



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
February 13, 2014, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 13, 2014,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Paul Lundeen (R), Chairman
Marcia Neal (R), Vice Chairman
Elaine Gantz Berman (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: State Board will come
2 back to order, good morning. Staff please call the roll.

3 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman?

4 MS. BERMAN: Here.

5 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff?

6 MS. GOFF: Here.

7 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen?

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning.

9 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec?

10 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

11 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal?

12 MS. NEAL: Here.

13 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel?

14 MS. NEAL: She just came in the door.

15 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Here. What door, where?

17 MS. NEAL: She came in the front door and
18 she went that way.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, next item on the
20 agenda is recognition of the 2013 Milken Educator. Mr.
21 Commissioner, I turn it over to you.

22 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. It's really an
23 honor to do this award as we do every year. And I'm
24 going to turn it over to Keith. But Jose -- I -- I've
25 gotten to meet -- he's our awardee. What's interesting



1 about him, and Jane knows him quite well as well, is that
2 his classroom when we were in the Gelpa (ph) event in
3 India, we Skyped the kids that happened to be a part of
4 his classroom and that was before he received the Milken
5 award. And then we get the award, and then just a couple
6 weeks ago we both -- (indiscernible) and myself went out
7 -- Rebecca, she's here. She got in a car wreck, so she
8 couldn't make it. On a snowy day we went out and talked
9 to all the kids about our visit that were on that Skype
10 call and one of the unfortunate things about this job,
11 you don't get to be around kids a whole lot. It was nice
12 to see a very much engaged group of high school kids.

13 And you can just tell the leadership that
14 is occurring in his classroom, which is exemplified by
15 this award, speaks so well of him. And so I have been
16 very impressed by getting to know Jose, which is, I don't
17 often get to know the award winners as well. So
18 congratulations.

19 So I'm going to turn it over to Keith and
20 we will start the process of pictures and all the good
21 things that happen.

22 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair? So good morning,
23 it's our pleasure today to honor Mr. Jose Martinez, our
24 2013 Colorado Milken Educator.

25 The Milken Educator Awards provide



1 recognition in unrestricted financial awards of \$25,000
2 to exceptional elementary and secondary school teachers.
3 Principal specialists who are furthering their excellence
4 in schools around the country. Each year, exceptional
5 educators considered without their knowledge by a Blue
6 Ribbon Panel, appointed by each State Departments of
7 Education, are caught unaware of the news of their
8 \$25,000 award. And they can use this award in any way
9 they choose. These announcements are made during
10 surprise assemblies held at each of the recipient schools
11 that are attended by students, peers, as well as federal,
12 state, local officials and the media.

13 At a surprise assembly at his school in
14 November 2013, Jose Martinez of Bear Creek High School in
15 Jefferson County was named the 2013 Colorado Milken
16 Educator. He was presented with a \$25,000 check from the
17 Milken Family Foundation in recognition of his
18 exceptional work as a role model for the state and the
19 nation. Mr. Martinez has taught civics, economics and
20 senate in grades nine through twelve for six years.

21 Mr. Martinez is a consummate professional
22 who serves as a role model not only for his students but
23 for his colleagues as well. He holds the position of
24 Department Chair, he provides strong leadership within
25 the building. He brings citizenship, politics, financial



1 literacy to life with interactive community focused
2 experiences. He believes that his students need to
3 understand how they, their community and nation influence
4 -- and are influenced by people, business, alliances,
5 global organizations and events from around the world.

6 Jose challenges his students to think
7 critically through rigorous, relevant, engaging lessons
8 with a 21st Century focus. He inspires students to take
9 the risks necessary to push their limits academically,
10 encouraging more complex thinking, creative problem
11 solving, that motivates the students to work harder to
12 strive to grow, to improve and to excel.

13 I would like for us all to recognize the
14 2013 Colorado Milken Educator, Mr. Jose Martinez; ask him
15 to come forward and say a few words.

16 (Applause)

17 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you all very, very
18 much. It's an extreme honor to be here, and while I
19 admittedly and unfortunately didn't get to know any of
20 you before this, except Dr. Hammond, which has been a
21 pleasure in and of itself. I'm very grateful to you all,
22 even though you may not have known me before this as
23 well, to just be able to work for you and for our great
24 state, and of course for our kids. You know, I know in
25 the times of education currently, there's a lot of



1 questions out there about technology and standards and
2 testing and even politics. And in all of that, I only
3 can think back to the fact that as a teacher we typically
4 thrive on questions -- that's what makes our job and our
5 schools so great.

6 And so all I can say is that I'm very
7 excited to work for our schools, and for you all, and for
8 our great state and kids. And it is truly an honor to be
9 here among my peers and among you all. It's a very
10 special place, especially at a very young age. So thank
11 you all very much, and if there is ever anything I can
12 do, let me know. If you want to come visit, by all
13 means. And -- we love Skyping, it was a fun experience.
14 So -- so thank you all very, very much.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible).

16 (Applause)

17 MS. NEAL: Pleasure to meet you, Mr.
18 Martinez. I remember a time when one of the teachers at
19 Madison County got --

20 MR. MARTINEZ: Say that again, I'm sorry,
21 I can't -- sorry --

22 MS. NEAL: Oh, I'm not on my mic. It's
23 on, I just wasn't talking to it. I'm from Grand Junction
24 and one year one of our teachers won and I had the chance
25 to attend that surprise assembly, and those are pretty



1 emotional. What do you teach?

2 MR. MARTINEZ: I currently teach social
3 studies.

4 MS. NEAL: Oh, my favorite subject.

5 MR. MARTINEZ: Me too.

6 MS. NEAL: That's why I like you. No,
7 it's just a -- it's a real honor to meet you and I think
8 it's one of the most exciting things we do all year. So
9 congratulations.

10 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. Thank you very
11 much.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Absolutely. My
13 perspective is this -- this is kind of a concentration
14 and a reversing of the honor that you do to students
15 every day in the classroom. We are as a body and through
16 Milken are trying to gather back together and pour on you
17 in a concentrated fashion that which you pour on
18 students. And by extension, not only the students in
19 your classroom, but the students across the state and
20 across the country by virtue of your leadership, the
21 challenge, the -- the inspiration that that provides to
22 others. So thank you very much for what you do.
23 Congratulations and we'd love to take a picture of you,
24 because we like (indiscernible).

25 MR. MARTINEZ: That's great. You've got



1 to get my good side.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: If you would come here
3 to the floor. The commissioner has an award to offer you
4 and I believe Jane would like to be in the picture as
5 well.

6 (Pause for picture with awardee)

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jose and friends,
8 please don't leave -- please don't leave just yet. I
9 understand there might be some past Milken Award
10 recipients in the room? Is that accurate?

11 (Indiscernible -- multiple people speaking over each
12 other)

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Would you please let us
14 know who you are? Come up to the podium here.

15 MS. BARRON: I'm Angelique Acevedo-Barron,
16 I was in '90 -- I was one of the early ones from '93-
17 '94.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent,
19 congratulations and thank you.

20 MS. BARRON: Thank you.

21 MR. PUTNAM: I'm John Putnam and at the
22 time of the award, 1989, I was a junior high school
23 teacher of mathematics. Any of you would like to examine
24 my tie, you would know that. And 1989 was the very first
25 year that Colorado was part of the Milken Family



1 Foundation awards. And it was a delight to see Jose,
2 because he marks the 25th year, 2013, of that award. I've
3 long since retired.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, excellent, thank
5 you.

6 MS. CLEMENS: And I'm Lisette Clemens.
7 I'm a 1989 from Illinois, so I've been with the award
8 also, but I've taught in seven states, been with the
9 Milkens in many states and I've served on the selection
10 committee in seven, eight, nine states, because I have a
11 military husband. In fact -- and I was on your selection
12 committee when I was in Colorado, so I helped to select
13 her. So I'm very proud of the award. I'm very proud of
14 all of the recipients. I'm proud of Colorado for being a
15 part of it for so long. Thank you for supporting the
16 award and your teachers.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you so very much.
18 What an honor to have several recipients.

19 (Applause)

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you, have a great
21 day.

22 MS. NEAL: Well, that's a good start to
23 the day.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Indeed it is. (Pause)
25 The next idea as I see it on the agenda is an update



1 regarding the 191 Principal Pilot Data from Year 2. Mr.
2 Commissioner?

3 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you much, Mr. Chair.
4 As we've done before on the teacher's side, this is now
5 on the principal's side. And so I'm going to turn it
6 over -- are you okay? You are contorting -- okay, I'm
7 going to turn it over to Katie. I will just let her go
8 ahead and start us out please.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good morning Mr.
10 Chairman, Members of the Board --

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thanks for having us
13 here. We are here to give you another update on the
14 rollout of Senate Bill 191 and the second year of the
15 pilot program for the Principal State Model System. So
16 we were hear a couple months ago and we gave you the
17 update -- sort of a quick update on the teacher rollout
18 and the same set of slides on the teacher/principal data.
19 And so now we're here to share with you the principal
20 data.

21 I want to just start by saying, over all
22 we're really pleased on how the rollout is going of the
23 principal system. So remember, this is the system --
24 principals have their own rubric, superintendents or
25 assistant superintendents or others will evaluate



1 principals; so that's what we're going to be talking
2 about today.

3 We did do some surveying of the principals
4 that are involved in the system and their supervisors,
5 and we've seen a lot of really nice growth in their
6 support of the system. So for example we have 93 percent
7 of the folks that took the survey -- principals and their
8 supervisors, that say that the state model system for
9 principals is intended to guide professional growth.
10 That compares to 32 percent of those same folks who said
11 their old system was intended to provide professional
12 growth. So we're really, really happy with that.

13 Seventy-five percent of the surveyed folks
14 said that the state model system for principals provides
15 actionable feedback for the person being evaluated. So
16 that is a critical core component of the system, is does
17 that system actually provide feedback to -- for
18 professional growth? And 75 percent say that it does.
19 That's compared to 26 percent that made that same claim
20 of their old evaluation system.

21 And the last piece I'll highlight here on
22 the survey results is that 88 percent of principals and
23 superintendents that are using the Principal Model
24 System, say that the model system sets high standards for
25 the person being evaluated. And that was compared to 43



1 percent when they were reporting on their old system.

2 So those are just three I wanted to
3 highlight, because it sort of shows the growth and the
4 comfort that they are starting feel. Principals have had
5 an additional year of practice on this, and so we're
6 excited. The teachers aren't quite at that level of
7 excitement yet, but we're excited by the trajectory that
8 we're seeing, and it just shows that with a little more
9 practice, I think they get a little more comfortable with
10 it and they learn a little bit more about the system and
11 they feel a little bit better about it. So with that,
12 I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Britt Wilkenfeld to walk
13 you through some of the internal --

14 MS. NEAL: Can I ask a question?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

16 MS. NEAL: The pilot districts, did they
17 also -- did we have a pre-pilot principalship? Were they
18 involved in that pilot program? Or is this the first
19 time?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is the same
21 pilot, the same group of pilots that we've been talking
22 about for the past couple years. So this is just their
23 second year of implementing the system. So it's the same
24 folks, yeah.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we do questions



1 now?

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, sure, go ahead.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I have a couple
4 questions just in general about the pilots. By the way,
5 are you going to write up that survey?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, actually we
7 posted it online.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's not it?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's not in there.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the data Britt
11 is going to go through. We actually had to collate some
12 of the other survey responses before your deadline, so
13 this is now posted and we can send you that link.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would like that,
15 because I thought that was really interesting. Did you
16 keep track of at what administrative level in terms of
17 Central Administration, the evaluators came from?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We do have that and
19 it's mostly -- it's mostly superintendents because the
20 majority of our districts are small. And then in some of
21 our larger districts, it would be "area superintendents".

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then there were
23 27 districts in the pilots and last year was maybe 23
24 districts and this year it was 21 districts. Tell me
25 about the fallout. Is the fallout of some districts



1 meaningful, or not? That you think?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On those -- those are
3 not falling out of the pilot per se. They've -- they've
4 fallen out of our data set in some ways either because
5 the end size is too small to report it, so if there's
6 like one principal in the district, or two principals in
7 the district, we don't report it, so that they can't be
8 identified.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, you're not
10 identifying the districts anyway. You haven't identified
11 any districts to us.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, just to clarify
13 there. So we did only receive -- in pilot year two, we
14 did only receive data from 21 of our districts, which is
15 down from 23. Ideally we would receive data from all 27.
16 I did -- just looking at characteristics of those
17 districts, there aren't -- I mean, they do tend to be
18 rural, but most of our pilot districts are rural. But
19 it's really just a function of, districts were going
20 through a lot last year and from following up with them,
21 some of them --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they just didn't
23 give you the data.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They just didn't give
25 us the data, right. They are still participating. Some



1 of them did complete the process and give the principals
2 ratings, they just didn't submit them to us.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you think a few of
4 them didn't even do the evaluation?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because they were
7 overwhelmed?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have lots of
10 questions, but that sort of covers the (indiscernible).

11 MS. NEAL: (Indiscernible)

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so now why don't
13 we power through the report, and then we'll hold the
14 balance of questions and we can kind of pick up there.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I agree.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

17 MS. WILKENFELD: Thank you, good morning.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning.

19 MS. WILKENFELD: Okay, so we'll jump right
20 in. Thank you for mentioning our -- the pilot district
21 participation. We do have 27 districts piloting the
22 principal system. We have more -- we have data from more
23 principals than we did in the previous year, but from
24 fewer of our districts. But it does -- it basically
25 means that more people are playing with the system, so we



1 do feel good about that.

2 We might recall that whenever I was
3 talking about the teacher findings, I was saying, you
4 know, we have some interesting stuff, but this is all
5 very preliminary. It's the same with the principal
6 system. This is year two, but it's still a new system,
7 they are still going through a lot of other initiatives
8 and changes during the '12-'13 school year, so everything
9 is still preliminary. But we use the findings kind of as
10 flags as to what we need to work on or indications that
11 we're moving in the right direction.

12 So we have early indications that the
13 rubric does capture multiple aspects of school
14 leadership; that professional growth occurs in the
15 consecutive years. What's nice about the principal,
16 since we have two years of data, we can do analysis that
17 we can't do with the teachers. And we do continue to
18 find evidence for reliability and validity.

19 Okay, so here we have the distributions
20 for the six standards, and the overall rating.
21 Principals do actually have seven standards, but you
22 might recall that the seventh standard is student growth.
23 So today we're mostly talking about the six quality
24 standards that have to do with the half of the pie that's
25 professional practice.



1 And here you can see the distributions for
2 all the standards. I apologize, I will probably be
3 coughing and/or choking. And you can see again with the
4 teachers that we see some variability with the
5 distributions. And if you look at their overall rating
6 on the far right, we see that 94 percent of principals
7 received a final rating of proficient or higher.

8 I'm going to focus on the highest and
9 lowest rated standards and we'll dig into those a little
10 bit. We'll dig into them a little bit. You do have all
11 of them in your slides and all of them in your report,
12 and if we do want to dig into them, actually we have, I
13 think, more time than we normally do, so we can. But
14 it's kind of a lot of information, I don't want people to
15 glaze over. So we'll dig into the highest and lowest.

16 The highest rated standard is standard
17 five, which is managerial leadership. And that has to do
18 with kind of creating an environment -- just being a good
19 manager. Creating an environment that's good for your
20 employees; in this case, teachers. And we'll dig into
21 that a little bit. Yes, please?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me, what do you
23 mean by the highest rated standard?

24 MS. WILKENFELD: Sure, great question. So
25 it's actually -- so we have -- last year we had the five



1 categories of not evident, partially proficient,
2 proficient, accomplished and exemplary. And if I assign
3 each one of them as 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 and then average it,
4 that's the one that has the highest average.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, it's
6 looking to me like strategic leadership has the highest
7 (indiscernible).

8 MS. WILKENFELD: So part of it might be --
9 so another way to look at it would be -- would be to
10 report on the standard that has the most amount of
11 principals that are proficient or higher, and which case
12 because they have so many in proficient, then I think it
13 would be standard 1, and maybe standard 3. But the way
14 I've done it is to create an average. To kind of weight
15 all the categories, because I want to account for: Yeah,
16 you have a lot of proficient, but do you have a lot of
17 exemplary as well? So that kind of pulls the average.
18 But there isn't actually a huge difference in the
19 averages across all of the standards. They are all right
20 around 2.5.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you are weighting
22 the level. You are weighting the level? I mean, this
23 sort of answers one of my other questions, because I
24 couldn't go from the character -- what is the word -- the
25 specific sub pieces into the overall standard. The two



1 didn't align because I didn't realize the way you were
2 averaging it.

3 MS. WILKENFELD: Yeah, Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

5 MS. WILKENFELD: Thank you. Yes, and so
6 for this purpose and because you can do more with a
7 measure if you treat it continuous like that and if you
8 create an average, that later I will talk about
9 correlations and stuff. It's just one way that I've
10 chosen to report it. But let me know if it's still not
11 clear, because I do think it's kind of important. Do you
12 want me to go through it again? I'm happy to. We have
13 time.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think you can keep
15 talking and we'll see.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I'll bring it
17 up later too because I have some concerns about what's
18 lost in doing it that way.

19 MS. WILKENFELD: Okay. Yeah, I agree. I
20 mean, there are multiple approaches. Some of it has to
21 do with just what's possible in terms of creating a
22 written report that a lot of people in the field can
23 understand. But if you feel that it's not done the best
24 way, then I'm open to that.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, just different



1 ways of getting information.

2 MS. WILKENFELD: For sure.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think there's
4 a right or wrong, but you make assumptions and then that
5 gives you certain results.

6 MS. WILKENFELD: Yeah, yes. I agree.
7 Thanks.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent.

9 MS. WILKENFELD: Thanks. And also just to
10 clarify, sorry, I'm going quite fast. I'm on a lot of
11 cold medicine.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It's that time of year.

13 MS. WILKENFELD: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You're doing fine.

15 MS. WILKENFELD: I just want to remind
16 people that we are talking about principals and assistant
17 principals. That they are evaluated on the same rubric.
18 We'll talk about that a little bit later, but I just want
19 to make sure everyone kind of remembers that going into
20 it. Okay, all right, thanks.

21 Okay, so Standard 5 is the highest rated
22 standard and then our lowest-rated standards are
23 Standards 2 and Standards 6, which pertains to
24 instructional leadership in the school and external
25 leadership. And you might remember from the teacher



1 findings that this is similar to what we found their
2 lowest-rated standard had to do with basically classroom
3 instruction. So we do see some alignment with the
4 teacher findings. And I think we'll dig into that a
5 little more, because that's something that we're
6 particularly interested in.

7 So if we go ahead a couple slides to
8 Standard 2. So here you can see we have five elements
9 that basically relate to curriculum instruction and kind
10 of setting an environment that facilitates, you know,
11 instruction in classrooms. And here you can see -- I
12 have notes on the side, but three of our lowest-rated
13 elements on the entire rubric are in this standard --
14 that's Elements 2C, which is high-quality instruction.
15 Element 2D, which is high expectations, and 2E which is
16 instructional practices. I can give you an overall of
17 what those are about, but just so you know, if you look
18 in your -- the full report, pages two and three have the
19 full text of all of the elements in the standards.

20 But Element 2E has to do with principals
21 and assistant principals kind of content knowledge about
22 best practice and instructional practices. And then 2C
23 is whether or not they set it up so -- basically giving
24 principals -- giving teachers feedback on those best
25 practices. Both on their practices, keeping teachers up



1 on research if they are not able to keep themselves up,
2 and also providing professional development opportunities
3 to improve their instruction. And that is the lowest-
4 rated element on the entire rubric. It was also the
5 lowest-rated element in year one. Which I thought was
6 kind of interesting.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)

8 MS. WILKENFELD: I'm sorry, could you
9 repeat that?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)

11 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

13 MS. WILKENFELD: Yeah, so I think -- so
14 yeah, and actually in a lot of our districts, the
15 superintendents do have a pretty tight relationship with
16 the principal and so I think that -- that they would say
17 that they know what happens in the school, and they know
18 if they are providing that context. But in our -- in our
19 larger districts, I think you're right that it's maybe a
20 little more removed and it -- the ownness might be on the
21 principals to provide evidence that they are setting an
22 environment where they have those high expectations.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair?

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If I could just add



1 to that. The way the rubric is constructed as well, the
2 elements talk about the high level expectation, and then
3 the professional practices that are underneath the
4 element, which we don't highlight here, actually
5 articulate what we expect to see in terms of high
6 expectations. So it gives more specifics about what the
7 evaluator would need to see in order to rate that highly.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The ru-, yeah, the
9 rubrics are what really answer the -- what they are
10 looking for.

11 MS. WILKENFELD: Yeah, and Mr. Chair?

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

13 MS. WILKENFELD: Yeah, that's a great
14 point. It's -- so there are very specific professional
15 practices and depending on how much the superintendent is
16 involved, or remember this is also principals evaluating
17 assistant principals. So they should be quite familiar
18 with what the assistant principal is doing in the school.
19 So they can either go ahead and give credit for that
20 practice, or the way the system is -- is set up, the
21 educator can provide evidence that they are -- that they
22 are showing that practice.

23 Okay. One other thing that I wanted to
24 point out about Standard 2, is that actually Element 2B,
25 which is providing enough instructional time, is one of



1 the highest rated elements on the standard.

2 So I think we're going to skip ahead to
3 Standard 5, unless people want to dig into every single
4 one? Is that okay? Okay. All right. So looking at
5 Standard 5, which is managerial leadership. Like I said,
6 this is the highest rated standard in our rubric. And
7 one of the reasons it's the highest, if you look at the
8 graph at the far right, 60 percent of principals receive
9 a final rating of accomplished or exemplary. So that's
10 pretty high and that's really drawing up the average.

11 Element 2B, which is conflict management,
12 and Element 5F, which is providing a supportive
13 environment in the school, those are two of the highest-
14 rated elements on the standard. But element 5A, which
15 pertains to resources and budget is one of lowest rated
16 elements on the standard. And this is one that I think
17 is kind of interesting. It could be that that is the
18 case and that is where principals and likely assistant
19 principals struggle, because that might not really be in
20 their purview. This could also be a reflection of school
21 budgets and district budgets and having to do a lot with
22 a little. Or it could be a reflection of
23 superintendent's understanding of budgeting, right? And
24 being able to be more critical of where principals may or
25 may not be doing -- or showing the practices.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it would be
2 really helpful -- I'm guessing it's going to be really
3 helpful for us to look at the rubric to get a deeper
4 understanding of what are the kind of questions. What
5 are the look-for's that are actually in there? Not in
6 order to pick on them, that's not what I'm thinking, it's
7 more to really understand where this comes from. Because
8 in the terms of the resources for example, sometimes it's
9 just communication. It's the kind of communication that
10 goes back and forth between different levels about the
11 funds that are available. And that once they really are
12 conversations, which is what I think this process is
13 going to generate, those things kind of change.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, I've gone
15 ahead and pasted the links so you could pull that up on
16 your screen if you wanted to. So that to carry -- to
17 send along to you, if you want to have that to refer to
18 while we're --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can't look at -- I
20 can't walk and chew gum, so --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's okay, it's
22 there though for you to -- to go to.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will go to that
24 later though.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And it does really



1 help you see, like, just on the high expectations one,
2 the kinds of things that the principal is doing and they
3 are cumulative, so when you do look at the rubric, a
4 principal has to get everything in the basic column and
5 then they have to get everything in the partially
6 proficient, and then they have to get everything in the
7 meets expectations. So it's -- it builds on itself. And
8 so every practice you see would be things that the
9 evaluator would have to have seen evidence of. So that
10 will help you as you look at that rubric.

11 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

13 MS. WILKENFELD: Just to clarify, thank
14 you, Jill, for sharing that. The ratings that we're
15 looking at are from last year and when the bottom
16 category was not evident. We have changed that category
17 for the '13-'14 school year and the first category is now
18 called "Basic". For different reasons, which we can get
19 into if you're interested, but just so you know and you
20 look at that document that it has been updated from the
21 data that I'm sharing now.

22 MS. GOFF: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, go ahead, Jane.

24 MS. GOFF: And I apologize because I --
25 it's actually -- my question will be based back on 2 --



1 Standard 2 a little bit, and I'm sure after looking at
2 our rubrics again and things like that. But in the
3 results, or in the research, do you -- is there a
4 designation between level that the administrator is in?
5 Is there a -- is there some distinction that shows
6 whether this is an elementary, a middle school,
7 preschool, high school job, scene. Because I guess I
8 would be interested, and I will do this, whether there is
9 also any distinction, or can you tell, between content
10 areas? I mean I just think of the pedagogy and the
11 methodology at various levels, been even more discrete
12 than that, within various content areas, especially
13 secondary, if there is some way that that can be
14 determined.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So for the principal
18 rubric we do not have it delineated by secondary or
19 elementary. We did do a lot of focus group work with
20 principals early on about -- gosh, it could be close to
21 three years ago now, or two and a half years ago, around
22 whether they thought that that was important. They --
23 they did give us feedback that this rubric could work for
24 all levels of the system, but we are tracking that in our
25 data, and Britt will actually talk about how that plays



1 out a little bit. But it is meant -- both the principal
2 and the teacher rubric is meant to be sort of content
3 neutral. It's around the practices that you're doing as
4 an educator, whether for a teacher -- you're a physics
5 teacher or a math teacher, that the pedagogy around that
6 is still the same in terms of practice. And similar to
7 the principal, but that the leadership you're providing
8 can be across disciplines and can be across grade levels.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, as it plays out
10 across both levels, whether it's classroom teacher,
11 principal evaluation, the performance standards are
12 generally going to be umbrella in nature. And I think
13 it's going to be more interesting to watch through the
14 years. It's the observer -- or whoever the evaluator is.
15 It could be the principal. But how it plays out within
16 various content areas in the evaluation of teachers. You
17 talk about instructional best practices. It's kind of
18 interesting. Amen.

19 MS. WILKENFELD: Okay, so here we just
20 have a summary of our highest and lowest rated elements -
21 - I'm on slide 10. So we've gone through some of these,
22 but just as a recap, our highest rated elements, and
23 these are in order -- Element 3B, which is Commitment to
24 the Whole Child; Element 5F, which Ensuring an Orderly
25 and Supportive Environment. Element 2B, which is



1 Providing the Instructional Time; that's what we talked
2 about. Element 4A pertains to Professional Development
3 and Learning Communities. Element 5B, which we
4 discussed, pertaining to Content Management and
5 Resolution. And then just a reminder that Standard 5 was
6 the highest-rated standard.

7 And then here we have a list of our
8 lowest-rated elements. Element 2C, Implementing High
9 Quality Instruction. Element 2B, High Expectations for
10 All Students. Element 1B, a School Plan. Element 2E,
11 Instructional Practice. Element 6A, Family and Community
12 Involvement and Outreach. And Element 5A, School
13 resources and (indiscernible). Thank you, Dr. Hammond.

14 And this is something, you know, when I --
15 when I present to districts, these are the kind of things
16 that they really hone in on. You know, if they had a
17 district where they know that they really implemented
18 with fidelity and they -- they are good on interrater
19 agreement and they feel confident in their ratings, and
20 they know that when their five lowest elements come up,
21 that that's really an accurate reflection of their
22 district. That's an easy way to say, okay, this is what
23 we need to focus on in the district, and let's look at
24 certain schools, where maybe some principals did it
25 better than others, and let's highlight those principals



1 or see what they're doing to kind of elevate their
2 practice.

3 So this is particularly useful for
4 districts and it's been well received, which is really
5 great. Because they give us a lot of data and it's
6 important for us to kind of give it back to them. In the
7 future they will have -- whether they are using -- we
8 produce Excel tools, or there will be online systems that
9 they can use that will provide reports that basically
10 give them this information in real time. Which is great.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair. This
12 gives you a little peek, because remember this is just 27
13 districts, or fewer, because they didn't all report. But
14 we're going to be able to have this data on all of our
15 districts when the system is fully implemented. And for
16 us, just looking at this data and comparing it to what we
17 shared with you in the fall about where the lowest
18 ratings were for teachers, there are huge similarities,
19 as Britt sort of highlighted.

20 The piece that I think is really
21 interesting is when you overlay those similarities with
22 the data on achievement gaps and what are the reasons for
23 achievement gaps, you see quite a cross section. So we
24 know that one of the big reasons we have achievement gaps
25 is about expectations; having high expectations. That



1 showed up in the teacher, showed up in our principal, as
2 one of the lowest rated elements. It's just really
3 interesting for us to start to dig into as a state, to
4 say, what does that really mean? And what do we do to
5 tackle that?

6 The other one is about feedback in the
7 teachers that comes to use of assessment, use of data.
8 And the principle, it's about providing that
9 instructional feedback and support. And what do we also
10 know around folks that really tackle achievement gap?
11 They make -- they are aggressive about using data
12 effectively every day to adjust instruction and make sure
13 what's going on. So it's not surprising that we see that
14 pop up, and it's pops up in both.

15 These are the kinds of things that really
16 are interesting for us, because at a state level we can
17 look at it as trends, and then we can look at things that
18 start to make sense across the data and start to then
19 pinpoint our efforts. So we're going to look a lot more
20 at what kind of trainings and supports do we give around
21 high expectations? Around use of data, effective
22 feedback. Those sorts of pieces.

23 But then as Britt was saying, at the
24 district level, they can really hone in on their own
25 specific district. But this is when the system that I



1 know feels onerous and hard for people to do, but this is
2 when the magic comes together, because we can actually
3 start to know what's happening and make a difference and
4 really dig in and -- and get at the pieces that are
5 flagging for us in the system. So I think this kind of
6 data is really exciting.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. Thank
8 you, Jill. This is the kind of stuff that gets us
9 excited.

10 MS. NEAL: It doesn't take much to get
11 some people excited.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's true.

13 (Indiscernible -- multiple speakers at once)

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it does also
15 point out, if you sat through two hours of feedback that
16 we got yesterday afternoon, is we need to be
17 communicating better about the system that's been built,
18 what we want to learn from it, why we want to learn from
19 it. So that there is a better understanding of the
20 purpose for the things that we do. And I think we're
21 losing that right now for lack, probably, of adequate
22 communication. I mean, I worry about that. The fact
23 that we've built an aligned system is being reinforced
24 here, to me, in a big way. But it's -- out there in the
25 real world, that's not the understanding. Because we



1 haven't had it before. Just my comment after a long day.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you continuing to
3 presenting.

4 MS. WILKENFELD: Yes, but please, if you
5 have --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead, I'll wait.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We'll let you --

8 MS. NEAL: Go ahead.

9 MS. WILKENFELD: Okay. So, Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

11 MS. WILKENFELD: Thank you. Okay, so now
12 we're going to look at the distributions from year one of
13 the pilot and year two of the pilot, and here we're just
14 looking at overall ratings. And just looking at the two
15 graphs, you can see that they look similar, but there's
16 been a small shift kind of on average where we have fewer
17 educators in partially proficient, and more educators in
18 exemplary. And this is actually a pretty decent sample.
19 I think we had about 250 principals that participated in
20 year one, and then about 200 of those also participated
21 in year two, in addition to a bunch of new people.

22 So of those 200 or 196 -- I was close --
23 of those 196, we see a small shift. Overall, if you look
24 at the individuals, 93 percent of principals maintained
25 or improved their performance, which we think is great,



1 because that's basically the foundation of the system
2 that if -- you know, if you receive quality feedback and
3 specific feedback, that you can improve your practice.
4 And looking kind of more granular, 57 percent of
5 principals received the same final rating, and 36 percent
6 improved their performance in the second year.

7 Now we're going to look at distributions
8 across the districts. So of the 21 districts that we had
9 submit data, I think it's 12 of them had enough data to
10 actually present at the district level. And here, the
11 minimum is that they need to have at least five
12 principals for me to share the data. And you -- you
13 know, you can't tell who they are, I haven't given you
14 their name, but kind of the smaller the end, gets the
15 bigger the risk that you could tell who they are.

16 MS. NEAL: How -- is there a trend to how
17 large the school was? Are they all small schools? Large
18 schools? Medium? Do you have a range?

19 MS. WILKENFELD: Well, it's across a
20 range, but you can assume that the smallest districts
21 that have fewer schools don't meet the end requirement.

22 MS. NEAL: Yeah, okay.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: So I asked yesterday about
24 turnaround schools and apparently there are a couple of
25 turnaround -- I'm sorry, districts, included. Can you



1 say anything? You're not supposed to identify them, but
2 can you say anything specific about this graph and
3 whether they are or are not a turnaround program?

4 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead. Angelika,
6 you're not letting us get to the end of this
7 presentation. Go ahead.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: I know, but it gets too
9 crazy, if I just go through a whole list of stuff.

10 MS. WILKENFELD: So two of our districts
11 in our pilot are PITA districts, but then we have nine
12 districts in our pilot that actually have schools that
13 are PITA schools.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. And is there
15 anything in here that teases out of that?

16 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Or have you had a chance
19 to do that? To look at --

20 MS. WILKENFELD: Yes, we have. We look at
21 some correlations with SPF ratings, but we haven't broken
22 it down by SPF category.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

24 MS. WILKENFELD: In this particular
25 report.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, okay.

2 MS. WILKENFELD: So back to -- this is
3 just a graph looking at the districts that have enough
4 data that I can share, basically, and they are ordered
5 from the highest rated districts to the lowest rated
6 districts. Again, if you assigned a value of 0, 1, 2, 3
7 or 4 to all the performance categories, and you can see
8 in the upper right hand corner, there's basically the
9 stoplight indicator of the categories whereby green
10 indicates a positive rating, yellow is problematic, and
11 red is very problematic. But you'll see that none of our
12 educators received a final rating of non-evident.

13 But here you can see the differences in
14 the distributions across the district. And this, at
15 least for our team, kind of underscores the need for
16 consistency in ratings. For understanding the rubric,
17 understanding the high bar that is accomplished in
18 exemplary, and how that should be applied. And so this
19 is -- our team is already developing tools to help
20 districts with interrater agreement and I don't know if
21 people want to hear more about that. Katie knows more
22 about them than I do. But this is -- this is just one
23 kind of further evidence as to how important interrater
24 agreement is and consistency across districts -- within
25 and across districts.



1 And here again, we'll look at some
2 distributions based on principal employment
3 characteristics. So we had the good question about the
4 education level, and we do see that principals and
5 assistant principals in elementary schools receive higher
6 ratings than principals in secondary schools. So for us,
7 that's just a flag. Basically -- we're doing these crazy
8 analysis looking at each individual professional
9 practice, so there are about 400 of them for teachers and
10 principals, to make sure that they are in no way bias
11 against principals of -- in certain schools, whether it's
12 in turnaround schools or in secondary schools, or that
13 serve certain groups of students. So this is just the
14 kind of finding that flags for us that that's one of the
15 things we need to look at, is the difference between
16 elementary and secondary principals and assistant
17 principals.

18 And we also see, consistent with last
19 year, that principals receive higher ratings than
20 assistant principals and that's something -- this is a
21 concern that we have heard from assistant principals,
22 that they -- that their job duties don't include a lot of
23 the elements that we think are important and we basically
24 say, you know, in the state of Colorado we -- we think
25 that they should. And so what can we do to support



1 districts and support schools in providing environments
2 where assistant principals do get the same kind of
3 leadership opportunities that principals get.

4 Here we just have some findings looking at
5 the ratings based on years of experience, both overall
6 years as a principal and years as a principal in that
7 school. And basically we see that the more years of
8 experience you have, the higher ratings that you receive.

9 And then looking at some demographic
10 characteristics, we see that female principals receive
11 higher ratings than male principals. We do not say why.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why?

13 MS. WILKENFELD: I think it might also be
14 related to the finding that elementary principals receive
15 higher ratings. Maybe.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)

17 MS. WILKENFELD: Just a guess. We don't
18 see any differences based on the principal's race or
19 ethnicity.

20 So we are switching directions here a
21 little bit, so if there -- if there are any questions
22 about those graphs or group differences, now would be a
23 great time, if you want to ask.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, we'll let you
25 proceed.



1 MS. WILKENFELD: We're going to go
2 forward? Okay. Okay, so what I'm going to present now,
3 this is different than what I presented for the teachers.
4 Basically, with the principals, we have two years of
5 data, they have two years of experience. We know this is
6 still hard and that they're learning the system, but we
7 feel a little more confident in being able to run kind of
8 deeper analysis.

9 We also -- we are working to link
10 individual students to individual teachers, and I don't
11 know how much this group has heard about the teacher-
12 student data link project, but it is a lot of work and
13 it's something that the districts are just starting, and
14 even for our pilot districts, it's just a really heavy
15 lift. So basically it's harder to link students to
16 teachers than it is to link students to principals.
17 Because we -- because of the October count, we can
18 pretty easily know which students are in which schools.
19 So because of that, we are able to run deeper analysis on
20 the principals looking at some student characteristics
21 and student growth and student achievement; which is kind
22 of interesting. So we're going to dig into that now.

23 First, I told you already that there was a
24 high -- maybe I didn't tell you -- but there was a high
25 correlation between principal's ratings in year one and



1 year two of the pilot. You can see here it's .67. In a
2 range of 0 to 1, that's really high. So that's a pretty
3 strong correlation. There is also a relationship between
4 principal's performance and the performance of the
5 teachers in their school. So you can see that basically
6 principal's ratings are correlated with the percent of
7 accomplished, or above, teachers. So I set the bar a
8 little higher because we have a lot of proficient or
9 higher teachers. So if you set the bar at accomplished
10 or higher, we see a correlation there.

11 Here we're looking at student
12 demographics, which you will see that all of those
13 numbers basically are very small and none of them have
14 little stars next to them, meaning that they are not
15 statistically significant, which is exactly what you
16 want. This basically means that principals have an equal
17 chance of receiving high or low ratings regardless of the
18 students in their school. And that's what you want. It
19 means that they're -- basically the rubric has a common
20 stan-, it's a common standard that's fair across schools
21 regardless of the kind of students in that school, which
22 is -- which is great. It's a good indication and this is
23 something -- this is something we'll check every year,
24 because it should always be like this.

25 Okay, this is the last one, but it's kind



1 of a doozy. So we've just been talking about kind of one
2 half of the pie of a principal's evaluation. Now I'm
3 going to talk about what some other pieces of that pie,
4 so looking at some student growth measures, looking at
5 the school performance framework, and also looking at
6 teacher survey results. Because what you want is that
7 all the -- all the pieces of the pie, all of the measures
8 would be in line. Right? Because if they are all -- if
9 they are all measures of high-quality leadership, then
10 they should be at least in the right direction. Right?
11 They should be in sync.

12 So if we start out looking at student
13 measures -- here we see -- we looked at the relationship
14 between principal's ratings and the percent of points
15 earned on the school performance framework. And here we
16 do see it's a small, but it's a positive relationship.
17 It's in the right direction. We do not see relationships
18 between the ratings and reading and math achievement of
19 all students in the school, but we do see relationships
20 with the reading and math growth of all students in the
21 school, which is our priority in the state of Colorado.
22 It's also -- it's more in line with our model, so we're
23 glad that it means the principals who are receiving
24 higher ratings have students in their school that are
25 showing more growth in reading and math on TCAP.



1 So we feel good about that. Again, those
2 -- I mean, those -- the statistics, the correlation
3 coefficients aren't gigantic, but they are in the right
4 direction and they are statistically significant. So
5 this is an indication, basically of validity. That the
6 rubric has some validity, which is a great.

7 So moving over to the teacher survey
8 responses, we have surveys in a couple of different
9 forms. We have the bi-annual TELL survey, which just
10 happened in 2013. The TELL survey contains a bunch of
11 questions. I basically went through and picked out
12 questions that are specific to school leadership and
13 there are just a few questions that are specific to
14 teacher evaluation. And again, we see a positive
15 correlation between principal's ratings on our rubric,
16 and teacher's responses on the TELL survey.

17 And then looking at an additional survey,
18 this is the Colorado Teacher Perception Survey, which was
19 developed by our partners at the Colorado Legacy
20 Foundation. It's a survey that's designed to be aligned
21 to our rubric, so it's not surprising that those are
22 highly correlated, but the important thing is that
23 basically teachers in the school are in line with the
24 principal's evaluator. All right? So principals who
25 receive higher ratings from their superintendent are also



1 kind of receiving higher ratings from there to the
2 teachers in their school. And that correlation is .37,
3 which is a pretty good correlation for education
4 research. So we -- we feel good about that. These again
5 -- these are all just kind of early indications of
6 validity and alignment with the multiple measures in our
7 system. So it's all -- it's all good news.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is this a survey that
9 everybody's going to get from now on? Or was this just
10 designed for the pilots?

11 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair? It was
12 designed and piloted in the pilot districts, but it is
13 available for all districts to use.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is it recommended?

15 MS. WILKENFELD: I believe it is
16 recommended by the Colorado Legacy Foundation. We are
17 supporting it. I mean, there's a student perception
18 survey and a teacher perception survey that we were both
19 developed through very rigorous survey development
20 processes, so we feel confident in supporting them. But
21 they're technically provided through the Colorado Legacy
22 Foundation.

23 Okay, so just a summary of what we've
24 talked about today. We -- just like with the teacher
25 survey -- or with the teacher rubric, we see that the



1 rubric and evaluators differentiate between principals
2 and between multiple aspects of school leadership. The
3 majority of principals maintain or improve their
4 performance in year two, which we feel really good about.
5 And we can basically continue to find evidence for
6 reliability and validity, if we know that we have a lot
7 of work to do on the reliability that pertains to
8 interrater agreement, but there are other kinds of
9 reliability. Kind of some boring statistics, which will
10 be in the full report, if they're -- if you're interested
11 in them. But they are really high, they are really good,
12 so we -- so on that kind of reliability, we are really
13 meeting the bar. And we also have indications that -- we
14 have evidence for validity in the system. And fairness.
15 So all of the things that we think are important and
16 helps us to kind of (indiscernible) to the field.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I add one thing?
20 Just to the Board's question on the survey, actually for
21 principals, one of their required measures of feedback is
22 teacher feedback in some way, shape or form. That
23 feedback does not have to be in the survey, but we
24 thought as a part of the state model system, we would
25 provide some tools to support gathering teacher feedback.



1 The TELL survey is a statewide survey that we've always
2 said that that's one option that you can use. But we
3 knew that the TELL survey only happens every other year
4 and so we worked in partnership with the Legacy
5 Foundation to develop this survey that they could use
6 either on off years, or choose to use as one of their
7 ways to get feedback.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And the corr-, well,
9 let's get to the end of it and --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are at the end.
11 We are there.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So now -- Angelika, do
13 you have any questions?

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, since I've been --
15 since I've been really bad, I would like to have my
16 colleagues have a shot at it before I get to the rest of
17 my questions.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

19 MS. NEAL: The rest of --

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think Dr. Scheffel
21 had questions she was holding, so Deb, please go ahead.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She's well behaved in
23 that department.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: So thank you for the
25 presentations. Can you speak again -- you may have



1 already addressed this, but who evaluates the principals
2 again? And I haven't re-read the rules, I'm sure it's in
3 there. But just, who evaluates?

4 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

6 MS. WILKENFELD: For principals it would
7 be -- in smaller districts it's the superintendent, and
8 the larger districts, it's an area or instructional
9 superintendent. And then for assistant principals, it's
10 their principal who evaluates them.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: So the area or instruction
12 superintendent -- what does that mean? If I'm a
13 superintendent in a rural area, I would go to a colleague
14 in another district? I mean, in another -- yeah,
15 district, and have them evaluate me?

16 MS. WILKENFELD: My -- Mr. Chair, sorry,
17 my understanding is that in the larger districts it's not
18 possible for every single principal to report to the
19 superintendent, so there are like, sub-superintendents
20 and sometimes they are based on elementary or secondary
21 level, and sometimes they're based on the geographic
22 location. Was that your question?

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, that helps. And then
24 you mentioned -- you alluded to this, that the teachers
25 get to also evaluate. So what's part of that pie? You



1 have one person evaluating you, and then you are also
2 asked to get teacher feedback? Or what else goes into
3 that holistic evaluation?

4 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

6 MS. WILKENFELD: The teacher survey
7 responses, or kind of unofficial teacher feedback needs
8 to be incorporated somehow. It's up to individual
9 districts to decide how. So it could either be what we
10 call artifacts -- they could show evidence for certain
11 elements that they -- if they are showing certain kinds
12 of leadership as evidenced by teacher's say in this about
13 them. So it could be to get -- to get credit for a
14 professional practice. Or it could be an actual
15 different piece of the pie. So instead of half of the
16 pie being the standards that we've talked about, they
17 could (indiscernible) those up and add a piece of pie
18 that would be teacher survey results.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: And as far as student
20 achievement then, student achievement is just correlated
21 with some of the responses, but it's not an actual piece
22 of their evaluation, right? Like it is with the
23 teachers? Are principals held accountable for student
24 achievement directly or indirectly through correlation?

25 MS. WILKENFELD: Yeah. Mr. Chair? So we



1 are only talking about one half of the pie today. That's
2 the professional practice side. That's the rubric.
3 That's through evaluation and then teacher feedback can
4 be incorporated into that half. We've not talked about
5 the other half, which is student achievement. And so
6 these -- these outcomes are just validating the rubric.
7 So when we talked about what we want to see, is we want
8 to see that half -- that rubric correlate with results so
9 that they are all pointing in the same direction, but
10 they do not replace that. There is a whole other section
11 of the pie that will be a whole range of measures.
12 Oftentimes they're using measures from the state
13 summative assessments. They may be using local measures,
14 school performance framework kinds of things. So they
15 create that pie with actual outcome measures.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: So right now there is kind
17 of a modest correlation of the performance on the rubric
18 with student achievements, so your sense is you're
19 probably heading in the right direction in which you
20 continue to flesh that out, right? Okay, then my final
21 question is: On this two-pager on the back, the two last
22 items provides an accurate assessment of my performance
23 results and improves student growth. It seems like
24 whoever filled this out said that only 58 percent
25 currently think that this evaluation system provides an



1 accurate assessment, and only 44 percent think it results
2 in improved student growth. So is that right? Am I
3 interpreting that right?

4 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair? Yes, that is
5 correct.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: It just seems kind of low
7 and I'm wondering what -- what the plan is to bring that
8 up?

9 MS. WILKENFELD: Right, I mean, of course
10 we would prefer it to be higher, but what we're happy
11 about is that they think -- they are more likely to say
12 that about this system than their old system. So even
13 though they are not convinced -- or they are not all
14 convinced that this system provides an accurate
15 assessment of their performance, they think it's more on
16 track than the original system that their district had.

17 We also know -- we hear from teachers and
18 principals that we can't capture what they do in their
19 schools. Right? We can't capture the magic, we can't
20 capture everything. And that's true. We -- you know, the
21 rubric is already long, we're trying to shorten it. All
22 right so it's -- it's -- for many reasons it's not
23 possible to capture all of the good work that happens in
24 schools. What we're trying to do is just our best job
25 capturing that. But there will always be people that say



1 that we can't -- we can't fully capture what they do.

2 And in terms of resulting in improved student growth,

3 they haven't seen that evidence yet, so it's -- it's --

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Premature.

5 MS. WILKENFELD: It's premature, yeah.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any questions? I've
8 got questions.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I have questions, but --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, let me take a
11 couple since you've had several.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Go.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So the first one is
14 kind of a question within the tool and it centers around
15 the instructional leadership piece. You know, what's the
16 meaning of that? What's the takeaway? What's the
17 action? What value comes down to that? At this point I
18 realize this is just a pilot, but none the less, I would
19 think that that might point us towards usefulness in the
20 future.

21 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

23 MS. WILKENFELD: So for us, and for me as
24 the data person, what I want to do is just dig into the
25 rubric and make sure first that the findings are not a



1 reflection of the rubric. So for instance, that -- that
2 the professional practices within instructional
3 leadership aren't more rigorous than the professional
4 practices in the other standards. So that's the first
5 step, is making sure that it's not a rubric issue.

6 The second step is making sure it's not an
7 evaluator issue. Right, that that -- that they don't
8 fully understand this part of the rubric or that they are
9 being harsher on this part of the rubric for whatever
10 reason. And then once we get past those two steps, then
11 the next kind of conclusion is that, well, this really is
12 where our leaders struggle the most in the state of
13 Colorado. And if that's the case, then what are we doing
14 to provide supports to lift them up in instruction?
15 Because obviously that's the core of what we need to be
16 doing in schools. And we -- so if we -- so once we get
17 to that point, then it's a bigger conversation on what --
18 what kind of support we're providing, what kind of
19 professional development is needed both at teacher and
20 principal level, because like Jill said, we saw this at
21 both levels.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So at this point, what
23 is your perspective on that validation of the tool? Is
24 that rubric on that issue sufficient?

25 MS. WILKENFELD: So I -- Mr. Chair?



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

2 MS. WILKENFELD: We haven't dug into the
3 principal professional practices yet. We just finished
4 digging into the teacher professional practices. And
5 because there are 400 of them and I looked at kind of a
6 slew of variables, I'm honestly just still digging into
7 that, so I don't -- I don't have an informed answer. So
8 I'd hate to just kind of --

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So we've got to
10 validate this tool?

11 MS. WILKENFELD: For sure. And
12 continually. I mean, not just during the pilot. We will
13 probably need to do this every year for many years.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, I think
16 that that's one of the -- you're seeing some of why
17 districts have opted into using the model system, because
18 to -- for each district to go through this kind of
19 research to validate their tools, ensure validity and
20 relia-, it's takes a lot of work and it doesn't stop.
21 You're constantly doing it to make sure that you're --
22 your tool is doing what you think it's doing. That said,
23 I think the early indicators are really positive and
24 we've made a lot of changes to the rubric to try to
25 address some of the duplication. We found duplication,



1 we found confusion with the term "not evident", so we
2 changed to "basic". We changed the way that functioned.
3 I think we're going to see a better distribution this
4 year because of that. But I would also say, just some of
5 it, for me -- so I'm not going to be the data person.

6 As I look at it and see, hey, am I that
7 surprised that principals are really showing strong on
8 managerial leaders? And they are not showing that strong
9 on instructional leadership? It doesn't surprise me.
10 And it also says, when we're asking folks to go out and
11 be instructional leaders, you should be spending 80
12 percent of your time in the classroom giving feedback to
13 teachers, and they say, how can I do that? You have all
14 of these other things that I have to go do, and my
15 comfort zone is over here in managerial; it all really
16 connects with where we are. And it connects with this
17 transition that we're trying to help our leaders from
18 being managerial leaders to instructional leaders. What
19 kinds of supports do you need? Maybe you need different
20 types of people in those roles. What kinds of things did
21 districts take on? What kinds of things did the state
22 take away to free up our leaders to be instructional
23 leaders.

24 So to me it has all of those implications
25 and that's where we're spending a lot of time of trying



1 to map that out as a team to support making that
2 transition happen.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Which segues into kind
4 of my next line of questioning, which was about the tool.
5 The usefulness of the tool. You know, what -- what can
6 we do with this? What are the -- what are the
7 capabilities of it? And I guess I'd start that area of
8 questioning, kind of just asking, what's the preliminary
9 cost benefit analysis on this thing? Does it -- is it
10 ponderous and burdensome? Or is it valuable for the
11 effort that you put into it? And what kind of -- are you
12 taking feedback on that issue? And what is that feedback
13 sounding like? It sounds like it might be somewhat
14 questionable.

15 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

17 MS. WILKENFELD: The answer to all of
18 those questions is "yes". It is onerous. It's -- it's a
19 lot of work that they have never had to do, but it's also
20 worth it. I mean, we hear both from the field on a
21 consistent basis. That it's, you know, this is too much,
22 we have all these other things going on, but this is the
23 right thing to do. So what we're doing on our end is
24 just continuing to run analysis to see where there are
25 redundancies; where we can shorten it.



1 We also know that like with -- with any
2 new process, the more you do it, the faster you get, the
3 easier that it gets. That -- that doesn't appease people
4 very much, obviously, because it feels like a lot right
5 now. It's just one of many things that they're dealing
6 with. But we do hear across the board that it's worth
7 the time. it's just -- they don't have time.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, and that's
9 probably the diplomatic response, but I think the value
10 response is found in this maybe better than what we had
11 before, but still only six out of ten are saying this is
12 bringing an accurate assessment of who I am, and four out
13 of ten are saying this is actually improving student
14 growth. So it's a pretty steep hill in terms of the
15 response to: Is this worth the effort or not? I -- I'd
16 say that is a big and looming question, based on the data
17 that you're brining. Now, so -- and I offer you the
18 opportunity to respond to that assertion.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I think
22 you're right and I think to -- to Britt's point earlier,
23 that those -- those two pieces that are talking -- that
24 are at the end there, I think -- I think we're still
25 early. The anecdotal pieces that we've gotten have



1 (indiscernible) that they feel like these conversations
2 with teachers and with their own supervisors are more
3 meaningful than they have ever had before. We are
4 tracking -- this is sort of a summary sheet of the survey
5 data that they are looking at. We are also tracking some
6 of the time burden pieces that we're still digging into
7 right now.

8 But we have seen pretty substantial growth
9 in the answer to that question around, yes, they will
10 rate very high time burden, but they will also say that
11 when we did into all of the reasons why, that they think
12 that it's the right work, and that they would like to
13 keep doing the work. I think --

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, is there a
15 question that gives them the opportunity to say: In
16 relation to all of the things that I do in my job, in
17 relation to all of the things that I do that I think
18 brings value to the classroom and promotes student
19 achievement, this fits into that equation at this point.
20 In this way. Are they given an opportunity not to
21 respond -- because I would, you know, yeah, boss, I get
22 it. This tool you've given me, it's difficult, it's
23 challenging, but boy, I think it helps me in the context
24 of just the tool. But in the context of my job, you know
25 what, quite frankly, I will give a one out of ten on this



1 one. Are you giving an opportunity for that response in
2 the context of their job as the leader of a building?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, we can
4 certainly -- we can certainly ask it that way. It's not
5 asked that way right now in the survey, but we're happy
6 to --

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, I'm not demanding
8 it, I'm just saying, don't you think that would be a
9 useful question?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that would be
11 a useful question. I think there's a couple of things
12 too that I would share. One is, obviously we'd love them
13 to love it the minute they have it, but most people don't.
14 I mean, when you're asked to change and change your role,
15 it doesn't feel good. It doesn't feel comfortable. And
16 it's -- it's still messy. There is still, we agree it
17 doesn't have all of the interrater agreement, you know,
18 the things still need to be tightened. These are people
19 who agreed to play with us in the pilot while it's
20 changing on them. I mean, we'd send them revisions, you
21 know. So it's hard being in a pilot. So some of it is
22 also like, I mean, this has been a lot of hey, we signed
23 up for this, but it's still difficult. So we also wanted
24 to see, are we growing? Did it get better than the first
25 year for them? And it did.



1 So we're going to see some of these -- to
2 me, they were somewhat to be expected data for change.
3 Most people aren't going to be happy when they are in the
4 middle of a change process for you to ask them about it.
5 Most people I think in corporate sector aren't happy
6 about saying they love their evaluation process. You
7 know, it just -- none of us like to be evaluated. That
8 said, when we go -- so we can certainly ask that
9 question, and you look at the overall range of the value
10 of this activity. We -- we should ask that, and how do
11 you rate it.

12 I would say though, from the research and
13 we've pulled together some of the metanalysis on things
14 like achievement gap and what are the big drivers of
15 that. And the people who are doing it well, are doing
16 this kind of work. They are in the classroom, they are
17 providing feedback. They are giving teachers
18 constructive, helpful responses. And if we're going to
19 try to move people to the activities where the research
20 shows, makes the biggest difference. I would be
21 concerned of throwing it out too quickly before we've
22 been able to reach that point.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And that segues to my
24 next question, and I will come back to you. It has to do
25 with this idea of one size fits all. I'm suspecting that



1 in the places where you're seeing the benefits that you
2 just saw, that the division of labor is probably greater.
3 That there -- that there are bigger districts, that they
4 have more resources in terms of more people to play more
5 roles, and therefore they are able to gain value out of
6 something as complex and ponderous as this would seem to
7 everyone, but would seem especially to a smaller district
8 where -- where they are more time constrained, where they
9 have a broader array of responsibilities, so on and so
10 forth.

11 So my question is: Is -- under this
12 heading of one size fits all, is there a way to -- to get
13 the salient pieces of this in a condensed or more
14 manageable version for environments that are not so
15 capable of handling such a large administrative burden?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So a couple things.
19 So of the actually interesting thing about some of this
20 research is that it's actually been in small charter
21 schools with the charter management organization, where
22 they have sort of some support for their tools, but then
23 it's just implemented with incredible fidelity in those
24 buildings. So we see it in small settings.

25 Anecdotally, some of ours, we just had



1 brought all of this sort of -- Robert's group of
2 superintendents together, and Scott Mader (ph) is in a
3 small district. He's been one of the pilots -- he's been
4 ornery, you know, pushed back as he should, and gotten
5 frustrated with us. And so when we asked what's working
6 -- and he was the one who puts 191 up there -- he said, I
7 know this is hard. And he actually said, and I have to
8 be specific, it's the gross stuff. Like, we're having
9 conversations that we've never had, and we don't have it
10 right. And it's hard. And we don't have all the
11 support, but this is the right work. That was very
12 affirming to hear it from someone with such low capacity
13 from a district support standpoint.

14 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair, if I may too --

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure, sure.

16 MR. HAMMOND: Jill is exactly right. You
17 know, you have to be - this is valuable information, but
18 I think you're going to see a change over time because
19 it's -- as I watch this unravel -- and Marcia, you've
20 been out there, with a lot in your area, watching this as
21 well. It's like a snowball. It's just growing, and it's
22 growing and it's growing. And people at first -- this is
23 a pain and they don't want to understand it. And when
24 they finally get there and understand it, then they start
25 liking it and quite frankly I'm getting great feedback



1 from the smaller districts.

2 It is amazing, and it's time and time
3 again, not only for people like Scott Mader, who when I
4 was in the Pike's Peak area, some of the smaller
5 superintendents -- and I never thought I'd see that --
6 who were saying, when they were looking at their
7 principals, I knew when I observed and I saw this stuff,
8 that yeah, that probably shouldn't be. But that's the
9 way they've always done it. But after really taking it
10 back to the rubrics and looking at -- and going through
11 everything, it's like a lightbulb went off. And I said,
12 oh my gosh, that's so wrong. That is not going to get us
13 where we need to go. And they are hard discussions.

14 And it's much like even -- when you and I
15 have talked -- with Douglas County and their system that
16 they're trying to do. You know, it's so different, okay?
17 It's getting people who used to -- I mean, it's so
18 different. And it causes to have so many hard
19 conversations. Because what it ultimately is doing is
20 changing instructional practices in the classroom. And
21 that's what will drive achievement more than anything.
22 So I mean, as much as the numbers -- I would never say I
23 learned that in his business, trust me. Nobody trusts
24 anybody in (indiscernible) anymore, but anyway, I have to
25 say that give it time. Because I think you're going to



1 see the snowball -- more and more and more. And just --
2 it's the time we're in sometimes. People have been very
3 honest about that. But we just continually have to see
4 the evidence that it's growing, people like it, and don't
5 throw it out.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'll make a feedback
7 summary comment. As this changes the conversation, as
8 this aligns thinking and causes thinking to turn toward
9 how does this improve student learning, there's no doubt
10 there's value in it. The question is, you know, the --
11 is there a quicker, more efficient, better way for us to
12 get to that value? And that's -- when I'm pushing on you
13 like this, it's simply to challenge you to be the
14 incredibly brilliant professionals that you can be. It's
15 not to say, oh, let's get the baby out with the bathwater
16 -- or the bathwater out with the baby, or however the
17 commissioner says that, I never get that straight. I
18 used to know that saying, but now he's gotten me
19 confused. It's under the idea of improving the effort.

20 So I'll tie off my comments there.

21 Angelika had a question.

22 MS. NEAL: No, I'm --

23 (Indiscernible -- many speaking over each other)

24 MS. SCHROEDER: This is not a question on
25 data, this relates to what Paul's been saying --



1 MS. NEAL: So does mine.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, Angelika, you can

3 --

4 (Indiscernible -- talking over each other)

5 MS. NEAL: I'm going to put the horse
6 before the cart. No, that really wasn't, I just had to
7 think of that. I think sometimes that we overestimate
8 the data, and underestimate the high expectation part of
9 it. And I always think of Willard Baggett, one of my
10 favorite people, who talked about the principal being the
11 clerk in the works, and that's what our principals had
12 generally tended to be. Also think about that Colorado
13 succeeds (indiscernible) and Susan Martinez, Hannah --

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And New Mexico.

15 MS. NEAL: And -- and she traveled around
16 the state that first year and just talked about how bad
17 they were. I mean, I'm sure she didn't do it that way,
18 but -- they didn't do anything, except that she went
19 around and talked to them about high expectations and
20 their scores went up that first year that she was there,
21 and they hadn't done anything. And so I think -- and
22 having come from the profession and knowing the
23 principals and it's no surprise that the elementary
24 principals, you know, scored a little higher, because the
25 expectations of many -- not all -- you can never put them



1 all in one big heap and say they are all there. But the
2 expectations particularly of middle and high school
3 principals were not high expectations. They were the
4 clerk of the works and they hired and fired, and if it
5 was really bad, they'd go in -- or really good -- but
6 they'd -- there was never that expectation. And that's
7 what's out there now.

8 And I know it's slow, and I know it's
9 hard, and I know we don't have all the data to make
10 everybody happy, but I think I we overestimate the
11 importance of data, and underestimate the importance of
12 high expectations. And that's what I see this movement
13 is all about. That suddenly somebody comes into your
14 room and you know they are expecting you to do better.
15 And you do.

16 So I would -- I -- I know and Angelika
17 both like numbers, but there's sometimes when you just
18 can't have the numbers for a -- for a while. It's not
19 like you don't, because that's part of our problem.
20 Before we didn't measure much of anything. And now I
21 know some people think we are measuring way too much.
22 But I just think that everything you say, you know, that
23 they are kind of compliant, and they are kind of ripe and
24 they are kind of -- what are you doing -- but the -- you
25 are seeing -- you are seeing improvement, and I think



1 you'll continue to see improvement -- I hope so. So
2 anyway, I just wanted to add that to what Paul was
3 saying.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So I won't start with the
6 number questions. But philosophically, there is -- there
7 is a tension between: Is the principal the principle
8 instructor in the school, or is the principal a manager?

9 MS. NEAL: That's what I said: A clerk of
10 the works.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: That is exactly what you
12 just referred to. And so if as a principal you believe
13 that you are the system manager, you don't own
14 responsibility for student growth. You defer that to
15 your teachers. And you say they're responsible for that,
16 it's just my job to manage everything. And that's pretty
17 much how our system, to a large extent, has worked, which
18 is why we've been able to hire non-traditional, very
19 effective principals. Now what we're saying is that
20 you're also the principal instructional leader in the
21 building, which means that you can go into a classroom
22 and that you can help to coach teachers to become better.

23 And therein lies the tension, I think, and
24 the frustration among many principals who didn't sign on
25 to assume responsibility for student growth scores. And



1 I get that. And I think, Paul, that's where some of the
2 rub and some of the resistance lies because they still
3 don't feel that that's what they should be responsible
4 for. And we've -- our legislature has been pushing that
5 and saying, you're also responsible for that, in that we
6 want you to help your teachers be better. And that means
7 that in the process of feedback, you better be very
8 specific or you better create a system where teachers
9 help each other. It's not necessarily required,
10 especially in a larger system, to actually be the one to
11 do the coaching, but you better provide the coaching,
12 because that's where you're going to see the improvement.
13 That's --

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Which resurfaces my one
15 size fits all question.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: That's the philosophical
17 rub. And I don't think there's necessarily a one size
18 fits all solution. But there is an expectation that
19 everyone gets better at what they do, particularly at the
20 classroom level, so that kids improve.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Absolutely. And this
22 is a good conversation, I really enjoy the energy -- all
23 three. It -- there may be different methods within a
24 school, of getting the student learning, which is what
25 this is all about. And if we're forcing down a system



1 that says it's A, B, C, D, E, F, G, guys, do it that way
2 or you're gonna be punished, then that may not be the
3 best method of getting what we're seeking, which is
4 student learning.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Right, and there's not --
6 there's not -- I don't think the system --

7 MS. NEAL: There's not a best way, I don't
8 think they do that --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: -- I don't think the
10 evaluation tool says there's only one way. The
11 evaluation tool says we want to see systemic change
12 improvement. You, principal, are also responsible for
13 having that happen. And whether you're capable to
14 provide that coaching that helps yourself --

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Provided we have tools
16 in place to give them the freedom to do it that way.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: And that's, I think, what
18 our staff is (indiscernible).

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I get it. And we're
20 reaching these levels of complexity that are ponderous,
21 it's the only word that I can -- I keep coming back to.
22 It's getting so complex --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's always been
24 complex, we just didn't get it.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, but we're forcing



1 additional complexity to an already complex situation.

2 Well, it's (indiscernible), but okay. So other

3 questions? Elaine? You haven't had a chance. Pam?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I'm still -- I'm --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, Angelika.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: -- nobody is letting me
7 ask my data questions.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: So if you would be kind
10 enough to go to -- actually Standard 1 is fine, although
11 I can't really see it on here. Here's what's gotten me a
12 little flummoxed, and I'm looking from the political --
13 from the communication vision. When I look at the four
14 elements, I see that -- oh God, I can't read this -- none
15 of them, in terms of the partially proficient, are less
16 than -- what is that? Ten percent or seven percent or
17 something. And yet when we consolidate it all because of
18 the weights, we make it look very, very high.

19 And so let me relate this to the criticism
20 that I've read in the press that even with the new
21 evaluation system, 97 percent teachers are proficient
22 because of some of the assumptions that we make in the
23 aggregations. And I'm not saying that I disagree with
24 you, but when I look at the element -- elements, I get
25 information that says quite a few folks -- quite a large,



1 significant percentage are not proficient in this area,
2 and that gets lost then in the aggregation because of the
3 way we're doing it in part.

4 So I would be grateful if you could think
5 about that, because I don't want the criticism-, the
6 public criticism to be, you know what, you really aren't
7 evaluating folks. You really -- but it's only in the
8 elements and probably even more so when we get down to
9 the rubrics, that we get the understand that you have and
10 that the rest of us can have. And so I worry about that
11 piece of it. And I don't know -- I don't know how to do
12 that. Whether we just give a 1, and do it based on pure
13 numbers and say, there's still 10 percent or 12 percent
14 in these particular areas. I don't have the solution
15 here. But I have the fear that we lose too much helpful
16 information, particularly to our school communities. But
17 also to our public as to whether we are really doing deep
18 evaluations. It's hard to say that when you get the
19 number down so small and everybody looks like they are
20 fantastic.

21 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

23 MS. WILKENFELD: I really appreciate your
24 comment. And as a fellow numbers person, I am much more
25 interested in taking a straight average, it's true to the



1 numbers. But what we found, which was actually planned
2 out by someone from one of our pilot districts, is that
3 when you do a straight average, you -- you're not giving
4 the benefit of the doubt to the -- in this case, the
5 principal, or to the teacher. So sometimes the math
6 works out that, you know, if they got 2 on Elements 1
7 through 1D. Let's say they got proficient, proficient
8 and then partially proficient, partially proficient. The
9 math would work out that their overall rating on Standard
10 1 would be partially proficient. And that didn't feel
11 very good.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: And that -- that part I'm
13 not criticizing. It's the -- it's the reporting piece
14 that I'm a little worried about. And I know that there
15 are going to be different areas where different
16 principals have weaknesses, so that makes it hard. But
17 I'm not sure we're -- we're being able to give the
18 message that we are doing some really deep work. So I
19 almost think it's more value here in reporting by the
20 elements out overall to the public, as opposed to just
21 the standards. So that we get a sense for: These are
22 the things we're looking for in our principals. Here are
23 -- and I think when you did some of the correlations, you
24 did some of them by elements, which is what was the --
25 what is the important piece of this? So that's one of my



1 data questions. I just want you to think about it. I
2 don't know that -- do you have an answer?

3 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair. Well, the --
4 the piece -- the rules that were passed, authorized the
5 Department to collect standard level data. We are able
6 to collect this element level data because we have
7 specific MOUs with our pilots to be able to collect this.
8 But I think we are realizing the same thing you are
9 realizing, which is a lot of the richness is in the
10 element level data.

11 However, it is important to note that in
12 order to capture all of this element level data, it's a
13 much larger data burden for our districts. So we have
14 altered our HR collection to be at the standard level,
15 but we don't have the element level data. We will still
16 have this data from our pilots for the next few years,
17 but it is a -- that's one of those tradeoffs we have to
18 think about around public reporting and how much data
19 burden it requires of our districts to give us this type
20 of detailed data.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm going to say my
22 timing is off here, because it is going to be easier to do
23 these evaluations with -- with practice and experience,
24 et cetera. But ultimately I don't think we can stay where
25 we landed, because we're just going to get -- I don't



1 know, what the group? The new teacher -- I mean, we're
2 just going to get the same push over and over again,
3 which is that we're not really doing the deep evaluations
4 when our districts are -- when in fact, they are.

5 So I pretend that that's going to be a
6 problem if we commit to where we are. And I'm not sure
7 what the solution is, but this is going to make me worry,
8 because 98 percent of the teachers are going to be
9 fantastic yet again. We've kind of broken it out by
10 level, but I -- to really get good information, you've
11 got to go deeper.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm going to
13 challenge that, okay? Because if this is implemented
14 with fidelity in what everybody is trying to do, that's
15 not going to happen. I mean, you end up with 98 percent
16 of everybody being highly effective -- that's not how
17 this whole system is designed. And I understand the
18 challenges we've faced. We've been able to do a lot of
19 things in the pilot that we quite frankly don't have the
20 money. And if we had the money, well, everybody would
21 probably complain even more because it is an incredible
22 data burden.

23 Right now, I think we're seeing things and
24 trends -- I think people need to be patient in some
25 regards because it's going to take the time, and then if



1 it really does merit this, and once people get used to
2 it, then that may be an additional question we can ask
3 the funding for, if everybody agrees with it and we can
4 do it. We are just at that awkward time, and I really --
5 I mean, all of us are very cognizant of that and I think
6 the bill sponsors of this would be deeply upset if every
7 -- we went through all of this stuff and everybody is the
8 same. That would be tragic.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I know. And that's what
10 other states are finding, unfortunately.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, that's where
12 Colorado is going to be. And I have to say that. We've
13 worked hard enough that -- if that's where we are at,
14 that's tragic. I'm sorry, I'm just (indiscernible).

15 MS. SCHROEDER: So my other question is in
16 the area of Standard 6, I think, the external piece. I
17 know that school districts do a lot of parent surveys.
18 Does that come in to the evaluation? Is it part of our
19 model that we get feedback from students? Maybe, maybe
20 not in terms of the principal evaluation, but
21 particularly the community and parent surveys?

22 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

24 MS. WILKENFELD: Yes, it is part of the
25 model. I'm sorry, I don't know off-hand if it's



1 required, but I believe it is written that maybe it's a
2 "might" or I don't know legalese, but that it would
3 include family and community input.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

5 MS. WILKENFELD: For our principal's
6 evaluation.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, because I was --
8 again, not seeing the rubric, I didn't know what it was
9 that you were looking for, but I would seem that -- I
10 would think that that would be a piece of the question
11 is: Does anybody know who your principal is, kind of
12 thing.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll pass
14 (indiscernible).

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane, question?

16 MS. GOFF: No -- well, sort of. Back to
17 the previous conversation about the concern that's of a
18 potential about never having those top two rankings
19 change, or having those always at a high level. I would
20 think within districts and within school buildings, a
21 district picture as a whole and a state, but looking at
22 the -- how the -- what's the change over time in the
23 basic to proficient?

24 I think there would be more story, there
25 is more rich anecdotal narrative, which oftentimes takes



1 the place of data any day, to talk about. Where people
2 can say, you know, I've -- and where, when, all -- anyone
3 who's getting evaluated moves into a much more even
4 comfort zone without talking about these things. And I
5 believe that's going to happen because of the tool. The
6 tool opens up the doorways to allow this to happen. But
7 I would probably be -- I will be interested in watching
8 where those lower two move, or don't. And of course
9 that's going to impact what happens at the high end.

10 But I would say, as far as the public
11 communication -- and it's just -- it's really a matter
12 of, we get to a culture of comfort that allows the
13 stories to come out, and where everybody, whether it's a
14 classroom teacher being evaluated or an administrator,
15 can say, yeah, here's what I've -- here's what I've
16 learned. Here is how we did this. Here is how we moved
17 from this to this. That to me is the value of having at
18 least a tool that's a framework for the conversations.

19 I still go back to my -- my basic premise
20 in supporting this whole change, is based on what I knew
21 and heard and people I worked with over a lot of decades,
22 but also it's to continue talking and that's my last
23 philosophical (indiscernible). I'm saying, to me, the
24 data is often more telling and more powerful in the story
25 data, rather than the charts.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's good you
2 aggravate.

3 MS. GOFF: When you aggravate, you lose
4 information. Evident.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine? We're wrapping
6 up here.

7 MS. BERMAN: Listening to this
8 conversation -- and the lunch is very, very good, by the
9 way -- I mean, it just seems like we always go full
10 circle in education, because before we didn't have the
11 data and we relied entirely on subjective and stories
12 and, you know, that doesn't get you very far in making a
13 case. And now that we have the data, there's pushback
14 that there's too much data. So I think we should be
15 reflective historically about where we've come, and why
16 we are where we are today. It's probably a combination
17 of both. But not having the data makes it completely
18 subjective and then we're completely open to criticism
19 and so forth, so --

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, I agree
21 completely. I think that there's a creative tension in
22 this. In business we always approach things saying,
23 what's a good business reason for this? You know, why
24 exactly are we doing this? You know, how do we promote
25 the business (indiscernible) team? In education, I think



1 it needs to be, how does this improve student learning?
2 And as long as we've got a credible answer to how this
3 improves student learning, it's probably worth the
4 effort. But if we're creating things to become ponderous
5 for the sake of ponderousness, then we've lost our way.
6 And I'm not saying we have, I'm just challenging that we
7 not.

8 MS. BERMAN: My other comment is that if
9 you look at different disciplines, unfortunately
10 education historically has not had very good solid
11 research, and so we have been open to criticism. I mean,
12 I -- I, my other world is medicine where they do a superb
13 job at constantly having, you know, a control groups and
14 test groups and researching and re-researching.
15 Unfortunately sometimes the data contradicts each other.
16 Like, mammogram stuff that just came out. But I think
17 where in the past five years, the education world is just
18 starting to try to catch up to other disciplines in terms
19 of having good solid research.

20 So is it cumbersome? It may be because
21 we're not used to it. But is it good for the discipline
22 of education? It probably is. Is it more cumbersome
23 than other disciplines like medicine? I doubt it highly.
24 I just think that other disciplines are probably more
25 used to it and we're not. That if we're going to raise



1 the whole, you know, prestige and rigor of teachers and
2 principals and administrators, I think we've got to do
3 this and we've got to do it right. And I think that's
4 what CDE is trying to do.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika and then Pam,
6 and then we're out.

7 MS. NEAL: Angelika? Oh, Pam hasn't had a
8 chance.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: But it's hard to do --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam gets to wrap us up.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm just responding real
12 quickly to this. It's very hard to do a control study in
13 education. In fact, it's hard to do it in medicine. We
14 give placebos to sick people.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We do it all the
16 time.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I know that, but I'm
18 not there. My heart is not there. So the kind of
19 research we can do in education is somewhat challenging
20 because we're doing research on our kids' learning and
21 there is a sacrifice in that, and what a lot of us are
22 not willing to make. So that's one of the reasons we
23 have suffered from anecdotal in the past, because that's
24 the only thing we were comfortable with. We are now
25 looking at assessing kids and we have heard the level of



1 discomfort with that. So here we go.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Member Mazanec? The
3 alliteration is awesome.

4 MS. NEAL: There was a response over here
5 too.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Just rolls well, does it?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, it does. We'll
8 let Pam go, and then --

9 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I think that -- so
10 this is the 50 percent of evaluating the principals and
11 then we have the 50 percent of the model that is student
12 achievement. I think that in a way, this illustrates why
13 it's good, even though we hear a lot of comments about
14 how it's unfair to judge teachers based on student
15 achievement.

16 I look at these -- this rubric, and a lot
17 of it is very subjective. I mean, I -- you know, okay,
18 I'm from Douglas County and we have a lot of upheaval
19 there, and so I hear a lot of comments about how, you
20 know, some teacher or some principal is worthless from
21 one teacher. From another teacher they're the best thing
22 since sliced bread. So I look at these rubrics and we
23 still have a very subjective -- so I'm hoping, and I know
24 this is going to take time, but I'm hoping that we can
25 see a balanced picture by doing it this way, but I do



1 worry a little bit about the -- the danger of looking to
2 the community as if it's like lake woebegone. Despite
3 whatever is happening in student's achievement, all of
4 our principals and teachers are above average.

5 You know, when you have those numbers like
6 97 percent, and that -- that's not to say that it might
7 not be true. There might be other -- but I -- this goes
8 back to my notion that all children can learn and we can
9 find a way to increase their achievement. So that's it.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other comments? Or are
11 we done?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we're done.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We're done. So then
14 let's wrap this up by saying, from the State Board of
15 Education where all the women are strong, the men are
16 good looking, and all the children are above average. We
17 will wrap up this conversation.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

19 MS. NEAL: Thank you very much for all
20 your work.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you, yes.
22 Alright, we're going to take a break and then we come
23 back for lunch and the study session.

24 (Meeting adjourned)

25



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 May, 2019.

/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