

## Meeting Minutes – Thursday, April 17<sup>th</sup> 2014 (9:00-noon)

---

### Warren Tech, 13300 W. 2<sup>nd</sup> Place, Lakewood, Colorado

**TAP Members Present:**

Norm Alerta (conference)  
Jonathan Dings  
Carol Eaton  
Jill Fellman  
Jacqueline Law (conference)  
Joy Perry (conference)  
Dwayne Schmitz (conference)

**CDE Representatives:**

Elliot Asp  
Dan Jorgensen  
Marie Huchton  
Josh Perdue  
Misti Ruthven  
Lisa Steffen

**Audience:**

Heather MacGillivray

**Welcome, Purpose, Roll Call, and Approve Minutes**

(Dan Jorgensen/Jonathan Dings)

- The meeting was held at Warren Tech, Lakewood, Colorado. A conference call option was provided. A number of TAP members joined by the conference call option. The TAP meeting was convened at 9:15 a.m. and an informal roll call of members and guests was taken.
- Dan clarified that the meeting minutes from the April 3<sup>rd</sup> webinar, this meeting, and earlier November meeting would all be provided for approval during the May meeting. The November draft minutes were previously provided and any feedback was incorporated.

**PWR 2.0 Indicator**

Dan Jorgensen/Misti Ruthven

- The PWR 2.0 topic was introduced. Given the assessment transition CDE is taking the opportunity to revisit all aspects of the accountability frameworks. This includes the re-visioning of the PWR indicator. CDE has initiated an internal work group to initiate and support this process. It includes broad cross-representation of offices in the department. To present, the group has started work on a preliminary project plan that includes a tentative calendar and possible measures/metrics. In the near future CDE is planning on obtaining stakeholder feedback concerning what they would like to have included within the indicator along with its design. Ultimately, the TAP will play a very important function as vision will need to be aligned with the technical considerations of implementation. *Dan anticipates bringing back this item with specific questions for feedback to the May meeting.*

### ACCESS Adequate Growth (work plan)

Marie Huchton

- An update on ACCESS Adequate growth work was provided. It is anticipated that for the next meeting ACCESS results should be available to begin discussions of analyses. The current challenge is that CDE doesn't have historical data but WIDA does. CDE has been trying to work with WIDA to get student level data but this doesn't seem like a viable possibility to present. They are providing us with technical documentation and resources. Also, CDE is hoping to obtain summary data over time.
- Suggested analysis to bring back to the TAP include:
  - *A request by Dwayne was made at this time for a study of catch-up students that examines if they hit proficiency within three years on the TCAP. Josh will bring the results of this analysis back in May.*
  - *Marie will be examining differences in adequate growth estimates based on using just one year of ACCESS data versus multiple years of CELA data. The findings will be discussed in relation to the possibility of also using WIDA coefficient matrices to determine adequate growth.*

### SPF/DPF 2.0 Analysis Priorities

Marie Huchton/Josh Perdue

- Dan introduced the topic by pointing out that numerous stakeholder groups have been providing us feedback regarding the future of the frameworks. Our goal is to examine all possibilities so we can adequately address the rationale for adopting or rejecting any proposed approaches. Marie framed the discussion by identifying four topics that we have received considerable feedback about: (1) change in proficiency and median growth percentiles, (2) adequate growth, (3) super sub group, and (4) disaggregated achievement. Feedback was requested regarding each approach with the largest focus being on adequate growth (i.e. the next agenda item).
- The TAP recommended that we don't consider change in proficiency as it's deemed a bad idea. Specifically, the random variation associated with these approaches make them less tenable as a solid accountability approach compared to what we have in MGP. Jonathan emphasized the importance of not wasting time on analyses linked to poor ideas. Marie mentioned that one of the challenges is that some less technically knowledgeable individuals are reintroducing this idea. Thus, we need some documentation to rebut the arguments. Carol mentioned the value of citing national research.
- The idea of super subgroups was first discussed when initially building the performance frameworks. The biggest change since that initial design is that the Department of Education appears to be more amenable to the idea of a super subgroup. We need more feedback from the TAP thus we will also want to include this within any pro-con document that we draft. Concerns were raised by the TAP regarding the possibility of losing important information by making the groups homogenous. *Dan pointed out that all approaches may need to be explored further so may be placed in a Google document to allow for further feedback.* Marie wrapped up this agenda item by briefly discussing disaggregated achievement. She asked do we need to add in a status gaps indicator into the frameworks. We are going to be having this conversation and will be doing a write up for the field. We will be asking what would the impact be at actually looking at minority, ELL, etc. or a super sub group. Also, would it be worthwhile in terms of status.

## Growth Indicator Work Session

Dan Jorgensen/Josh Perdue

The TAP engaged in discussion of various approaches towards the use of the growth model in the performance frameworks. The TAP provided input regarding the pros-, cons-, and appropriate analyses that may be associated with each approach. The presented approaches and TAP feedback are as follows:

- MGPs Only
  - Pros:
    - More easily understood and communicated to stakeholders
    - Fairest, each school can compete for the highest scores more completely than they do on things related to status. Not totally fair, but easier to compete evenly.
    - Metric that is presently fairly well understood, lots of training already.
    - Helps with the conversation at the school level, takes excuses off the table.
  - Cons:
    - If we don't have a way to do growth to standard, we may be required to use status for the Feds.
    - If we were to use MGPs only, we may have to weigh status more heavily.
    - Normative model only
  - Analyses:
    - When you set cut-points, use achievement concept, including EMH and subject level, use cut points for achievement
- MGPs and AGPs (current model)
  - Pros:
    - Satisfies federal requirements
    - Links growth and status
    - Can avoid status gaps measurement
    - Communication/training, field understands this more than if we changed it/had to re-explain
  - Cons:
    - Hard to understand
    - Seen as unfair by those not making AGP (low performing school has different cut points)
    - Magnitude of bifurcated rubric is unreasonably high
    - For HS, very high AGP seems unattainable for schools
    - Dwayne's white paper
    - Pollutes growth measures with status measures
    - Current model promotes exclusive focus on proficient level
  - Analyses:
    - Cut point may change with PARCC, cut points more aware of step level growth, similar to CELA/ACCESS model.
    - What to do to show effective weight of achievement in the current model.
    - Impact of choosing less severe bifurcated rubric
    - Cut points: produce data on how long it takes to move from level to level, expectations for improvement.

- % Catch-up, %Keep-up
  - Pros:
    - Fits with goal of all students to proficiency by 12<sup>th</sup> grade identifies schools that will not meet the goal (pointed out by CDE, not TAP)
  - Cons:
    - Driven by status, not growth
    - Informational but does not reflect instructional quality/school performance which can at times be predicted by demographics.
    - Relies on AGP calculation
  - Analyses:
    - Additional disaggregation's by ELL and SPED status that include students that exit
- MGPs and Separate Growth to Standard Indicator (using % catch-up, % keep-up and % move up)
  - Pros:
    - MGP and catch-up
    - Viable, exclude move-up, could weigh catch-up then keep-up differently
  - Cons:
    - Model has the risk of polluting growth with status, depending on the particulars of the model
    - % move-up may not be appropriate
  - Analyses:
    - Rubrics for catch-up that create subgroups within PP/Unsat, combined/averaged together to a standard
    - Validation of P/I/PI/TA cuts based on performance not just capacity of CDE to support.
    - Split performance bands at the 15<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles for achievement, calculate scoring within groups and then look at patterns of outcomes compared to demographics.
    - CELA or ACCESS model for growth to standards.
- Statutory Definition: MGP, % making AGP, % move-up, % exceeding statewide MGP
  - Cons:
    - Returning to original statute would not be appropriate given extensive public engagement, research, technical advice, legislative consultation that went into the current rules.
    - Current practices incorporate legislative intent.
- Other (Five Level Approach)
  - Analyses:
    - PARCC: integration of five performance levels, different weightings

**2014 SPF/DPF Specification Decisions**

Marie Huchton

- The decisions that were made by CDE concerning the 2014 SPF/DPF design were presented. Feedback concerning these questions was obtained from the TAP during an April 3<sup>rd</sup> webinar. Also, it was mentioned that additional feedback was obtained from various stakeholder groups concerning each of these questions.

**Public Comment & Adjourn Meeting**

Public/TAP Members

- Audience members were invited for comments. No one chose to address the TAP during this meeting.
- The May meeting will include further discussion of PWR 2.0 and supplemental analysis results. The TAP will also select a vice-chair for next year and begin scheduling meetings for the 2014-15 academic year.

**Meeting Adjourned at 11:50 a.m.**

**Spring Meeting Scheduled for Thursday, May 15<sup>th</sup>, 9-noon (tentative time)**