

Meeting Minutes – Thursday, April 18th 2013 (9:00-12:05)

201 E. Colfax, State Board Room, Denver, CO

TAP Members Present:

Norman Alerta
Linda Barker
Randy Black
Jonathan Dings, PhD
Carol Eaton, PhD
Dwayne Schmitz, PhD

TAP Members Not in Attendance:

Jacqueline Law
Joy Perry

CDE Representatives:

Elliott Asp, PhD
Marie Huchton
Dan Jorgensen
Keith Owen, PhD
Alyssa Pearson
Jessica Knevals

Audience:

Aaron Diel, Adams 14
Grant Guyer, Denver Public Schools

Other Presenters:

Toby King, Ed Effectiveness Unit, CDE
Elena Diaz-Billelo, Center for Assessment

Welcome & Minutes Approval

- Susan Krebs and Marie Thurman have left the TAP. Dan Jorgensen, Norm Alerta and Randy Black (interim from CASB) have joined.
- Dan Jorgensen, from the Accountability & Data Analysis office is the new TAP organizer/facilitator.
 - If anyone knows of a good additional member, especially from a rural Colorado area, please feel free to provide your recommendation to Dan.
- Dan would like everyone to review the TAP rules of order before the next meeting.
- Dan has recommended Carol Eaton as the Interim Chair.
 - Jonathan Dings moved to have Carol as the Chair-pro-tem.
 - Elliott Asp Seconded, the motion passed.

We would like to formally select the chair and vice-chair at the next meeting. Also, adopt the TAP rules of order with a possible amendment to the length of appointments for the chair/vice-chair.

TAP Procedures/Terms

- The group agreed to schedule 3 meetings a year: Fall, winter, and spring with the recognition that additional meetings may be scheduled based on need.
 - Conference call meetings possible for short decision items
 - The group likes CDE as a location
 - Linda Baker offered for anyone to park at CEA for free, let her know.
 - Days of the week recommended:
 - Mondays are the worst

- Thursdays are recommended as a good day to host the TAP
- Preference for mornings.
- Dan will be sending out a doodle poll to establish the three official meeting dates for 2013-2014
- Smaller group/working group requested by CDE to discuss the Growth Model and Ed Effectiveness.
 - Ed Effectiveness needs some more involved thought on the guidance, and looking for TAP participation.
 - There is an expressed concern by the TAP that they would all like to be involved

N-Size Study Discussion

- Elena Diaz-Bilello from the Center of Assessment opened dialogue concerning her report.
 - Many of the findings are already known to the TAP, but important to share with the public.
- Alyssa Pearson shared the reason for the commission of the N size study
 - The SB163 Task Force recommended investigation in how the system is working for small schools and districts. Analysis was contracted to the Center of Assessment. Written for a superintendent audience.
 - At the next SB163 meeting there will be a formal recommendation on 'next steps' and what to do in terms of policy around these findings.
- Elena's recommendations
 - This is the only state in the country that has a Request to Reconsider process, for which schools and districts can "appeal" the rating to the state if performance is not sufficiently characterized.
 - Input still needed from the field for the Request to Reconsider process. Hard for schools and districts to develop a credible and rigorous claim against the performance framework.
 - Elena would like a better structure on the Request to Reconsider process. How does CDE encourage a deeper dive into the data at schools/districts. Especially smaller systems that may lack capacity.
 - Concern of N sizes a problem with all data, not just Colorado Growth Model.
- Discussion
 - Concern was about the normative development of the Colorado Growth Model for standard setting.
 - Megaphone pattern shows smaller schools and districts will be in the highest and lowest, while large systems will be concentrated in the center.
 - There was concern, from some TAP members, about the normative development of accreditation category cutpoints, that SPF/DPF cut scores appear to be the sole definition of an accreditation category, and that assignment of schools and districts to accreditation categories has not been systematically validated with observational or other data besides test scores.
 - Alyssa (CDE) shared long and short term goals:
 - PARCC transition will be a good time to look at the system, there will be new cut points, a new system. Currently we plan to keep our cut-points the same for consistency until then.
 - Would like thoughts on how to strengthen the system now.
 - 12 school Request to Reconsider this past year, many small systems. We approved 9 of those requests. Currently CDE is using this request to reconsider process to assess problems with small n systems.
 - Validity argument will become important for schools/districts in year 4 or 5 of the turnaround clock. Growth gaps validity will also affect schools and districts.
 - The State Review Panel will play an important part in considering actions in regards to priority improvement and turnaround district's on the 5 year clock.
 - CDE looks for feedback from the districts if they feel the system is "off", as well as offers support in dealing with the current SB163 system.

- The school board will likely consider schools/districts in continual decline, in regards to the 5-year clock.
- SPF/DPF will not need to be as 'pin-point' accurate if we can develop more qualitative and quantitative analysis of schools/districts.
- TAP members expressed some agreement that the use of AGP in SPF/DPF calculations was inappropriate.
- The Priority Improvement/Turnaround clock should not only take the SPF/DPF into account. UIPs, action plans, change in performance should all be considered.
- Elena asked, are the frameworks focusing attention in the right places? To what extent do they mislead efforts?
- Percentile ranking included with Achievement-, indicates a comparison relative to other schools. Why not do this for MGP? Percentile ranking by level (taking out AECs and Online Schools) and create rank percentile.
- R2R Suggestions
 - The AEC system where there are required and optional measures maybe a good option for K-3 schools (the menu system)
- Ed Effectiveness results may be worth incorporating into the SPF/DPF in the future.
 - What does a good school look like vs. what is a good score (qualitative vs. quantitative)
 - Idea of including both performance based inputs and practice based inputs
- Concern over 'distinction' rating for districts. Recommendation not to focus our attention there.

Summary provided by Elliot, from CDE, 1) how do we validate the frameworks? 2) How do we make the frameworks more effective, and 3) how does the PARCC transition impact our decisions? (Linda B.)

CELA to ACCESS Transition

- Marie Huchton (CDE) spoke on the transition of CELApro to WIDA's ACCESS for ELLs and the implications for the growth model. The growth model can make the comparison between assessments, but the question currently is 'is it valid and meaningful'? Different test scales should not be a problem as the student rankings are likely to be consistent, but the question is whether the construct relationship is valid?
 - ACCESS is more academic language focused, while CELA was more social language focused. Are the constructs of social and academic language similar enough to make growth interpretations meaningful??
 - CDE has access to two studies from other states regarding the transition, and there has been a strong relationship between the two assessments.
 - Practitioners see these tests as different constructs (LASLinks to ACCESS). They also see ACCESS as a better, more rigorous assessment.
 - We do not have children who have taken both tests in the same school year.
- The analysis will be started once the ACCESS data is returned (after April 26th) to see if growth can be calculated meaningfully. CDE is looking for feedback as to whether MGP ACCESS should be included in the frameworks.
 - CDE has asked WIDA to use historical WIDA data from other states to calculate AGP as reference, for use in future years. AGPs will not be possible in the transition year.
- Discussion
 - Will districts need to develop new cut points for exiting ELL programs? Will this be a more appropriate assessment that will develop ELL practice in districts, or will we be using this the same way as CELA.
 - CDE will be putting out guidance on exit criteria at the end of April.
 - What will we signal to districts by not including ACCESS growth? If we do not include growth now, it may set a precedent that we won't offer growth results when we transfer to PARCC.
 - Recommendation to offer an appeal.

- If the data is a very bad match, CDE may have to pull it, but it's not recommended
- Recommendation, take the regular MGP and do a simulation of random student growth percentiles, create distributions, the curve will be an example of random variation. Then do school by school MGP comparison. This will show systematic variation as well as random variation. First in math, then in CELA, then in ACCESS, see comparison to determine validity.
- CDE will share preliminary results with districts and ask for feedback. Do the results reflect the growth of individual students and schools over the year?
- Consider if CDE programmers could integrate 'ACCESS information made a difference in your score'. This would be very difficult to have programmed in at this time, but Accountability staff may be able to run this.
- The TAP may be useful to assess CDE's review and recommendation for ACCESS inclusion.
 - May 23rd at 9:15am recommended to discuss
 - CDE would like feedback iteratively if possible. Will send some preliminary findings before May 15th.

Educator Effectiveness – Growth Discussion

- Toby King (CDE) currently TCAP and growth data must be included in educator assessments. The field has shared that calculating growth may not be possible for many assessments. Proficiency is now being recommended as possible measures that may be included in an educator's body of evidence. A 16 page guidance document has been put out, and has led to some anxiety with assessment staff in districts and reduced anxiety in the field. There are concerns that one measure could have a huge impact that may result in job loss. SB 10-191 requires that multiple measures contribute to the body of evidence so that any one measure does not have such an influence on job loss.
 - CGM results are required to be used in educator evaluation. How CGM data is used is a concern with the field. (The field also notes a general lack of data literacy (i.e. understanding what the CGM results are actually communicating) in their districts.)
- Questions for TAP from CDE: How to include more depth in the guidance about use of CGM, without getting so technical that the guidance doesn't help the field?
 - What are the CGM results that should be used in educator evaluation? (AGP, MGP, Catch Up, Keep Up)
 - It is in state rule that results from the CGM are used.
 - Suggest that the TAP be a work group to spend a whole day developing recommendations.
 - The Center for Assessment may convene a TAC (with some TAP members may be recommended for participation)
 - How can student growth percentiles be aggregated/used at the educator level. A student-teacher data link in the future may be available. Can we aggregate across years? What is the minimum N size for this use?
 - What should the cut-points be is a discussion currently occurring. (Should there be three ranges? Atypical low, typical, and atypical high?)
 - Can SGP be used to set targets? MGP used to set targets?
 - What does the CGM measure? A year of growth in a year of time.
- Discussion
 - Does Educator Effectiveness want to use the growth model to assess things besides TCAP/RWMS, for example placing a pre and post assessment through the CGM?
 - CDE will be using only RWMS due to data confidence and district capacity.
 - Ed Effectiveness would like the TAP to contribute if they are interested.
 - TAP members are happy to have the Educator Effectiveness Unit come to the TAP, and would like to participate, and come out with a recommendation.
 - The TAP can also help recommend if more time is needed to develop the Ed Effectiveness system.
 - We should consider the change between assessments (TCAP to PARCC)

- Concern that these questions are of inference, not of technicality, which will be important with the transition to consider.
- The state should watch what districts do this next year, find the districts with good programs, and extrapolate from that.

Action Items for May meeting

- Adoption of Operating Procedures, selection of Chair/Vice-Chair, adoption of minutes
- Discussion of CELAPro to ACCESS analytics and provide CDE with a recommendation around inclusion in accountability (SPF/DPF and AMAO 1)
- An extended discussion of the educator effectiveness CGM questions (see attached document)
- Our next meeting will be held from 9-4 p.m., May 23rd. The exact location is to be determined.

Meeting Adjourned