

## Meeting Minutes – Thursday, April 3<sup>rd</sup> 2014 (8:00-9:00)

---

### Webinar, CDE, 201 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, Colorado

#### TAP Members Present:

Norm Alerta  
Jonathan Dings  
Jill Fellman  
Jacqueline Law  
Joy Perry

#### CDE Representatives:

Elliot Asp  
Marie Huchton  
Dan Jorgensen  
Alyssa Pearson

#### Audience:

Eric McMartin  
Kirsten Toy  
Mary Vigil  
Other unidentified participants

#### Welcome, Purpose, and Roll Call

Dan Jorgensen

- The meeting was held via Adobe Connect webinar. The TAP meeting was convened at 9:00 a.m. and an informal roll call of members and guests was taken. A separate call with TAP members, Dwayne Schmitz and Carol Eaton occurred at a later date to obtain additional feedback regarding the 2014 proposals.
- Dan welcomed participating members and thanked them for joining on relatively short notice. The reason this meeting was called was to obtain feedback from the TAP regarding a series of questions related to the 2014 frameworks.

#### Proposed Changes for the 2014 School and District Performance Frameworks

Marie Huchton/Dan Jorgensen

- Marie introduced each of three questions. The questions and TAP feedback are below.
  - Does the TAP have any concerns regarding the proposed approach to handling science and social studies participation?
    - A concern was raised that if technology fails and can't administer one assessment then likely can't administer both so would not meet participation rate and plan type could be lowered.
    - It was expressed that CDE needs to make it clear that the request to reconsider process can be used to address these issues as technology fails unexpectedly at times.
    - Other recommendations included counting science and social studies as one content area instead of two separate areas to account for larger technology failure.
    - It was asked if the participation issue is limited to just ES/MS? The response was, yes, for one year. For HS, would include two prior years of science participation. So would there be a one year at HS with no science? Only for three year would be using historical science. If move to add science then concerns would change.

- It was pointed out that the request to reconsider process may play a role in case of technology failure. Also, additional invalidation codes (state applied exclusion) for technology issues may be utilized.
- Does the TAP support removing the foreign exchange students from the COACT results?
  - The TAP supported the removal of these students from the COACT results. However, it was emphasized that it's important the TAP is aware of any accountability changes in the future. Some TAP members felt that changes to testing requirements occurred in the past without appropriate feedback/discussion.
- Which of the three presented option do they recommend to use for the three year English language proficiency growth sub-indicator?
  - When we transitioned from CELA to ACCESS we were unable to calculate AGP's during year one. CDE is requesting TAP feedback regarding the recommended approach for the 2014 frameworks. Three options were presented including: Option 1: just use ACCESS 2014 for MGP and AGP; Option 2: include both ACCESS 2013/2014 for 3-year framework with AGP for both frameworks being based on ACCESS 2014; and Option 3: use ACCESS 2014 for MGP, 1-yr; ACCESS 2014 for AGP, and CELA and ACCESS for 3-yr MGP.
  - The TAP chair raised two additional possibilities:
    - Option 4: option 3 but include AGP info from CELA 2012
    - Option 5: 3-year version to not have AGP but do what we did this year
    - It was asked why not considering these two additional options?
      - Marie, for option 4, inclusion of CELA's 5 PL's compared to ACCESS 6 PL's. Concerned that this difference and expected time frames would create a lack of equivalence. For option five, may add to the complexity with multiple rubrics.
  - Jonathan recommended analysis that shows choice won't do harm relative to the proposed option 5.
  - Alyssa responded that using the one year data on the three year seems to make the most sense. She asked for feedback and TAP member Jill Fellman, agreed that option one would be the simplest and would be her preference as it reflects the current data.
  - Marie asked for other input regarding using option one. Jonathan said that he believes the easiest explanation is to not use AGP at all. Marie pointed out the federal requirements differ for reporting thus preventing this flexibility with PARCC.
- No other immediate concerns were raised by the TAP regarding the calculations for the 2014 frameworks.

### **Public Comment & Adjourn Meeting**

#### Public/TAP Members

- Audience members were invited for comments. No one chose to address the TAP during this meeting.

**Meeting Adjourned at 10:00 a.m.**  
**Spring Meeting Scheduled for Thursday, April 17<sup>th</sup>, 9-noon (tentative time)**