Could we  
15 compromise on that?

16                   MS. PEARSON: -- so let -- let's see if this  
17 gets out that this approach C, hybrid. So you'd use the  
18 disaggregated groups when they're large enough. Otherwise,  
19 you do a reported combined group. So then you'd get that  
20 additional school and district level accountability, and the  
21 disaggregated groups would be highlighted and assign points  
22 when it was possible to do that. We just have some concerns  
23 about that internally. Mary and I and our team trying to  
24 figure out how we pull this off and how it goes. We need  
25 some time to determine the criteria of how many



1 disaggregated groups would -- should be individual or how,  
2 if you will had one would that go to combine or would you  
3 stay at once. We need some time to look at that and really  
4 analyze the impact and talk with districts about how with  
5 this would go because there's going to be districts that get  
6 different systems there.

7                   And so, when there's already this perception  
8 that things aren't fair, because your kids are counted  
9 multiple times, especially for districts that tend to have  
10 all those disaggregated groups, for them to get the  
11 accountability at the individual group level. And then the  
12 smaller ones to get the accountability at the combined level  
13 and kids only count once. There may be at now -- it may  
14 create some issues for the districts within a child --  
15 within themselves of even greater sense of unfairness there  
16 in the system because this -- the rules are being applied  
17 evenly. I don't know, we haven't had time to really have  
18 that conversation with them. So we need to do that, we need  
19 time to program the change and do the validation of that, we  
20 don't want to put out reports that have incorrect data roll-  
21 ups in it. So that just take some time to do.

22                   It's a little bit more complicated to  
23 communicate and we need to give some more guidance on how to  
24 use it for improvement planning. So we would prefer not to  
25 do this for 2016. I think it could be a solution for 2017.



1 We can work it through our ESSA plan. I -- who knows what  
2 the USDE will end up on but I have a hard time believing  
3 that they wouldn't let us use a combined group if there  
4 weren't any other groups being reported already, because it  
5 just adds to accountability. So I think -- but I haven't,  
6 you know, we haven't vetted that with them and it will be a  
7 different administration and the Department of Ed at that  
8 point too. But we think there's a possibility here. I think  
9 we just think that we need a little bit more time to work  
10 that out and really look at the data and see how it plays  
11 out and talk with stakeholders about it. That said if you  
12 all wanna go that route, we can --

13 (Meeting adjourned)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and Notary, do hereby certify that the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set out.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT the proceedings of such were reported by me or under my supervision, later reduced to typewritten form under my supervision and control and that the foregoing pages are a full, true and correct transcription of the original notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of October, 2018.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright  
Kimberly C. McCright  
Certified Vendor and Notary Public  
  
Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC  
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165  
Houston, Texas 77058  
281.724.8600