



Meeting Minutes – Thursday, January 21, 2016 (9:00-2:00)

201 East Colfax, State Board Room, Denver, Colorado

TAP Members:

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

Audience:

Elena Diaz-Bilello (CADRE)
Dan Jorgensen (Harrison School District)
Austin Mueller (Douglas County SD)
Van Schoales (A+ Colorado)

CDE Representatives:

Marie Huchton
Erin Loftin
Tina Negley
Alyssa Pearson
Josh Perdue

Welcome & Minutes Approval

Norman Alerta/Marie Huchton

- The meeting was convened in the state boardroom at 201 East Colfax Avenue and was called to order at 9:00.

TCAP to PARCC Percentile Comparison Reports

Josh Perdue/Marie Huchton

- Josh explained the purpose of the new reports. It will help support implementation of a new accountability system; it will support the UIP process, and provide information to the public. Questions were raised with the TAP for consideration.
- *The TAP was asked, which metric should CDE use for rankings?*
 - Mean scale score: suppress less data, more available to public. CDE ran into problem with math, no differentiation for 0 to 20th percentile.
 - Percent P&A/Benchmark: as used in the frameworks in the past.
 - Feedback indicated that the mean could be more useful for norming and would allow schools greater opportunity to take actions that result in change. Also, the importance of statewide comparison data was raised. It was also pointed out that with percentiles people understand it is a ranking. A change to mean scale score may be confusing to the field, so some consistency may be important. Some members said that both a presentation of mean scale score and percent at benchmark may be helpful.
 - Per CDE, it's important to message our actions at the state level; highlighting the same expectations exist for all kids.
 - It was also discussed that moving to mean scale scores (as well as the removal of AGP) will completely remove reference to students reaching proficiency from the SPF and DPF. This was pointed out as a possible opportunity to redo the frameworks into something that may make more sense.



- *What distribution to use for determining percentile rankings within the reports?*
 - Josh explained various options including the use of the school level distribution or district level distribution. Possibilities were raised concerning the use of z-scores by student, rolled up to averages. The thought was that it might eliminate widely different distributions. Also, effect sizes were mentioned because people recognize that statistical significance doesn't always translate to practical decisions.
 - It was asked, what do we gain using separate school and district distributions? Also, how do we clarify the differences/conflicts of information through different lenses
 - It was raised that all systems may produce something unfair, implausible, or needing extra explanation. It was said that a preference may exist for the extra explanation for accuracy.
 - Per CDE, if we stick with the current system, we really have separate systems for schools and district.
 - One recommendation, calculate school distributions as usual and for districts use average ratings

Integrating New Federal ESSA Requirements

Marie Huchton/Alyssa Pearson/Tina Negley

- Marie provided overview of ESSA. The legislation calls out the importance of differentiating schools based on performance. The term 'consistently underperforming' is vague in ESSA, will need to be operationalized. A number of questions were raised by CDE for TAP members to consider regarding ESSA implementation.
 - *Do we want to have two systems for state and federal? Or align them to a single system?*
 - If adjustments aren't severe it's better to have one system. If too severe then may need to have a conversation about separating them. In the past, some conflicts existed between Adequate Yearly Progress and the School Accountability Reports.
 - *How do we account for newly arrived ELs?*
 - It was expressed by one member that they're not sure testing in year 1 (less than 12 mo in US) is good for kids. Also, DPS representative expressed that they feel very strongly about not testing in year one.
 - CDE pointed out that including testing results from year 1 (less than 12 months in US) may not even be valid. It would be important to have a single state policy in this regard.
 - *How do we deal with parent refusals?*
 - It was pointed out that per SBE motion CDE is unable to hold districts/parents liable for parent refusal.
 - TAP members mentioned that there could be indirect penalties for low participation.
 - A concern raised by CDE is that not providing ANY rating could encourage others to opt out.
 - TAP members expressed that some districts are already getting refusals/calls and a PR campaign about why assessments are important is needed. In DPS, teacher incentive pay were tied to some of these measures.
 - *What possibilities might exist in regards to school quality/ student success data?*
 - Marie pointed out that we have more options in High School than other levels. CDE is conducting work with Elena on what measures we already have access to and brainstorming what other measures may require (i.e. legislation, money, etc.).
 - It was mentioned that it may be worth bringing together stakeholders to think about new measures and identify competencies that lead to successful graduates
 - It was asked if this will lead to additional incentives for things we don't want. For example, could using attendance data as an engagement measure lead to parents pushing sick kids to go to school?

**Lunch (12-12:30)****Target Setting for SPF/DPF 2.0**

Alyssa Pearson/Marie Huchton

- The idea of setting different targets for achievement was discussed. This included selecting appropriate metrics, determining targets including different targets for ELL and EMH levels.
- Questions were raised about wanting to retroactively apply different targets. One recommendation was to have 50 as the middle. Also, CDE would want to consider how many districts/schools could be served.
- Per CDE, if quartiles were applied, would have ¼ exceeds, ¼ does not meet. With targets, CDE wants to avoid holding different students to different standards. The SBE has been supportive of using percentile rankings.

Calculating Growth for PARCC Math Grades 9-10-11

Marie Huchton/Josh Perdue

- CDE pointed out that 10th and 11th graders won't be tested with PARCC in future years. How should CDE treat that data? TAP members indicated that it doesn't need to be included within the report. CDE needs to remain aware of issues with comparisons between non-comparable groups.

Transition to PSAT and SAT

Marie Huchton/Josh Perdue

- The TAP was asked how do we want to incorporate PSAT and SAT results into Accountability determinations moving forward. Alyssa Pearson pointed out that various bills were being introduced that could lead to the cutting of the 9th grade assessment. It will be a point of future discussion.

Public Comments & Action Items

Norman Alerta/Marie Huchton

- The opportunity for public comment was provided to all audience members.
- The next TAP meeting date/time is to be determined.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:00 p.m.