



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO

May 12, 2016, Part 3, Weighting Framework

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 12, 2016, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Steven Durham (R), Chairman
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Joyce Rankin (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 MS. LISA: Have a survey that went out
2 with the -- with the report and that's due back May 27th
3 because you want to get it back in time to be able to
4 look through that -- through the responses and make sure
5 we can share those with you at the June meeting. We're
6 also doing focus groups, and trainings, and office hours
7 with district. So we've been -- this has been the week
8 for Colorado Springs. We've had staff down there Monday,
9 Tuesday, and then tomorrow doing trainings with educators
10 down there.

11 We've got a Metro training that I'm doing
12 tomorrow. We've got a training on Grand Junction
13 tomorrow, and then we've got more next week. We've got
14 office hours, we're doing webinar. I think there was a
15 webinar yesterday, I can't remember when we ended it, but
16 we're just trying to get people oriented. We put out a
17 guidance document -- like a four page guidance document
18 to help with the interpretation of the report of where
19 it's at, and then the survey as well, and the survey
20 reports too.

21 So we're trying to support everybody in
22 understanding what this is, and being able to give us
23 feedback on it. And we will take all that feedback we're
24 getting, and share that with you all at the June meeting,
25 so that any revisions, anything that people are concerned



1 about like the graduation rate targets we talked about,
2 and we have some proposed solutions for you. So our
3 goals for the day, we want to talk about the options for
4 determining weights of performance indicators and Marie
5 ran a bunch of data.

6 We'll walk through with you to help you with
7 that, and we want to discuss the options for determining
8 the cut points for the ratings. We talked about that
9 last month. We wanna kind of, just make sure we heard
10 the right thing from you last month. Provide you a
11 little bit more information about how those cut points
12 work with the ESSA and then see where you are or at.
13 Both these points, we're going to need to finalize the
14 June meeting. If you guys decide you're at a place that
15 you feel confident with today and some of these, you
16 could decide them today, but by June in order for us to
17 get the frameworks out in the fall, we need -- we need to
18 know by the June meeting.

19 And then, based on the feedback -- public
20 comment yesterday, around the combined subgroup and the
21 letter you all got, we're going to stop in the middle, in
22 a place where it fits in very well in this presentation,
23 and talk through what that change was. We talked through
24 it a little bit last month, but I'll draw it up on the
25 board. Show you guys what that -- what that's about, and



1 talk about the rationale, and see where you want to go
2 from there. Okay. So I'm going to turn it over to Marie
3 now to talk about the indicator weights and then she'll
4 walk through that. We'll have -- we can stop after that
5 section, have some conversation and feedback, and then
6 we'll do the final section around the -- the ratings and
7 the cut scores there.

8 MS. MARIA: Thanks Lisa. All right. So to
9 continue the conversation about indicator weights that we
10 started the last meeting, we're sort of getting into the
11 question of how much weight should be given to each
12 performance indicator? Then based upon some of the
13 confusion that I saw from last time, we decided that we
14 would actually get a little bit more background and some
15 type of what is a performance indicator.

16 The performance indicators are the major
17 categories that schools and districts are held
18 accountable for. So that's Academic Achievement,
19 Academic Growth, Postsecondary Workforce Readiness. To
20 get into more of the details, the Achievement Indicator,
21 it indicates a school or district's average level of
22 student mastery of the Colorado Academic Standards. So
23 the scores which we use mean scale score, and that's what
24 we're planning to do for this fall, include the English
25 Language Arts, both CMAS part and then the CoAlt DLM.



1 That's the alternate assessment, Mathematics and in
2 Science with -- for CMAS and for CoAlt. So as a status
3 measure, achievement is highly correlated with poverty
4 rates and other student demographic characteristics.
5 Just keep that in mind as we sort of go through this --
6 this discussion of weighing things. So then we also have
7 an Academic Growth Indicator which indicates the average
8 amount of progress students have made compared --
9 compared to their academic peer group.

10 So we use the Median Growth Percentile as
11 it's been a big thing in Colorado, something we highly
12 value. We have a Growth Percentile for English Language
13 Arts, also for CMAS part, Mathematics, and then English
14 Language Proficiency. That's how to read access
15 assessment. So this growth measure is not correlated
16 with skewed demographic characteristics like poverty
17 rates. It really is a measure of how much is school is
18 impacting students learning from over a year's time and
19 then the final indicator performance frameworks is
20 Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.

21 So this has three components to it. The
22 first one is the Average Composite Colorado ACT score.
23 It's required to be a nationally recognized college
24 entrance exam and so for 2017, we'll be transitioning to
25 the SAT -- for that measure but we still have sort of



1 that -- that national benchmark for college entrance. We
2 also have been using the best of the four, five, six, or
3 seven-year graduation rates, and so that's pretty much
4 the proportion of students meeting both midterm and
5 graduation requirements.

6 And then the final sub-indicator in PWR is
7 dropout rate, which is the proportion of students in
8 grades 9 through 12 or 7 through 12 for districts that
9 have been quoted as dropouts in the prior year. I mean
10 as Lisa had mentioned, we've gotten some feedback about
11 some of the targets that we've proposed for -- for the
12 PWR indicator, and so we're going to -- we have to
13 revisit those, and reconsider them a little bit.

14 But just to sort of give you again the
15 grounding in the performance framework and all the pieces
16 of it and then I forgot, of course there's one more,
17 which just matriculation rate, that would still. It's
18 not yet sort -- ingrained in my brain. So matriculation
19 rate, for the first time this year, we are having of the
20 students that graduated in the prior year. This is the
21 percent that had enrolled in a two-year college, enrolled
22 in a four-year college were enrolled in a Career and
23 Technical Education Program, and also includes students
24 who have completed two-year in CTE programs during high
25 school as well. So this is -- this is our Postsecondary



1 Success Measure.

2 And then the state requirements, you know,
3 around waiting for these indicators is a State Board rule
4 which says that we shall place the greatest emphasis upon
5 the longitudinal growth into Postsecondary Workforce
6 Readiness -- for Readiness in Performance indicators. So
7 that has been a value of the State Board of CDE in
8 previous years that measuring student progress in
9 attaining content knowledge, and then measuring students
10 readiness to go to college have been, sort of our key
11 values. So just to let you know that.

12 And then in ESSA, we also have the
13 accountability system. The state must be tribute
14 substantial weight to each of the required achievement
15 growth in PWR indicators and then greater weighting must
16 be given to the aggregate of the achievement growth in
17 PWR indicators as compared to the measures of school
18 quality or student success. So based upon sort of what
19 the fed -- new federal guidance has laid out, there's a
20 lot of flexibility for us in how we choose to weight, you
21 know, achieving growth PWR. And then once we have this
22 available next year hopefully, that other indicator of
23 student success or school quality, which is to sort of
24 give you that background. And --

25 MS. LISA: So just to help you all in terms



1 of timing, we're asking about weightings for Achievement
2 Growth and Postsecondary Workforce Readiness. Now, when
3 we get ESSA incorporated and have that other indicator of
4 school quality or student success, then we'll have to
5 come back and talk about the weightings again because
6 that will come in handy, and that one just can't wait
7 more than the aggregate of the other three together. But
8 we'll just -- just know you'll get to have a similar
9 conversation again, once we figure out what that
10 indicator should be or measure should be for that
11 indicator.

12 MS. MARIA: It's still in the work, so it'll
13 be a little while. But just sort of to give you context
14 for what previously have had in the weightings for the
15 performance frameworks, from 2010 to 2014, elementary
16 middle schools weighted about 75 percent growth. I do
17 want to stress though that this included adequate growth
18 and good growth gaps measures. So it's kind of an
19 inflated version of growth -- it really wasn't actually
20 75 percent of points were directly from growth measures,
21 it was a little bit less than that, but it's hard to
22 quantify exactly how much.

23 But just in -- in -- since we're moving
24 forward and we're no longer having growth gaps indicator,
25 I just wanted to show you, sort of, you know, what --



1 what growth as opposed to the whole of the pie. And so
2 75 percent growth, 25 percent achievement, and then for
3 high schools, it was 50 percent growth, 35 percent
4 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness, and 15 percent
5 achievement. So this is kind of what we previously had
6 in the past.

7 And just sort of things to keep in mind,
8 we're thinking about weighting, Achievement Measures are
9 correlate -- are correlated with the demographic
10 characteristics of school student population, but growth
11 does not correlate with demographic characteristics, so a
12 lot of times districts feel that it's more fair to them
13 to look at their growth over their achievement results.
14 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness tend to be more highly
15 correlated -- correlated with demographics. So they also
16 depend on level determinations and values because
17 individual districts get to set their own graduation
18 requirements.

19 And then, this process is important for me.
20 The process of assigning weights, it's really about
21 balancing sort of the underlying values associated with
22 each of those indicators. So achievement growth with PWR
23 and as we want them to relate to our statewide system
24 accountability and how we want, you know, to represent
25 our school in our districts and give credit for their



1 progress with their students, their achievement of their
2 students, you know, getting their students enrolled in
3 college. All of these kinds of things. You have to kind
4 of, you know, balancing act to try to find what feels
5 comfortable for -- for you guys. And so for the proposed
6 framework changes, I just mentioned previously, but just
7 to reiterate that -- the growth measure previously
8 included adequate growth and heavy weighting, 50 percent
9 to 75 percent was good in this metric.

10 And so with the -- the changes, we are now
11 removing adequate growth. So it's important to sort of
12 reconsider the weightings that we have for the entire
13 system and then how that plays out without that adequate
14 growth components. And we also have made a pretty
15 significant change in that in the past, the achievement
16 metric had included only sort of all students group. So
17 it was on the aggregate of all students and now, the
18 proposed framework will include the disaggregated
19 subgroup achievement information. So the combined
20 subgroup. And this is where we're going to try to step
21 out a moment, and -- and explain a little more about that
22 combined subgroup versus the individual disaggregated
23 groups, and some of the thinking in conversation that
24 have gone into that.

25 MS. PEARSON: So I'm gonna go up here,



1 right? Choosing the avenue PWR?

2 MS. MARIE: So Allyssa, this -- just to
3 clarify -- this is the conversation that you heard a lot
4 of public comment around yesterday on the super
5 subgroups. So it's -- sometimes it's called the combined
6 subgroup, sometimes it's called a super subgroup. So
7 this is to just explain a little bit about what you've
8 heard yesterday from --

9 MS. LISA: So as Marie talked about in 2014,
10 this is how part of the frameworks we divide -- dividied
11 up. We had an achievement indicator that was made up of
12 reading, writing, Math, and Science achievement, the
13 percent of students proficient in advanced, but just
14 overall. We just looked overall, who was enrolled in the
15 school. We didn't disagree any of it in terms of what
16 was on the accountability reports. We report the
17 disaggregated information in all the places, but it
18 wasn't on the accountability report.

19 And we also had growth. The growth metric
20 was made up of this adequate component, which was not
21 only how you're doing in growth normatively, but is it
22 enough growth to get kids where we want them. And the --
23 the way that we define that in the state is for kids that
24 are below proficient to get to that proficient cut point
25 in three years. For kids that are already above



1 proficient or aren't proficient to stay above that cut
2 point for three years. What that does is that for kids
3 that are below proficiency, it's a very ambitious target
4 to get there in terms of how we're currently doing
5 education in Colorado. It was very ambitious to get
6 there within three years or by 10th grade. For those
7 that are already proficient, it was very, very attainable
8 and not so ambitious to stay above that proficiency cut
9 point.

10 So this really had a high correlation with
11 achievement with who those kids are in school. And I
12 just want to clarify, when we talk about the correlation
13 with achievement and demographics stats, that's what --
14 what we see as a whole, we know that we have schools and
15 districts that are outliers to that correlation and have
16 some really strong achievement for students that come
17 from disadvantaged background. So it's not a blanket
18 statement. There's, you know, it will always be that
19 way. It's just -- it's correlation. It's what we see in
20 most places, but there are some outliers. So I just want
21 to get that in.

22 So growth was included the adequate which
23 has that kind of achievement component. Demand growth
24 for reading, writing, and Math. Can't do Science because
25 it's not consecutive grades. And we looked at growth



1 overall and then with the growth gaps measure we had for
2 English learners, for free reduced lunch, for students
3 with disabilities, for minority students, and students
4 who need to catch up. That's kids that are below
5 proficient, we looked at their median growth percentiles.
6 This is how it was, points for all of this added to the
7 framework are reported on the framework.

8 We have heard -- we've done surveys and
9 focus groups, and been out with stakeholders in the
10 accountability work group, and I think you all have heard
11 a lot of concern about students that fall into multiple
12 categories and students counting over multiple times in
13 the same category. So we've looked at possible solutions
14 for that and what we've seen other states do is going to
15 a combined or super subgroup combined group.

16 So this is the proposal based on all the
17 stakeholder feedback we got. Not all of it. We
18 definitely had some people that were concerned, but of
19 district representatives that we talked to that came to
20 our focus groups that went -- right the superintendent
21 dean that filled up the surveys, there was a huge, huge
22 support for going to combine. So that's kind of the
23 rationale that we got there. So let me walk through what
24 that looks like and then I can tell you a little bit more
25 about the impact.



1 So proposed for 2016, you have achievement
2 again, English Language Arts because you know, we went
3 from reading writing to this single English Language Arts
4 test, Math, and Science. As Marie talked about, we're
5 looking at mean scale score instead of percent proficient
6 in advanced. We think it better captures the performance
7 of all kids and not just the bubble kids that are at that
8 line. So achievement will be looked at for all students
9 just like we've been doing, but then we've add combined
10 over here, along with reporting for EL, students with
11 disabilities, free reduced lunch, or minority. So all of
12 that would be reported and you all can see it on those
13 annotated reports they give you on the second page.

14 And the top part, it's got the combined
15 group and then it's got the disaggregated. What combined
16 means is any student who's a Member of any of these, will
17 count once in combine. So if the student is an English
18 Language Learner and free reduced lunch and had an IP,
19 that will count one from this combined group. But when
20 we report these individual groups, the student will count
21 for each, would be reported each time. So we'll really
22 see any kid who's an English learner even if they are in
23 multiple categories, we'll see their performance there.

24 So what you'll see on those -- on those
25 annotated reports, there's a kind of a column for points



1 and a column for ratings, and what's being proposed is
2 that you would get points for all. You would get points
3 for the combined. The points add up to the overall
4 rating you would not get for the individual groups, but
5 you would have a rating, as you can see color coded right
6 there for each of the individual groups as well as
7 combined and overall. So that it will jump out very
8 clearly through the color, through the rating, the
9 performance of the individual groups. So that's right
10 there. Again, just proposed and if you -- you all can
11 make this decision on this. Sure.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just the combined,
13 those groups, those four areas plus everybody else makes
14 the all, is that the way that works?

15 MS. LISA: Yes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's all at the top,
18 it's all -- all at the bottom and that's like EL, EEP,
19 FRL, you know, I mean -- and then you have that combined?
20 For the core -- for the --

21 MS. LISA: Yeah. So the combine is any of
22 these students counted one time instead of the multiple
23 times that we've heard. Counted one time, points are
24 assigned there and then are rated. And then here the
25 performance is recorded, so you'll see the achievement,



1 the scale score of the kids right there. Points will not
2 be assigned but a rating is there so you can see that
3 relative level of performance.

4 MS. FLORES: And so to all up there is also
5 all the bottom too?

6 MS. LISA: It would be, all these guys and
7 anybody who's not in these categories. So one thing we
8 spent a lot of time talking about with accountability --
9 accountability workgroup was what do you do for schools
10 and districts, where there's a high overlap between the
11 percentage of students that are in the -- on the
12 percentage that aren't combined, right? District --
13 districts that have 75 percent of students free reduced
14 lunch like you've got a really high overlap there.

15 So we spent some time looking at that and
16 thinking about, what if you did the students in the
17 combined and the kids that were not in the combined and
18 only use those two groups that never do all. Could you
19 do that for your reporting? I went back and forth, its -
20 - it seems like it's very valuable data. I think it may
21 not be quite ready for accountability yet. When we ran
22 the data -- 'cause people were concerned if there was
23 high overlap, if they were getting double dinged they
24 actually -- their ratings don't change this way. It's
25 the districts that -- this is a very -- a smaller



1 percent, that's what actually are impacted in terms of
2 ratings by having them on the combined in there.

3 MS. RANKIN: Why wouldn't you pull out that
4 other group?

5 MS. LISA: It's something we can talk about.
6 There's a few things more, and we can -- there are some
7 solutions around it or a non-combined. I don't know how
8 we --

9 MS. RANKIN: Yeah.

10 MS. LISA: I know we can try and do that
11 though. I think there's a lot of districts in our state
12 that are really small. We won't have data necessarily if
13 you do these two only. We could make a rule that says,
14 if you don't have data in these two, then you do all, we
15 could figure something out about that. When you look at
16 the data, it's really powerful, how you see in terms of
17 what the gaps are between the two. I think people want
18 an overall sense and they don't know -- I don't know, is
19 our sense that we weren't ready to go here as a state
20 right now. If that's -- if you go on and investigate
21 that further, we can investigate it further. I think it
22 would be a hard change to make for -- for this fall, just
23 in terms of the field and their comfort level, with how
24 their performance is categorized, and what they're held
25 accountable for. If that makes any sense.



1 MS. FLORES: So I am -- sorry. I didn't
2 hear the question that you asked.

3 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Where it says combined,
4 it's those four groups, that's the combined.

5 MS. FLORES: Right.

6 MS. RANKIN: And then all, is the combined
7 plus everybody else.

8 MS. FLORES: Right.

9 MS. RANKIN: So if you put those two
10 together it should equal the all?

11 MS. FLORES: Uh-huh.

12 MS. RANKIN: My question was if you take the
13 combined subtract that from the all, there's another
14 group there. Shouldn't we have those ratings, too?

15 MS. LISA: I thought you meant that -- put
16 that on there too.

17 MS. RANKIN: Yeah. That was -- that was
18 what I said but I thought -- I thought you answered it.

19 MS. LISA: Sorry, I missed it. Sorry, I
20 missed.

21 MS. RANKIN: I thought you answered it. You
22 just said we weren't ready to put them --

23 MS. LISA: I think we could -- and I think
24 it's a question of -- do we wanna report it? Do we want
25 to hold them accountable there? Do we want to -- so I



1 think -- I think. Yeah.

2 MS. RANKIN: I see -- I see. I'm just --
3 I'm curious to see --

4 MS. LISA: Absolutely and I think it's
5 really --

6 MS. RANKIN: I did not follow that. I
7 thought I followed it until I explained it and --

8 MS. FLORES: So what's left after you have -
9 -

10 MS. RANKIN: Really. I really wouldn't --

11 MS. LISA: Yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I hear your question.
13 I do.

14 MS. RANKIN: I mean, all is all students
15 need --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Combined. And then
17 anybody who's not in DLL, IPE (inaudible) ready .

18 MS. MAZANEC: You're saying, you wanna know
19 who -- the non-combined kids, it's not --

20 MS. LISA: Yeah. And I --

21 MS. RANKIN: Because it is true, some may
22 have 90 percent are also all but what about these
23 districts that -- they have a very small percentage down
24 below so --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.



1 MS. RANKIN: That would really pull out the
2 (inaudible), but I would like those numbers met.

3 MS. FLORES: And should you -- I mean, I'm
4 just thinking, should you have IETs with ELs and FR, the
5 free and reduced lunch in minority, I mean --

6 MS. LISA: That's a good question and I
7 think you've heard a lot of those comments yesterday,
8 right? So there's concerns on either side of it. I can
9 walk you through where we got, and where we were trying
10 to think about this compromise because we heard so loud
11 and clear from the schools and districts, and we heard a
12 lot pretty loud and clear yesterday on the other side of
13 it. So can talk you through -- where we thought we can
14 come up with some kind of compromise there. But again,
15 we are very open to it. This is a hard, hard topic and
16 hard, hard solution to come forward with.

17 MS. FLORES: And since you have -- since we
18 have a large number of Latinos --

19 MS. MAZANEC: Sometimes.

20 MS. FLORES: -- well, in -- in big
21 districts, shouldn't you have that large group, kind of,
22 go through the same segregated?

23 MS. LISA: That's another -- there's lots of
24 good questions, but I'll let --

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's try and hold the



1 questions.

2 MS. LISA: Back to your point Joyce about
3 this. I think one thing that we've historically tried to
4 do in the state is before we rule out anything for
5 accountability like -- like educator effectiveness
6 metrics, try to give people the data first, to be able to
7 get familiar and understand it. So I think we can
8 prioritize having this other -- the non-combined students
9 reported on some of our deeper tools, where we have
10 people look for improvement plans. So they can start
11 getting used to seeing that data then we can think about
12 where it might be valuable to use it, if it's valuable to
13 use for accountability. Just -- I think it's fascinating
14 and I think people will find a lot of value in it.

15 MS. RANKIN: As a Board Member, I'm curious
16 of the breakdown.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: True.

18 MS. LISA: Yeah. And we can get that for
19 you -- definitely. So that's the idea behind it. So
20 again we're going to all -- only looking at the off
21 achievement to the all the combined, and the reporting of
22 the disaggregated over here. And then, again these
23 disaggregated reportings go much deeper than our other
24 data reporting tools. This is only for the frameworks
25 but we break things down by its race, ethnicity, but we



1 look at the different levels of language proficiency,
2 that's all available elsewhere. But this is really just
3 for the frameworks.

4 And then growth to be talked about next year
5 -- we will not gonna have adequate growth. We need some
6 more years for the same assessment to really be able to
7 look at it. And I think we really as a state, wanna look
8 at is that definition of adequate the right definition.
9 So growth is going to be pure growth, taking up that
10 achievement and a measure to it for English language,
11 Arts and Math. That's what we have.

12 We also do access growth but I didn't want
13 that up here. For all -- access growth is the English --
14 it's the English language proficiency Ed section. So we
15 report, we use that too, for all and for combined. I
16 know it'll be the same thing in terms of points and
17 ratings, but we report all the different groups. One
18 thing we've had is that catch-up group, for these kids
19 that weren't proficient and we're -- we're asking for
20 feedback on -- through that -- through the spring reports
21 about if we should include report on students that are
22 below benchmarks, that are below level four and five, and
23 what their growth is, and that's a valuable piece of
24 information to have on the framework, or should we should
25 keep it somewhere else.



1 So that's one of the questions in the
2 survey. So that's really what the -- what the picture is
3 and so it's really taking segregation that's over here
4 and growth with the adequate growth of the achievement
5 component and splitting it up and putting it here and
6 putting it here. We are looking at it like that. We are
7 looking at, sorry -- it slipped my mind, I guess.

8 And then just to think a little bit -- where
9 with the ESSA, I think this is an area where we might be
10 able to leverage some parts of the ESSA. The ESSA and
11 we'll talk about it later onto. It has two major ways we
12 de-identify schools. One, comprehensive which are the
13 lowest five percent of Title 1 schools for the most part.
14 There are some other definitions in there, but basically,
15 you can think about as low as five percent, and then
16 target which are schools that are struggling with their
17 individual segregate group of students.

18 So what we can do with that, and this is all
19 part of the state plan development. We don't have an
20 exact plan yet, we need to get feedback, we need to have
21 people think through this. But based on the performance
22 here of the individual groups, it's on the frameworks,
23 this identification can be made for the targeted. And
24 then this can get reported on the frameworks so that, you
25 know, we have our points, we have our employment plans,



1 or recruitment plans, or prior improvement on turnaround
2 plans.

3 We may also have another identification at
4 school monthly performance, but it depends -- depending
5 on how steep you decide to identify or to find the
6 targeted. They might perform it, but they're targeted
7 for students with disabilities. Because at school maybe
8 overall really loud but they struggling with their
9 student with disabilities. So we can bring that kind of
10 attention at that way.

11 We've also been talking in terms of the
12 unified approval plans, in terms of the UIP. Right now,
13 the direction is that schools and districts need to
14 address at the indicator level achievement growth, PWR.
15 If they're struggling at the indicator level, they need
16 to address that in the UIP. We could talk about if they
17 have performance challenges with a disaggregated group
18 that -- that's part of the guidance around UIP, and
19 having to incorporate there. So there's some ways to
20 balance this, that we've thought about but there's
21 concerns on either side. I think it's an important issue
22 that -- wrestle with think about what makes sense. All
23 right.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead.

25 MS. RANKIN: So another question. So ESSA



1 requires that -- what I see on the right.

2 MS. LISA: Yeah.

3 MS. RANKIN: And we already are doing or
4 will be doing these things in the middle --

5 MS. LISA: Yeah.

6 MS. RANKIN: -- and those will meet the
7 requirements of the ESSA without adding any more on top?

8 MS. LISA: For these identifications or for
9 --

10 MS. RANKIN: Yeah.

11 MS. LISA: We don't currently. So we --
12 I'll talk about it when we get there in terms of
13 comprehensive. We don't currently do this kind of
14 identification in terms of targeted for schools.

15 MS. RANKIN: But do we do this -- in the
16 middle?

17 MS. LISA: We have. In the middle. This is
18 what we're proposing to do for the fall.

19 MS. RANKIN: So okay. I get it.

20 MS. LISA: So this data that we have here,
21 and we're trying to build it that there's that -- the
22 data and the pieces here, that will align with the ESSA,
23 in the way that align with what we've heard from
24 stakeholders and what they want and what makes sense.

25 MS. RANKIN: Okay, so --



1 MS. LISA: So we're trying to balance all,
2 yeah.

3 MS. RANKIN: But -- but we will be meeting
4 the requirements. But are the ESSA requirements less
5 than what we are doing in the middle?

6 MS. LISA: ESSA --

7 MS. RANKIN: I mean, are we doing -- are we
8 end up doing more --

9 MS. LISA: I think -- and you think more?

10 MS. RANKIN: -- than what's minimally
11 required?

12 MS. LISA: No. No, right?

13 MS. RANKIN: Pretty much exactly what is
14 required?

15 MS. LISA: ELA Math -- ELA Math and Science.
16 We're not doing that's in the ESSA is that other
17 indicator school quality and student success. We don't
18 have that for elementary and middle. I think you could
19 use some of -- you could some of the like, reticulation
20 rate for the high school one if we wanted to. That's the
21 only thing that the ESSA has that we don't have. We need
22 to make sure with the U.S. Department of Ed about that
23 using mean scale scores of -- okay. 'Cause it's 10
24 percent efficient in advance, so that'll be an
25 interpretation. And then it's not clear -- I would say



1 that it's not clear if combined will be allowed or not.
2 Some people are very clear and think it's not allowed, so
3 -- but I think it's something to find out. And I think
4 it's worth --

5 MS. RANKIN: Is that what some of the
6 discussion has been about in yesterday?

7 MS. LISA: Yeah. You probably heard that
8 yesterday.

9 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

10 MS. LISA: And I think you could read it
11 very literally that -- that this is not allowed. I think
12 you could read other parts of it that say yeah, you could
13 do that, and have these -- these groups reported. You
14 use it and try to get it in identification and it could
15 be allowed. I think we just don't know well enough yet.
16 So the only other thing, we are not posing to put social
17 studies into the frameworks, because we have it on a
18 rotating basis. We don't have it from every school,
19 every year, and so -- but that social studies it's not
20 required federally. So we are not proposing it -- put it
21 in here. We'll take it through a strict consideration if
22 that school wants to submit additional evidence. Does
23 that kind of give you an overview of the conversation
24 yesterday?

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions about this



1 particular item, Ms. Mazanec?

2 MS. MAZANEC: I would like you to explain in
3 -- with regards to the comments of the (inaudible).

4 MS. FLORES: I can't hear you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Talk a little louder,
6 please. Sorry, Pam.

7 MS. MAZANEC: I just like -- I'd like you to
8 explain again why -- why the combined reporting proposed
9 is more accurate reporting than the studied amount
10 separately?

11 MS. LISA: I don't know that I would say
12 it's necessarily more accurate. I think the reason --
13 some of the rationale for going there was because
14 districts and schools felt like -- same kid was counting
15 multiple times in the frameworks. And they were feeling
16 like, that based on their population, that wasn't a fair
17 way, they didn't perceive it as a fair -- way to be held
18 accountable. We ran the data on that, and either doing
19 it like this or doing it combined the outcomes were the
20 same. We still identified the same schools and
21 districts, same readings come out. Overall we're not
22 seeing a big change in who's accountable and who's, you
23 know, how the accountability falls out. So that's one
24 thing that made CDE staff looked at the data feel better
25 about going this way, 'cause what we don't feel like it's



1 masking or hiding performance that way.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Anything else on that?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have -- I have one
4 more question, that word super combined, where does that
5 fit in here?

6 MS. LISA: So we're with -- nationally
7 you'll see super subgroup kind of float around, that
8 didn't feel good to us. We've had a really hard time.
9 One of the survey questions is this, what should we call
10 this group of students. The reason why these groups were
11 picked initially in -- was around historic -- they've
12 been historically disadvantaged, historically have --
13 groups of students that haven't been served as well by
14 our schools or having done this on our schools. And
15 we've tried out different titles for that group with
16 different people. And everything that's tried out,
17 somebody has a concern with and then we got to this very
18 high level combined subgroup. It doesn't say much but --
19 it kind of (inaudible) the fact that it doesn't say much.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Does that satisfy the
21 questions that we heard yesterday by that explanation?

22 MS. LISA: I don't think so.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. We heard
25 some good questions yesterday.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Can you tell us what it is
2 those people we heard yesterday really want?

3 ALL: Yeah. Okay --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You could speak for them.

5 MS. LISA: I will do my best. You give me
6 the eyes if I'm not saying it well. I think there is a
7 concern that -- there's a few different concerns, right?
8 One is if you report at the combined level and you're
9 saying -- you're messaging that all these groups of
10 students are the same, right? And an English learner is
11 very different from a student with a disability, is very
12 different from a student who's eligible for free and
13 reduced lunch, is very different from a minority student.
14 But I'll --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'll agree that they are
16 different, but you do have that data. It's not that
17 we're depriving anybody of that data. It's just that
18 when you're trying to -- when you're trying to major the
19 achievement of a district or a school it's an average.
20 And you've got a 100 students that means you got a 100
21 things to average, that's all.

22 MS. LISA: That's very true. But I think
23 it's the messaging around it that's --

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There's no messaging
25 around it, it's math.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Come on.

2 MS. LISA: You asked me to explain Durham,
3 I'm just -- I'm trying to --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Don't argue with her.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Let me just ask -- let me
6 ask you a question.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: As long as the -- as long
8 as a desegregated data is available and it's there for
9 everybody to see, and there may be a rating attached to
10 it. I can't see now -- I can't see how anybody fails to
11 get the information they need from this scheme. Yes, Dr.
12 Schroeder.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: So when you do this average,
14 if you look at the three examples, these are all
15 different examples, four different examples, right?

16 MS. LISA: Those are -- it's one district
17 example of the elementary level, the middle level, and
18 the high school level.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. If you look at all
20 three, you will see that the minorities student score is
21 the highest of the four subgroups. And that -- if I'm --
22 unless I'm mistaken, that minority score includes Asian
23 students who outperform white students. So when we talk
24 about why we have the subgroups, it's because they are
25 groups of students who have not done as well, who have



1 not been --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or historically haven't
3 been observed as well.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Historically. And now we've
5 added a subgroup that has the opposite effect. And now
6 they are averaging the effect of that higher score, makes
7 the combined subgroup score higher because you're
8 actually including a group of students who are higher
9 performers than, in other words, you do -- you lose --
10 even by just having minority you lose information. So
11 Val's point about subdividing those --

12 MS. LISA: Yeah

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- those subgroups of kids
14 is important simply because we have some -- a sub-group
15 or two couple of sub-groups that actually have performed
16 --

17 MS. LISA: Depending on the community.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- the average.

19 MS. LISA: Depending on the community.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Depending on your community.

21 MS. LISA: Absolutely.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: So that's it. It's us
23 actually getting to be a greater and greater.

24 MS. LISA: Yeah.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: That's the highest number of



1 immigrants or kids who are being added to our schools.
2 It's not -- it's not Spanish kids. It's Asian kids. So
3 that's --

4 MS. LISA: Yeah.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: And not changing the
6 dynamics.

7 MS. LISA: Change that we've had in
8 minority, it's been minority --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't think it's 2010.

10 MS. LISA: But again, it's been an issue
11 we've been to --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: They were only counted once
13 in 2016, where they were counted.

14 MS. LISA: If they were in multiple groups,
15 they're counted multiple times -- in those multiple
16 groups before.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: So I kind of get the
18 dilemma.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh. It's a hard
20 conversation.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, it's a dilemma, I
22 mean, if you take it to the extreme we're not going to
23 accept the desegregation unless you disagree. Left-
24 handed Lithuanians.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- they may wanna to do
4 that I --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We are doing okay. They
7 advocate for left-handed Lithuanians as -- Dr. Schroeder,
8 please.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: There are a couple of things
10 that I worry about, and I'm not sure so -- in my old
11 studies in accounting and in disclosure, and giving
12 investors as much information as possible in order to
13 make decisions about their investments and stock. Some
14 of the research has shown that information overload is a
15 huge problem. Because the more information you provide,
16 the less you actually use. Which is why people went to
17 earnings per share even though they got an annual
18 statement from their corporation they've invested in in
19 this study.

20 So I think that same notion we need to
21 consider that especially for taxpayers and parents who
22 want to know about schools. What is the information that
23 is actually critical and most important for them? How is
24 it presented and that is not too much? Then we get to
25 this where we're hoping that at the community level and



1 at the school level, there are different ways that --
2 that there are discussions about all the different
3 subgroups, and what their needs are, and what should be -
4 - how should the targeted money be spent, et cetera.

5 You've got a bunch of different things going
6 on, and so I think one of the reasons we're getting the
7 pushback on how to present this is based on, who's gonna
8 to be using it and for what purposes, and that's what
9 makes it difficult. Because I think there -- there might
10 be nearly enough information. I don't actually disagree
11 with Val that it might even be that appropriate for a
12 school district depending on the league of their students
13 to desegregate even greater.

14 MS. LISA: Absolutely, and that's our plan.
15 The third level and the next level of reporting. They
16 can dig in and see English learners by their language
17 deficiency, and see minority students by race ethnicity,
18 and really pull it apart, go deeper.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, even by IEP --

20 MS. LISA: Yeah.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: -- don't we have -- we've
22 had a --

23 MS. LISA: We have a tight --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: -- we've had a significant
25 change in the mix of to say, well, kids based on changes



1 in some of the -- the challenges that our kids were
2 having, and so is this -- I don't see this is a real
3 simple thing to make a decision about. What we would you
4 wanna give at first blush, a big picture --

5 MS. LISA: Yeah.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: -- and I'm not sure what --
7 what that means, and then, dig deeper, and deeper, and
8 deeper.

9 MS. LISA: Yeah. That's exactly what we
10 wanna do. More of a higher level reporting than this on
11 what's on the frameworks, and what you see there that be
12 a much more public-friendly report. You're seeing that
13 report that's gonna help people understand where their
14 ratings came from and then they'll be a deeper level
15 where you can really dig in, kind of where we are with
16 the Dash tool right now, but you can go deeper with that.
17 We wanna make sure we get a -- desegregations that are
18 all really useful.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So I just add one more thing
20 that though. One of the requests that's come from this
21 22 groups or whatever, is that they become a part of the
22 discussion.

23 MS. LISA: Absolutely.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: And I -- I kinda think that
25 would be appropriate.



1 MS. LISA: It would be very appropriate,
2 yeah.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: We might get -- we might get
4 some insight if we frame it properly. We talk about
5 what's the most critical information that you want users
6 to have -- have it users to have. What's the most
7 critical information for your organizations, because I
8 think that's one of the things they are support
9 organizations of very different areas and what I wrote in
10 that list, et cetera. So their input, I think --

11 MS. LISA: I agree, yes.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: -- I think it would merit to
13 -- to have input from them.

14 MS. LISA: It's still this thing of when we
15 pull the accountability work group together and who we
16 reached out to and we -- I don't know why like I'm trying
17 to remember back. It's good learning, I'd rather have
18 everybody at the table 'cause we had that group and then
19 I was trying to talk to different groups from there and
20 do the go -- between I'd rather have everybody in the
21 same room.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Right and talk to each
23 other.

24 MS. LISA: And talk, exactly.

25 MS. FLORES: And -- and we might find out,



1 for instance, if we look at let's say, Cherry Creek,
2 ESLs, let's talk about just ESLs, and Denver and Cherry
3 Creek, and Cherry Creek is doing very well. Let's just
4 suppose -- that they're doing really well with ESL kids
5 but let's say, that Denver is not doing very well with
6 ESL kids. Well, what is Cherry Creek doing that Denver
7 isn't doing?

8 MS. LISA: Exactly, and that's where we want
9 this data to be able to be useful. So that people can go
10 find districts that are similar to them, that have
11 different outcomes and be able to --

12 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

13 MS. LISA: -- and then -- and so this is big
14 picture overview of that issue. You all let us know what
15 more we can do to help. The way -- this is where they --
16 schools and districts got on their spring reports because
17 it was proposed, so they're staying the combined, staying
18 in desegregated groups. We're trying to build into a --
19 a contract to get some evaluation on whichever way we go,
20 combined as the way we go to get some impact on --
21 research on that to see does having a combined group
22 reduce attention for our individual desegregated groups.
23 So some of the concerns that there are -- if we go this
24 way, we wanna -- we wanna take a year, two -- let's see
25 what the impact actually is. If it is a negative impact,



1 then let's change it if we go that way or if can do the
2 opposite, we can -- we can do research in the opposite
3 way too.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: What are your thoughts about
5 the comment that maybe ESSA doesn't actually allow us to
6 do this in the rules?

7 MS. LISA: I've heard our chairman say that
8 we should do what's right for Colorado, and so whatever
9 Colorado, you know, decides is right, let's do that.
10 Let's take it to the US Department of Ed because I don't
11 think it's totally clear what the ESSA says, and then
12 let's see where we go there --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me but --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and we got with
15 them.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What do you think ESSA
17 says, Angelica?

18 MS. SCHROEDER: I have no idea.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We don't know.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: We don't know.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't know. Okay.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So other questions that
24 we have?

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah? Or do we wait?

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, we can do it now.

3 It's a -- we have -- go ahead. Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I had -- I think you
5 answered one. We dropped adequate growth because we
6 don't have -- we don't have that based on new assessment?

7 MS. LISA: Yeah, it's hard. We can do it
8 with two years and since we'll have a second year park,
9 it's better if you have more than two years --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

11 MS. LISA: -- with the same assessment data
12 and then we really wanna have a conversation with you all
13 and it's in state statute with that definition of
14 adequate growth is and think that that might be a
15 conversation worth having --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

17 MS. LISA: -- just because we're seek
18 ambitious and attainable targets. We might wanna work a
19 bit.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why -- why don't we
21 have remediation rate in our Postsecondary Workforce
22 Readiness?

23 MS. LISA: It's a good question. We've
24 looked at it. We've gotten concerns that it wouldn't be
25 appropriate statewide since we only have remediation rate



1 data, I believe, first in-state colleges for students
2 that leave the state. Go to the college out of state --
3 their remediation rates wouldn't be included --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that national --

5 MS. LISA: -- so people feel it's fair. I -

6 -

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you know the --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's a national --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The National Student
10 Clearinghouse.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't believe that
13 the data that we get from them includes remediation rates
14 --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you be good
16 enough follow up on that? Because I think that's a --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- an evolving
19 database.

20 MS. LISA: Yeah. That's a good point.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Next.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That reminds --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, go ahead.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that reminds me,
25 does the matriculation rate include only Colorado public



1 institutions?

2 MS. LISA: When you get the matriculation
3 rate data from the National Student Clearinghouse along
4 with a merge file with -- from the Department of Higher
5 Ed, right? That they have a little bit additional data
6 that's not in Clearinghouse, so we put them together. So
7 all -- not all colleges and universities in the country
8 are in the National Student Clearinghouse, but there's a
9 lot of them. (Inaudible) is in there.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's a trade
11 school is you gonna have a hard time with it.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably so. I think
13 that's what we're --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's a lot of those
15 -- because there's a lot of those kinds of schools around
16 the country for very specific car maintenance, Toyota,
17 that kind of thing.

18 MS. LISA: I think we're gonna get a lot of
19 request to reconsider around that matriculation indicator
20 about all the different pathways to go on that aren't
21 there so.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How does this -- what
23 we have created here compare to what other states are
24 doing?

25 MS. LISA: It's similar to what a lot of



1 other states have done. Under the EE and CA waiver, I
2 feel like there was just like four or five states left
3 that weren't doing a combined group, and I can go double
4 check that we're the --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Center for American
6 Progress was that the name in that group?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

8 MS. LISA: There's a group that we had just
9 filled out a survey about what -- what's in our
10 accountability system and what the weights are and all of
11 that. They're about to release a report and we were
12 hoping that it's gonna be ready for you all for now, but
13 I think it will be in the next week or so about what all
14 the states include in their accountability systems and
15 what weights they give to the different measures. So
16 we'll get that to you as soon as they put it out
17 publicly.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And -- and I would like
19 you to put a summary in your own words.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, okay.

21 MS. LISA: You don't want to read the whole
22 report?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I --

24 MS. LISA: Yeah. We can do that for you.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Questions?

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we're going to
5 switch back and go back to the indicator now but now, I
6 hope you have a better understanding of what that
7 combined thing means and we can talk --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. That's
9 helpful.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

11 MS. LISA: If there's data or there's
12 something you want to look at that we can bring to you in
13 June, let us know but again in June is when we're gonna
14 need to know if you don't want to use combined, and you
15 wanna go back to the individual to desegregate groups we
16 need to know in June, so we can have a writing otherwise,
17 we won't look at the deadlines, so.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Push, push, push.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Push, push.

20 (Inaudible).

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So what do you need by
22 June? I'm sorry.

23 MS. LISA: A decision.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

25 MS. LISA: If you all wanna change from what



1 we have in those -- those informational reports where we
2 have the combined for the ratings. If you don't want
3 that and you want the individual groups instead, we'll
4 need to know that in June, so that we can have it ready
5 for the fall. Because right now, we built the system to
6 do it with the combined.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

8 MS. LISA: And I know you don't wanna move
9 in July.

10 MS. FLORES: And -- and if we hear from
11 several groups -- I know you've heard from some areas but
12 when you go to that heavy duty, you know, like Denver's
13 and -- and if you hear that it's better to desegregate
14 what --

15 MS. LISA: We'll bring you that feedback at
16 the June meeting if we're in. We'll have it hopefully,
17 those materials are gonna be hard to get for you too far
18 in advance but we'll bring --

19 MS. FLORES: And this is why I think it's
20 important that we do have one and we do make aware of say
21 Denver and Jefferson County. I think you have some,
22 you've have Adams County and all those groups. I think
23 they may have different ideas and they may not like the
24 combined is what I'm saying.

25 MS. LISA: And I think it's a difference



1 between district and school staff and then other
2 stakeholder public groups --

3 MS. FLORES: That's right.

4 MS. LISA: -- which is understandable that
5 they're gonna have different perspectives.

6 MS. FLORES: Right.

7 MS. LISA: So I think it's going to be --

8 MS. FLORES: And we really haven't learned
9 from them, yes.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- just trying to
11 figure out the balance.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, so.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I'm gonna ask
14 probably what's a silly question, I guess. When say, we
15 leave it this way -- this is how we go because districts
16 get this information --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- can a district go
19 down deeper? Can they -- can they actually fish out?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The -- yeah -- deeper
21 desegregation, absolutely.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we'll -- we'll
25 report deeper.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's useless because if
2 -- CDE -- I'm sorry. I'm really struggling here. Would
3 CDE have -- you can, of course, because you have the
4 information? So you could co-regulate it and put it back
5 up or you could take it apart even further.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I'm seeing exactly.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry. I am
11 (inaudible) sitting there right now, but I just wondered
12 because yeah, I can predict some districts --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and I deal with --
15 they're gonna wanna know each one of those real
16 specifically and --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that --

18 MS. LISA: Yeah, and we have all that
19 reported and publicly available too. So it won't just be
20 for the districts as long as it meets the minimum and
21 size, we're not revealing personally identifiable
22 information. CDE will have in our reporting, the
23 individual groups, individual race, ethnicity. ESSA
24 requires some crosstabs basically like gender by race,
25 ethnicity reporting and --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 MS. PEARSON: -- I don't remember all the
3 different -- there's a whole lot of different
4 combinations. So we will be doing all of those and
5 making it very public. We have a tool, Marie, has -- has
6 been working on with RIMS staff to get updated. It's
7 called the Data Lab and people can go in and say, I wanna
8 see female students that are Hispanic, that are English
9 learners in each district in the state, and what their
10 performance is, and what their achievement is, and what
11 their growth is.

12 And you just put in this, you know, you
13 check all these boxes and you hit enter and then it spits
14 out a spreadsheet with you -- for you, and you can do
15 that with any different desegregation, combination that
16 you want just about -- has pretty much all the different
17 flags that we have in the assessment file in terms of
18 data for students. Again, it doesn't do it if it -- if
19 the numbers of students are too small. So we were not
20 doing anything personally identifiable but it's a really
21 good tool, so you can always -- we wanna continue that so
22 people can go deeper (inaudible).

23 MS. FLORES: Alyssa, I'm just remembering
24 something from -- from that Maleo (ph) conference that I
25 went to, and I think that ESSA asks for the separation.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean it does ask for
3 it.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's one of the
6 things that it does this time where it hasn't been
7 before. So that's one thing I do remember. So if we're
8 gonna combine it, we're kind of not following -- I know
9 we don't care but I think we do care. I think minorities
10 would care.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what will -- what
12 will the public see? Let's -- let's just --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- say we're looking at
15 school view or whatever it ends up being called down the
16 road. Somebody sitting there and -- and they are looking
17 up, they want to see some -- they want to see something.
18 What's going to be different whether it's terminology or
19 -- or nature of some content on there?

20 MS. LISA: In the acts - so first, in our
21 vision is that people can dig in as far as they can in
22 terms of like publicly available information or publicly.
23 So that we don't violate any student privacy, but that
24 there will be ways -- that's our vision that you could
25 dig in as deep as you wanna go and in its many different



1 categories. In terms of the accountability reports, what
2 will be different is previously, for achievement, all you
3 got was all. You didn't see any of the desegregated for
4 achievement. We had it reported in other places on the
5 website for the -- on the accountability reports, you
6 didn't get that.

7 So now, you will get achievement for all
8 students, achievement for the combined group, and you'll
9 see the performance level and the rating for all the
10 individual groups. That's -- that'll all be visible
11 there. Previously, you had growth for all the
12 desegregated groups and overall, you'll still have that
13 and then, you'll have this additional combined group
14 that's on there.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

16 MS. LISA: How the points are assigned is
17 what's really different. Points are only gonna be
18 assigned at that combined group level. So all the data
19 is going to be available.

20 MS. MARIA: So we'll give you a different
21 angle, a new perspective on how to look at your -- at
22 your combined group, still get some detail in the --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

24 MS. MARIA: -- on them individually.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And there be some so --



1 MS. FLORES: And -- and -- and another thing
2 I think that would be important is to look at people who,
3 again, how many people and a group that did very well,
4 and also include the different cultures or different --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ethnicities.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- races and such, and
7 the -- that did very well in the medium and then, who did
8 poorly, and I bet you'll find that you'll have, you know,
9 a lot of kids who are minority, and who may be free and
10 reduced lunch up here in the middle, and you'll have a
11 combination of all. And then, at the bottom, you'll have
12 a combination of all two. So that, you know, so we don't
13 -- it's a way of saying look, minorities don't always do
14 badly. They do well over here and some reduced lunch
15 kids do well too.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I -- I have -- I have
17 an interest today. I mean, I don't know where it fits in
18 this but quite a bit of call (inaudible) to have GT, to
19 have advanced learners --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- be more visible and to
22 bring them out then -- not so much do we get into and
23 then there's the insights. Are we gonna to be talking at
24 some point about the change in -- in size in -- in
25 relation to what we talked about yesterday on --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- on that topic but this
3 too. It's hard to know when would it be a good idea.
4 When would it be important to know even if it's a very
5 small in size. If that's -- if that's 100 percent of
6 your -- of some minority population that's represented in
7 your school and let's say it's three kids --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- or two or one and they're
10 doing fabulously well.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I know it's -- it's -- it's
13 kind of the opposite side of privacy issues but where do
14 we go with that?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think it's --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have a good point.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's interesting that the
19 higher achievers are -- this is the parent community, the
20 GT directors, the public is asking about this, folks who
21 are -- it's not only the concurrent enrollment bunch of
22 our world, but it's also off level testers who are
23 looking for ways to -- it's one of those areas where
24 we're like, kind of, kicking ourselves in the foot to
25 keep them in school when they really should be ahead,



1 which is the whole point of the competency-based
2 education. So you know, we're not keeping track of some
3 things really accurately in some individuals minds, we
4 are just not doing it. A child can't be counted as a
5 high school graduate because they graduated in two and a
6 half or three years. That doesn't make sense.

7 MS. LISA: They're counted.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: It happens in -- in some
9 there's like a small and there can be a ding on your
10 graduation rate of kids that really they don't go through
11 the normal graduation cycle because they've graduated
12 early and they're not counted as graduates. Or they were
13 accepted early at Harvard, whether they graduate in high
14 school or not, there's a relevant to them at that point.

15 MS. MAZANEC: And that we wish we have a
16 large number of those.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's interesting. I'm just
18 thinking the N size conversation where we go at some
19 point. Maybe today -- are you expecting that today?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So did we, you know,
21 did we confuse you some more?

22 MS. LISA: No. I think -- I -- well, just
23 to reiterate. We're going this path if you all want us
24 to go a different path, tell us and we're happy to go a
25 different path. We just need to know in June; is that



1 okay?

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: I do want you to provide that
3 input, that broader discussion with the other group.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Absolutely.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Let's hear what -- how that
6 comes out. See if there's a compromise that's equitable.

7 MS. LISA: Yeah. Okay. Let me talk to you
8 a little bit more on that exactly and timing. Because
9 we're defining --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, what's ideal -- I think
11 is to have some -- some alternative examples to see what
12 does it do.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I mean, I think you were
15 talking about Cherry Creek but --

16 MS. FLORES: No, no, no. And I was just all
17 in that suppose.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- a study extends that have
19 very different demographics.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Should we keep moving?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we will.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I forgot, I got the hammer.

25 MS. MARIA: So getting back to indicator



1 ratings, we have gone out and talked to all of our
2 different stakeholder groups. So there have been, you
3 know, meetings with superintendents, measurement experts,
4 advocacy groups, and so we've gotten their feedback on --
5 on you know, how they -- how they - the indicators should
6 be rated.

7 And so there's been a general consensus
8 where 70 percent of respondents thought that growth
9 should be rated the highest with PWR and then
10 achievements sort of following. I mean, then we talk to
11 our technical advisory panel for longitudinal growth,
12 those were the super duper measurement experts from
13 districts in Colorado who we ring together, and they
14 narrowed that down and gave us some recommendations for -
15 - note 60 percent growth and 40 percent achievement for
16 elementary and middle schools. And then for high schools
17 and for districts, it'd be 40 percent growth, 40 percent
18 achievement. Sorry, 40 percent Postsecondary Workforce
19 Readiness, and only 20 percent achievement. And then we
20 also --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: And what's special about
22 them compared to -- what --

23 MS. MARIA: So our tech --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: -- what do they bring to the
25 conversation that we don't have in the first group?



1 MS. MARIA: They bring a level of technical
2 expertise and assessment expertise that is not had by the
3 general fields. So this tends to be the district
4 assessment coordinators and district accountability
5 coordinators. So they are more numbers oriented and more
6 specific, and we have been working with them over the
7 past couple of years. They helped us build the framework
8 originally and we bring them usually all of the numbers
9 and all the scenarios, and we get into all of the leads
10 with them.

11 MS. FLORES: There are an interesting group.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: So what -- what I'm -- I
13 think what I'm trying to figure out in my own mind, the
14 first column is the values?

15 MS. MARIA: Yes.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: And then this is the
17 technical, and why do I want to listen to the technicals?
18 I mean, this is about values.

19 MS. LISA: They were take -- so they were
20 taking the values and translating into what those numbers
21 should be.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, that helps.

23 MS. MARIA: Yes.

24 MS. LISA: Because they're right along with
25 the values, but they -- but knowing those values, how



1 should we up the percentages.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. And have they come
3 back to these folks? And said this is what this should
4 look like?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's -- no, that's a
6 good point.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

8 MS. MARIA: I think that the challenge we've
9 had by the larger stakeholder group is that they feel
10 that, you know, and, you know, it should weigh the most
11 but the exact -- how much is -- how much is the most?
12 What does that actually look like? So that's when we
13 went to the technical advisory panel and sort of asked
14 given the values and told them -- and we did tell them
15 sort of what's stakeholder feedback was and what should
16 people feel and felt. Is there a reason of how we
17 actually operationalize that? What proportion it should
18 be giving to growth now?

19 And so their feedback was, you know, 60
20 percent growth, 40 percent achievement. And then we did
21 also take this on the accountability working group who is
22 not so technical, but more from district administrative
23 folk. And they said that they were fine with sort of
24 that 60-40 split or being -- also okay with the you know,
25 66-33 like the one-third, two-thirds. The accountability



1 working group did have concerns about the high schools
2 and districts being weighed so heavily on achievement in
3 PWR, so those status measures.

4 And we have to sort of take that into
5 consideration, but I also think that -- with the changes
6 to the assessments, right now, we don't have a lot of
7 high school growth. So we have some questions about what
8 we're gonna go with high school growth in the next couple
9 of years that I think that we're all gonna get to talk
10 about again. So we sort of for the moment we'll -- we'll
11 see what we can do and then again consider it again
12 later.

13 MS. GOFF: Okay. The accountability working
14 group -- who are those people again? You said the
15 administrators?

16 MS. LISA: There's district and school
17 representatives from rural, urban, high -- districts from
18 higher performing students, districts with students that
19 are struggling, we've got a CASE, CASB, CEA, CSI, League
20 of Charter School representation there too.

21 MS. GOFF: How does that differ from
22 stakeholder meeting?

23 MS. LISA: So the stakeholder meetings,
24 Eliot and I spent a lot of time over the fall going
25 around the superintendent meetings and talking also.



1 I've got a whole list of them and I'm not gonna picture
2 it.

3 MS. GOFF: Are they -- do they overlap with
4 the accountability working group?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some. The
6 accountability work group is made up, I think of 26
7 people from around the state that come together and come
8 to us. The stakeholder meetings that we went out to, we
9 went out to regional superintendent meetings and regional
10 meetings around the state to get a broader -- this is
11 what the accountability work group is recommending, what
12 do you think about these recommendations?

13 MS. GOFF: So how was the accountability
14 working group selected if it was 26 people?

15 MS. LISA: We asked -- I'm trying to
16 remember. It was the fall of -- where we at? Fall of
17 '14.

18 MS. GOFF: '15?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: '14.

20 MS. GOFF: '14.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Fall of '14, we had
22 sent out a notice over pulling this group together,
23 sending a letter of interest in a resume if you're
24 interested, and then CDE staff and Robert ultimately
25 decided who would represent. He had had -- Robert had a



1 Superintendents Advisory Committee for implementation of
2 163. And as we got into the more details of changing
3 things, we knew we wanted more than just Superintendent
4 voices, we wanted some of the staff that were working
5 deeper and we wanted some other organizations involved.
6 So we kind of took that Superintendents advisory and
7 broadened it. But we clearly didn't run in as wide as we
8 should have brought it too. So we'll keep enlarging that
9 group.

10 MS. GOFF: On the bottom part it says,
11 concern about the high school districts being weighted so
12 heavily on achievement, PWR. That is that their opinion
13 of that technical advisory group just before them that
14 did 40 percent?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly.

16 MS. GOFF: Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly, and we'll show
18 you some data. We didn't have the data when they were
19 talking about this, but Maria and Josh have really run
20 the data now and we'll show you, and I think that the
21 concerns that they had probably aren't there when you see
22 how the data came out in terms of relationships.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Go ahead.

24 MS. MARIA: We also have some information
25 that we had shared this last meeting too, about sort of



1 what other states are doing. And as Alisa mentioned, the
2 Center for American Progress is putting together a
3 comprehensive report of all the accountability districts
4 for all the states. So once we get that, we'll get into
5 it more carefully and sort of give you the specifics of
6 that. But in the case of all of these states, it's
7 always a balancing act. Maybe what they value, what data
8 they have available, I mean, what assessments they have
9 available.

10 And so depending on the particular local
11 climate, they have made different decisions. And we just
12 need to keep in mind, you know, sort of our Colorado
13 climate and what we are valuing and what we have
14 available to us to try to find what we consider to be the
15 right balance. And so in this process -- so in this
16 process of trying to see what the possible weighting
17 scenarios would be and what -- where would that balance
18 fall, we actually brand data, you know trying out a
19 couple of different options for us.

20 And so I called them scenarios A, B, C, and
21 D, and then there's -- on this slide, there's sort of an
22 explanation of it. So I thought what would happen if
23 growth heavily outweighs achievements? What would that
24 look like? What would happen you know, for scenario B if
25 growth only moderately outweighs achievement? What would



1 happen if I weighted growth and the achievement equally
2 and then scenario D is sort of if achievement moderately
3 outweighs growth? And then for all of those, I started
4 with the elementary and middle school results and sort of
5 tried to keep the same proportions by adding in PWR for
6 the high schools.

7 So these are just some examples that I've
8 tried. Doesn't mean that you have to stick to any of
9 them, but I wanted to give us some information to look at
10 and react to so that you could all -- you all could see,
11 you know, sort of what the impact of these different
12 scenarios and how you choose to, you know, weight the
13 indicators, what that actually looks like on the district
14 results.

15 MS. LISA: And just to -- sorry, going back
16 -- going back to that one. Scenario B is really what the
17 -- is what the tapping that accountability work group
18 kind of came to -- that 40-60 and the 20-40-40, and C and
19 D are not aligned with your State Board rule. So if you
20 wanted to go to a place where achievement and growth were
21 equal or achievement was more, we wanna go back and
22 adjust the rules there. But we wanted to just show you
23 kind of what happens when you've got these different
24 weightings in there. So we just did it for illustration
25 purpose. You can absolutely go there, we just have to



1 change Board rule.

2 MS. MARIA: Just wanted to make sure that we
3 have covered the full range of possibilities, so you all
4 can really see sort of, you know, what your options are.
5 And so for scenario A, so this is the one where you are
6 heavily weighing growth and achievement, it's weighted
7 last. So again, growth is the -- this is the pure
8 growth, so it's different than the previous weightings,
9 but so a 75 percent growth, 25 percent achievement for
10 elementary and middle schools and then for high schools,
11 it's 55 percent growth, 15 percent achievement, and 30
12 percent Postsecondary Workforce Readiness.

13 So sort of when I look at this, to me, this
14 scenario significantly prioritizes a school's impact on
15 student progress over student mastery of the achievement
16 standards or the PWR outcomes. So this work is by far
17 the most important thing in this scenario. It is
18 weighted much more heavily than anything else, and it
19 takes the majority of the points. So -- so just you
20 know, like just keep that in mind, this is that
21 particular slide of that balance you know, and the scale.

22 MS. MAZANEC: I have a question about these
23 pie charts, when you say growth?

24 MS. MARIA: So it's the median growth
25 percentile.



1 MS. LISA: We can do a -- is that the
2 Colorado growth models, we can do -- we can sit down with
3 you and explain technically, but -- but the big idea is
4 that an individual kid is compared to kids that are like
5 them in terms of how they score on the test. So a kid
6 that has scored at level one, the lowest level on PARCC,
7 as compared to other kids that have scored like that.
8 And then the next year, how does their growth compare to
9 other kids like them? Let's put on a like a normative
10 distribution like a growth chart of a pediatrician's
11 office and their assigned percentile rank, based on that.

12 MS. MAZANEC: So when I go back to a couple
13 of slides where you have the different states, is their
14 definition of growth the same as our definition of
15 growth?

16 MS. MARIA: Some states, yes. A lot of
17 states have different definitions of growth. They can
18 use value added models in a variety of other.

19 MS. MAZANEC: But the ones that you've given
20 us examples of are the ones that are using the same
21 definition for --

22 MS. LISA: I think it's close. I think most
23 of those are states because they came from Atlanta, she's
24 working with them. I think most of them are using the
25 same Colorado Growth Model, which is called the Student



1 Growth Percentile Growth Model.

2 MS. FLORES: But don't we have a district
3 nearby that -- that uses growth in a different way than
4 we do? Denver, gives a lot more weight to growth than
5 achievement. I think it does. I think that's --

6 MS. LISA: They did get -- they do a whole
7 lot of different things with their growth system.

8 MS. FLORES: And I think they -- that's an
9 example of how it's done differently.

10 MS. LISA: But underlying, it's the same
11 growth model and we can do a different seminar on growth
12 metrics.

13 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

14 MS. LISA: I don't wanna get into that
15 today, but we're happy that --

16 MS. MAZANEC: I think I've heard that the
17 district is complaining too that they -- they don't get a
18 lot of credit for the growth of achieving students,
19 either they don't have the growth, you know?

20 MS. LISA: One thing about our model is you
21 are just as likely to have high growth if you're a high-
22 achieving student as a low-achieving student because it's
23 the normative.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Under the old system, that
25 was the case, Pam.



1 MS. MAZANEC: So that's old?

2 MS. LISA: Yeah. One of those is weird.

3 Yes, it was. I'm one of those first weird iteration from
4 that and say, all right, I think it was. But the one
5 that we've been using since 2005-'06 but really came in
6 2010, but we've data that file. It's -- its --

7 MS. MAZANEC: Was there a (inaudible)?

8 ALL: I'm so sorry. It was your good elbow.
9 No more.

10 ALL: Right now, Growth Model, no matter
11 where you are in terms of performance, as a student
12 you're easily likely to have the high growth or low
13 growth.

14 MS. RANKIN: So I guess my question is it's
15 all weighted. So the student that only grows one month,
16 I mean, that's a growth in a whole year, does that look
17 differently from a student that grows a whole year in a
18 whole year?

19 MS. MARIA: Yes. So the whole thing is that
20 -- on a growth percentile scale from one to 99, a student
21 who makes more growth, the student who only get one month
22 of growth would probably have a growth percentile of 10
23 or 15. A student who made a full year of growth could
24 have, you know, 60 or 70 percentile growth. So the more
25 growth a student makes, the more sort of higher credit



1 that you get for it in the model.

2 MS. RANKIN: However, this -- the pie chart
3 just says growth.

4 MS. LISA: Yeah. It's just the concept.

5 MS. MARIA: It does. And it's the average
6 growth for the school. So it's all students within the
7 school and it takes the average of the amount of growth
8 that they have made. So a lot of schools have, you know,
9 you always have population of -- of low growers and then
10 sort of you're higher flyers. And so we're taking it
11 all.

12 MS. FLORES: But think of a model where a
13 student is four years behind, okay? And you have growth
14 in a year that they grow, so you give them credit for
15 that but yet they never get to grade level?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Grade level. That was
17 the adequate growth.

18 MS. MARIA: That is the adequate growth
19 case.

20 ALL: Yes. And that's what we did away with

21 MS. RANKIN: So I think -- I think I need
22 the two summary.

23 MS. LISA: Yeah. No, we would have -- we
24 have an online one but like we can sit down, we can go
25 the online. There's an online tool that kind of walks



1 people through it, visualize it, and that's pretty good.
2 Joyce would be happy to sit with you and go through it.

3 MS. MARIA: And in general, the perception
4 of schools a lot of times is that sort of achievement is
5 they take students as they come into them and that is the
6 population that they start, they serve. They're kind of
7 stuck with that. But growth is sort of what they get to
8 add to the student, it's that learning that the school is
9 responsible for. So the schools a lot of times that
10 start with sort of the low-achieving students who come
11 in, you know, not really, you know, school ready, they
12 feel like this is a more accurate reflection of their
13 impact on the students, whereas a lot of times schools
14 that have high achieving students see -- see achievement
15 that isn't worth. It seems achievement is more
16 important.

17 MS. MAZANEC: I can see where a little bit
18 of squishiness it is.

19 MS. LISA: Yeah, absolutely.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: But you start real low
21 you've got the opportunity to make huge gains.

22 MS. MARIA: Right. Right. But --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And if you start high,
24 you want to get credit for the fact that your students
25 are at benchmark and are already performing very well.



1 MS. MARIA: But you also -- but we also want
2 to put the pressure on not having a ceiling for our --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that is -- that is
4 a big thing.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's -- that's been
6 the huge discussion historically from the mid-90s on.

7 MS. MARIA: Exactly. Is making sure that we
8 can show growth for those high performing students and
9 that there is something to -- to strive for. That's one
10 of the reasons that we want to reconsider those adequate
11 growth targets, so that for those high flyers, we can't
12 actually make, you know, goals that are rigorous instead
13 of just easily attainable. And as with everything, it's
14 a balancing act.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there -- is there
16 conversation right now about -- I don't know when it
17 would happen but we've had keep up. Is there
18 conversation around keep -- is what did -- catch up --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Catch up, keep up and
20 move up. This is a new version is (inaudible).

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Keep at it.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Keep at it. It's not
23 the same nuance. That is the other one is.

24 MS. LISA: I think that's what we really
25 want to look at with the new assessment because now we've



1 got five levels and we know students are going to be in
2 different kind of -- it's gonna be a different
3 distribution than what we saw before. I think we really
4 want to look at the data. Once we've got two years
5 apart, we can really start digging in and seeing what
6 those appropriate growth targets would be for kids at all
7 those different levels of performance.

8 MS. MARIA: And so that we could actually
9 set more meaningful targets for students who are across
10 that achievement spectrum so that we could say, you know,
11 this is what you should be striving for and have you
12 actually made it or not have those meaningful goals for
13 them. I think those are going to be additional
14 conversations that will probably come to you all.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it seems like it be
16 -- it sounds, feels today more -- more amenable or
17 actually amenable to all levels, so if you have -- we've
18 got those kids or schools on the lower achieving end.
19 Keep up is not -- I mean, I'm just hearing it different.
20 I'm hearing a little difference in there but the same for
21 the high end as well. So if there's a matter of
22 different challenges, how do you make -- how do you make
23 growth when they have like see the height to go, you
24 know, before they -- is that better than 100 percent?
25 That's what -- that's where gifted people are.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They don't know how to
3 answer that question. They just know when they see it.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For this --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a great
7 contribution.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- we want to make sure
9 we include that but --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good.

14 MS. MARIA: So skipping ahead to Scenario B.
15 We said, you know, this is what had been recommended by
16 the TAP, and sort of the accountability working group had
17 agreed, that this is growth moderately outweighing
18 achievement. So it's 60 percent growth, 40 percent
19 achievement for elementary and middle schools, 40 percent
20 PWR, 40 percent growth and 20 percent achievement. And
21 so this sort of gives moderate priority to a school's
22 impact on student progress over the student mastery of
23 the achievement standards. Then for high schools, this
24 gives equal priority to student growth in PWR outcomes.
25 So this is kind of, I would say, that the -- the



1 compromise that if most people felt comfortable with, but
2 we definitely want to defer to you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which compromise?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This -- this one?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Scenario B is -- is you
6 know, 60 percent growth, 40 percent achievement. Yes,
7 growth is still weighed more heavily, but there is a
8 significant achievement component to the frameworks as
9 well. So this was the--

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's really low for
11 achievement.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that is why we kept
13 going.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You mean, 20 percent in
15 high school?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In high school, yeah.
17 Yes. Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's high?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, low.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Low, yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In achievements.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And this was -- and
24 that was the -- the concern of the accountability working
25 group with that perhaps PWR was weighted a little too



1 high and we can -- we can merge that. We can look at
2 what it will be like if we had only 30 percent PWR or 20
3 percent PWR, that's definitely open for conversation and
4 discussion. This was just kind of the heuristic because
5 a lot of things that we have heard is that growth in PWR
6 are most important things. So we want to weigh --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Based on our
8 definition?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's about being
11 college and career ready.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So it's values
13 conversation. Then we also wanted to -- you'll see what
14 would it look like if we didn't give growth, the most
15 weight. So you know, if -- if we had achievement and
16 growth being equal and that if we had PWR are being rated
17 slightly less. So this would give equal weight to
18 student mastery over achievement standards and student
19 growth over time. Then for high school PWR outcomes are
20 given almost but not quite equal weight. That scenario,
21 maybe -- we'll show you the results for all these things
22 and how they compare in just a moment.

23 But for Scenario D, we wanted to run, you
24 know, to complete to the other side. So what if we have
25 achievement moderately outweighing growth. So in this



1 one, we had 40 percent growth and 60 percent achievement
2 and then for high schools it was 40 percent Postsecondary
3 Workforce Readiness, 25 percent growth percent and 35
4 percent achievement. So sort of the -- the values behind
5 this, is that it gives moderate priority to student
6 mastery of the achievement standards over student
7 progress.

8 For high schools, it gives the greatest
9 weight to the PWR outcomes as the critical measure of
10 students and school is last. If that is -- in college if
11 we are ready as our primary focus, then -- then this
12 scenario, it emphasizes that. And so one of the first
13 things I wanted to -- to bring up in -- in looking at the
14 results of this scenarios is the relationship with
15 percent for reduced lunch and percent of framework
16 points. So we have gotten a lot of -- there's been a lot
17 of discussion in the fields up around, you know, schools
18 and districts that serve large proportions of
19 disadvantaged students.

20 Is that automatically in a, kind of,
21 accountability penalty for them and or, you know, if they
22 really are doing a fabulous job with their students. Is
23 -- is there a way for the state to recognize that. So
24 we've gotten -- we've had a lot of conversations about
25 what the -- the relationship between, you know, free and



1 reduced lunch and your framework outcomes, and in
2 framework points are. And so we wanted to show you that
3 for the different scenarios, it does make a difference.
4 When growth is weighted more heavily, there is a lower
5 correlation with percent for reduced lunch.

6 As you increase the weighting of achievement
7 over growth, the relationship becomes stronger. So I
8 don't think I'm doing very well explaining that. So
9 pretty much it's when you are have -- when you are
10 emphasizing growth, the proportion of your students who
11 are disadvantaged doesn't have as much of an impact.
12 When you look at achievement, the more students who are
13 disadvantaged, the lower your performance framework
14 ratings wind up being. So it winds up having sort of
15 that -- that negative correlation -- that a lot of the
16 larger districts who serve more, you know, high risk
17 student population and this is why they value growth over
18 achievement a lot of the time.

19 MS. LISA: And so you can say on any of
20 these are correlations but basically, you look at the
21 elementary level as you go through Scenario A to Scenario
22 D, the relationship gets stronger between free reduced
23 lunch and achievement. It's really interesting when
24 we're talking about high school weightings and the
25 current concerns earlier. The relationship is the high



1 school level even that Scenario D is not strong, which
2 was very interesting to us. We're going to dig into that
3 a little bit more, but it's not strong there. We love to
4 pulled up, we had a report done that looked at 2010, '11
5 and '12 data. And in 2012, the correlation in high
6 school is -0.33. So down here in Scenario D with the
7 weightings that we have had -- have been using currently.
8 So --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we have the option
10 of having the elementary and the high school that we
11 wanted to or not?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You could do that?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It might confuse people
15 --

16 MS. FLORES: I think to Pam's remark a while
17 ago when she said that achievement is really low,
18 scenario B of high school level and really at the high
19 school level, you want to believe that all the work
20 you've done in elementary and middle has gotten in to the
21 point where you've got achievement. I'm trying to speak
22 up, but not technically, but philosophically.

23 MS. LISA: Philosophically, absolutely.

24 MS. FLORES: If you really think about what
25 those kids are doing, they're learning and it may not be.



1 There's a lot of learning that's taking place for them.
2 I mean, you're learning to be adults, they're learning to
3 be -- and so achievement is important, but given the
4 total growth --

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: But we're gonna send them out
6 in the world and they don't have the skills and they
7 don't have the knowledge.

8 MS. FLORES: Well, we're not saying --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: This is our last -- this is
10 our last chance with them.

11 MS. FLORES: Yeah, but if we push them as --
12 as Europe does with the K through 9th grade or 10th grade
13 or so -- if you really think about that. That that's
14 when they do most of that and then they go out into the
15 work world and do 11th and 12th, this is work basically
16 in some other countries. And I mean, they're learning,
17 but it's a different kind of learning.

18 MS. LISA: Let's show you some of the
19 specific examples of schools too because I think that
20 helps illustrate some of this on the next slide.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good. Thank you. This
22 is really great.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so just so you
24 know, so when -- when you're thinking about making this
25 decision between how much you want to weight things, you



1 have to understand or I should say you have to understand
2 like we want to impress upon you -- that it -- it tends
3 to be that the too extremes, it doesn't matter which
4 weighting scenario, if you have low growth and low
5 achievement, or high growth and high achievement,
6 choosing how to weight growth achievement doesn't really
7 have a huge impact. So there's quite a lot of schools in
8 the state that regardless of which scenario you pick,
9 they'll get the same rating. They'll get the same
10 percent of points. It really doesn't matter.

11 So you can see with this one, you know, I've
12 chosen A, low achieving, low growth in elementary school,
13 and then a low achieving, low growth in high school, and
14 we need to orient you to the -- the graphics and you see
15 on the vertical axis, it's 50 percent of framework points
16 to earn and for the horizontal axis, it's each of those
17 individual scenarios A through D. You can see that, you
18 know, for the school, 25 percent regardless. It doesn't
19 really make a difference. Then for the high school, you
20 know, it wanders around 35 but the impact of which
21 weighting scenario is pretty minimal.

22 Then I also have the same example for high
23 growth, high achieving school, you know, that for a -- a
24 high growth, high achieving school, again, it doesn't
25 really matter how we choose to weight. The framework,



1 they're doing well enough on all of the indicators that
2 they will still have a really strong showing and their
3 performance will be really good. But the challenge
4 becomes when we have schools that are not consistent, you
5 know, if we're schools that are low achieving and high
6 growth. Which scenario you choose has a pretty
7 significant impact on the kind of inferences that we make
8 about that school's performance and their quality.

9 So you know, for this example, if you have a
10 high growth school and you weight growth a lot, then they
11 will do very well on our performance frameworks. As the
12 weighting for growth goes down and so their achievement
13 weighting goes up then they are not shown as doing as
14 well. So the difference between, you know, the Scenario
15 A and Scenario D, you're going for about 85 percent of
16 framework points earned to about 65 percent approval
17 rates earned. Depending on where we set the cuts, that
18 can be the difference between your prior improvement
19 versus performance or improvement versus the performance
20 rating.

21 So I mean, 20- 20 percentage points from the
22 frameworks is a significant amount and -- and that we
23 also have the situation for high schools where there is a
24 little bit of moderation using the -- the Postsecondary
25 Workforce Readiness indicator it -- it makes it so that -



1 - that has a significant weight as well. But you can
2 still see there's a similar trend and a similar drop in
3 about 20 percentage points, when you have a high growth
4 high school that's also low achieving depending on which
5 way scenario you choose.

6 Then I wanted to show about rule that would
7 be reversed when we have a high achieving and low growth
8 elementary school and high achieving in low growth high
9 school. So the -- the discrepancies between the
10 scenarios are not quite as significant. So on this one
11 for Scenario A, there are about a 52, for scenario D, it
12 goes up to about 65. So you know, 13 or 14 points shift
13 and a high school received a little bit less, you know,
14 about eight points is how much this news depending on
15 which scenario you choose. But the important part is
16 again, sort of when you have it in consistent growth and
17 achievement, you know, make up of your school which --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're -- you're not up
19 in that one quarter.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly. Yes we
21 thought about bringing in the quadrant charts, actually.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's okay. I got to
23 internalize them.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, then which
25 rating scenario we use will have a significant impact.



1 So that's why this is a values conversation, you know,
2 for you here in the State Board for, you know, how we
3 prioritize growth versus how we prioritize achievements,
4 and what we want that, you know, we want to follow, we
5 want the ratings and our school rating also. You want
6 school ratings and the inferences you make about their
7 quality.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: So can we have different
10 values for different levels?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't see. Why not.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think so.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean.

14 MS. LISA: Yeah. If you have any purpose
15 there.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Part of me says that when
17 we're looking at freshman to senior, this is our last
18 shot for these guys. Whereas, it's fine with me that the
19 growth is dominant in those early years because we're
20 catching -- we believe we're catching up for --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Actually --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: -- social economic
23 challenges for some kids, et cetera. But I mean, I think
24 that calls for an assumption that we get these kids and
25 we can't keep these kids. We know that's not true for



1 all kids.

2 MS. FLORES: I see that -- I see -- I see it
3 differently. I think achievement needs to be higher at
4 the elementary because you have -- it -- because it --
5 but when you have, you go into areas of work -- what is
6 it called, the P --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Postsecondary Workforce
8 Readiness.

9 MS. FLORES: Postsecondary -- you're
10 learning there too. But it's not counted as achievement,
11 and so you need to have. Also just the -- the whole
12 issue of how kids grow, and when they learn, I mean,
13 they're sponges when they're younger, so you need to get
14 the -- the learning there much earlier and then you're --
15 you're just growing as a human being more in -- in high
16 school and such. You have different achievement goals.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: All right. Well, this is a
18 values conversation, so that --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

21 MS. RANKIN: Yeah. I -- I agree with that,
22 Angelika. Why -- who chose the PWR, the growth in the
23 academic achievement as our --

24 MS. LISA: It's in the statue.

25 MS. RANKIN: All three of those together?



1 MS. LISA: All three of the statute -- sorry.
2 They -- there's also a gap indicated in the statute that
3 we've built into the individual metric, so in achievement
4 that's why we've got the disaggregation in there and
5 growth, that's why we've got the disaggregation in there
6 PWR.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just have a real
8 problem with career and college ready, and achievement as
9 being so different. I -- I have the problems with growth
10 in career and college ready as being so different. I'm -
11 - I'm having a real hard time but I think I need the
12 second part of the first tutorial that I'm gonna go into.
13 So I have so many questions about this that are and would
14 be happy we can sit down and talk.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How is -- how is
16 Postsecondary Workforce measured if --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go back --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just graduation --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: ACT composite graduation
20 dropout.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So it's kind of what --
22 she's right. It's quasi-achievement.

23 MS. LISA: Yeah. And that's one thing . We
24 need to talk about going forward also in terms of high
25 school. So right now in ninth grade assessment that we



1 know -- and we'll know better soon with the -- the parent
2 excusal rates are for that. But that's intended to be
3 high schools where we've had more kids opt out. Out to
4 the ninth grade. We'll have 10th grade PSAT. We are not
5 planning to put that in for the fall just because it's
6 new and the timeline, we wanna learn about it. In the
7 future years, we'll have that and we'll have the ACTs for
8 one last year, this year. ACT isn't in our PWR use and
9 our PWR is not as an achievement measure.

10 So for 2016 for high school for achievement,
11 it's gonna be ninth grade. And for growth we're going to
12 have, eighth grade to ninth grade growth. So it's
13 limited data. Hopefully going forward, we'll be able to
14 run growth between PSAT to SAT and have that in there.
15 But these are areas where you don't have as robust data
16 set as we do from middle school or even for an elementary
17 school.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And also graduation
19 rate. There are going to be 170 different graduation
20 requirements.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's not a very
23 stable measure a month across -- I should say, across
24 districts.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Guys so --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Where are you guys?

4 MS. LISA: We are -- thank you. We're in
5 discussion I think. What we need from you all is to know
6 what can we help keep provide to you, so that in June,
7 you'd feel comfortable giving a direction for the
8 weighting. So Joyce will set up time to talk. Anybody
9 else wants time to talk, we would love that. We can do
10 it together, individually.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we have a webinar
12 though?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have a webinar that
14 walks through -- works all the -- the whole performance
15 framework.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Should we do it by
17 ourselves?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, absolutely. Its
19 meant to do by yourself. I just want you to feel like we
20 wouldn't sit down and do it with you. Clearly you, and
21 spent that time. It's supposed to be a self directed
22 webinar and it walk you through all the measures.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But we need a coach

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. You got
25 it.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So then, understand the
2 basic decisions you need to get made or whether we go
3 with combined or just segregated. Correct?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's one, yes.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You want to take some
6 sense on the Board at the moment? Anybody want to
7 express --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I wanna. To have
9 -- to have a discussion go back and forth --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- among the very --
12 with the group that feels excluded, and the group that
13 has been included.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But this one, you do need
15 a -- that one, you need a June result.

16 MS. LISA: We need in June for the file,
17 that's not to say that we can't look at things being
18 different for 2017 and '18 and '19. But for June --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We really -- so we really
20 need to do something so - with whatever information we do
21 have in June we going have to make a decision, and so I
22 presume we should make sure that agenda item is --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we have that like
24 first thing in the morning?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you a morning



1 person?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You just described me.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And late in the
5 afternoon -- in the afternoon of the second day.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That is enough? Okay.

8 That would be fine. And then -- and the --

9 ALL: [inaudible]

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So -- so we need to make
11 that decision and we need to make --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A, B, C, D.

13 MS. LISA: Yeah, a recommendation on the
14 different, the weightings. What -- what the values are
15 for achievement and goals.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And this stuff. They're
17 basically, it's encompassed in this --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A, B, C, D.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- in this file.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. No. It is, but
21 it's A, B, C, D.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We can change the things
23 we want.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Yeah.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely not.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Including E or F.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely, yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So right now, I guess, let
5 me only ask just one question then. You know, I know
6 you've heard of high performing districts with Cherry
7 Creek being a good example. Of achievement is 25 percent
8 where they gonna -- we just like that -- it's
9 historically been high-performing going to end up?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Honestly Cherry Creek
11 because they're also high growing. They will do quite
12 well.

13 MS. LISA: Anyway. Historically, the way
14 we've had it has been, not quite scenario A. Somewhere
15 between A and B is probably where the points have been --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- historically. So
18 Cherry Creek with their performance rating and Academy
19 with their distinction rating, those districts -- or and
20 those with growth being as high as 75 percent but with
21 the added growth component in there. So the -- so --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's a decision we have
23 to make.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. It's a decision
25 we have to make.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's see whether there
2 are any other decisions.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Let's see one
4 other decision.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You really want me to
7 read it out loud?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's do it.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And there's probably a
10 whole bunch of decisions that could make a over time to
11 get you just be --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, let's do.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Three is our limit.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why is that --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Two.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So this is the
17 last one. We talked about this a lot last time, and I
18 just wanna make sure I heard you right and figure out if
19 there's anything else you on the -- and this is where
20 those cut points are set in terms of what schools are at
21 performance, which ones are improving, which one are
22 currently improving and which ones are deteriorating. I
23 know there's a question about those labels, those labels
24 are in law, they are in statute. You are allowed to add
25 additional accreditation level with the state Board law.



1 But you can't add additional school plan types today
2 though. Right Tina?

3 MS. FLORES: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm talking. Yeah, I'm
5 sorry. We looked it up yesterday again. So if --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Was that --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- you wanna know the
8 accreditation level, you could give back, you can.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this is the school
10 plan.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We know.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this is a school --
13 this is a district here. So what we're talking about
14 today is the red circle. What are those percentage
15 points earned for these five who's at distinction, who's
16 at accredited. All that. So again, state statutory
17 requirements is that -- in state law these are the plan
18 types that need to be assigned performance improvement,
19 priority improvement turnaround. And then your Board
20 rule which we use within the statute, the accreditation
21 ratings are distinction, credited, improved, accredited
22 with improvement plan, accredited with priority
23 improvement plan, accredited with a turnaround plan, or
24 you can have some of the unaccredited. Which I'm gonna
25 get to when we get to the clock conversations.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Schroeder?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Do we have the -- the leeway
3 and the rules to say that -- to be accredited with
4 distinction is not only points but that you have no
5 subgroups on turnaround?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think so. I think we
7 -- we can sit down with Tony and look. Because the --
8 the rules don't talk about being assigned a percentage
9 points at all on the CDE policy -- it's been in CDE
10 policy. So I think that's something that came up a lot
11 before especially looking at the 2014 ratings when we had
12 some districts that ended up with a distinction rating,
13 that we're really struggling with their disaggregated
14 groups. And the kind of work group has talked about that
15 wanting to make some different criteria around
16 distinction. All right. They're gonna be sharing that -
17 -

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That might help assure
19 the --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- 22 folks -- I don't
22 know what they're called. But there's not -- there's not
23 an easy way to ignore a particular subgroup.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Absolutely.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, I think that's



1 an --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- it's a high value.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And especially with
5 this new CSS -- CSS. Hey, we can't take that route
6 because it's all about that group.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I guess I'm not
8 sure how it's changed. I think it's -- its always been
9 disaggregated. It's just that it didn't look like we
10 were focusing on anything more than points.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, exactly. And then
12 the way the points ended up rolling out, you could end up
13 with a distinction rating and have your growth got to be
14 an approaching level in two districts that were there.
15 So I think it was something that flared for a lot of
16 people at a time. I don't know historically, if that it
17 had ever happened before, but it definitely popped up
18 high on the radar in 2014.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Was that right?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So last month we talked
23 about some options for how to set those determinations.
24 We said we could use the 2010 distributions. We talked
25 about using the 2014 distributions, and that's got the



1 asterisk there because that's what I heard coming from
2 you all. As you wanted to keep stability and
3 identification in percentages. We can do more about
4 criteria reference, and maybe we want to think about that
5 for the distinction level, or then maybe some other
6 options. So again, if you use 2014 this is where the
7 distributions were in 2014 for performance.

8 So what we can do -- come August when we
9 have the data back, we can run everything, we can see
10 what this would look like. I think we want to do some
11 checks on the data just to see where districts fall, and
12 the trends that they may have to see these exact
13 percentages make sense or you might want to do a little
14 bit of adjustments. But this could be our benchmarks for
15 setting the cut scores. But then maybe we want to have
16 another conversation about distinction above that to earn
17 distinction you have to earn this percentage points. And
18 also have a certain level of performance for your
19 combined group, or I mean for your subgroups.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So based on that for
21 example, we would have a district, we would have only the
22 lowest 5 percent districts?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Being identified that's
24 where we were at in 2014. So in 2014 --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's 2014?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Which was the
2 last time we gave ratings and we had one district on
3 turnaround, and we had nine districts on priority
4 improvement. So you can match back up there with those
5 percentages. But again, I think we want to look at the
6 data and see if --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- somebody has been
9 trending up or trending down, and see if those numbers
10 still make sense in terms of the performance that we're
11 seeing too. Which is going to be a --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- little tricky.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- are we required now
16 to identify the bottom 5 percent?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Under the ESSA?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because it have -- we
19 have a minimum of 5 percent of schools that need to be
20 identified.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's perfect.

22 Thank you. Let's go to the next slide. So what ESSA
23 requires, there is no state law requirement for
24 percentage of schools or districts in any of those
25 categories. The ESSA requires this identification of



1 comprehensive improvement and it's the lowest 5 percent
2 of Title 1 schools.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Title 1 only?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not all schools, Title
5 1 because remember --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- they're working
8 through Title 1. So Mary went and ran the numbers on
9 this to look at based on where we were in 2014, what
10 percentages if we use the turnaround and prior to
11 improvement that we were there before. So that
12 traditional schooling, we're going to look at our
13 alternative education campuses a little bit differently.
14 Of the Title 1 schools, there's about 609 Title 1 schools
15 that are non-alternate ed campuses. If use the
16 turnaround and priority improvement cut score -- you'd
17 have 20 percent of your Title 1 schools identified that
18 way. It's not all your schools Title 1. And if you just
19 use turnaround, you'd have 7 percent.

20 So then, as we do our state plan
21 development, we can decide does comprehensive mean
22 turnaround? Does comprehensive mean turnaround and
23 priority improvement? It will be a conversation we want
24 to have. The majority of our resources for supporting
25 schools in the state, come from federal dollars.



1 So we have very little state funds to spend
2 on supporting those schools. So to think about who we
3 may want to identify as comprehensive to be able to use
4 those funds to support schools, that really you may want
5 to think about, is it just turnaround or do you want to
6 have the turnaround and prior to improvement as well? If
7 we want to be able to give support to the schools and
8 more of that. So there's lots of things to balance we
9 don't need -- this does not need to get decided right
10 now, this will be part of the state plan.

11 We wanted to make sure you saw that we're
12 thinking about the alignment. To make sure, you know,
13 where we go if we use this same cut points as 2014 we
14 would be fine. We'd have -- we have our 5 percent in
15 turnaround and we could have that alignment there. We
16 have more than 5 percent in turnaround.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And when that guy
18 talked to me and said that if -- just filling up those
19 forms, we could basically get \$700 million from the feds
20 if we don't get now.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's significant.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is significant.

24 So they're looking into it I know that, and school
25 finance are working on. So -- so that's all we had on



1 those cut scores. So what we heard from you is -- let's
2 look at 2014, let's talk maybe we should bring back some
3 other suggestions for what we can do for distinction B
4 points and some other requirements maybe? We could bring
5 that back to you for June. But if there's anything else
6 you would like to look at, if it is from a different
7 direction you'd like to look out for determining what
8 those cut scores are, let us know because again in June -
9 - we're going to need to say, this is how we're doing it.
10 At least a very clear idea because you guys don't want to
11 meet in July. We'll have to figure out timing in August
12 we want to get at the frameworks out as soon as the data
13 is actually ready.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So have you heard the
16 feedback on folks wanting us to change? What we did in
17 2014?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I mean what we've
19 heard -- I've heard a lot of people that have -- not a
20 lot. But I've heard districts and schools that have
21 worked their way out in turnaround and priority
22 improvement, that have some fear that they're going to
23 fall back in if it gets totally re-norked (ph).

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is very fair -- in
25 my opinion, it's a very fair concern.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This would probably not
3 be the year that I would want to take that hit.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I want them to take
6 that.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think one thing
8 to know, and I haven't looked into those guys
9 specifically. But there's going to be some shifts and
10 we're already starting those informational reports have
11 been good. Because we have new standards, right? And so
12 we've expected a shift in instruction, and a level of
13 depth that we didn't necessarily have before. And based
14 on implementation and schools and districts, some people
15 that have historically been high performing, if they
16 haven't gone that far and made that shift, they may have
17 seen a drop.

18 And so there's going to be some people
19 needing to spend some time. Which is again, why when we
20 get to spring up we're getting adjusted to where they may
21 fall. Now things have switched a little bit. And so
22 just know we're gonna -- gonna have some of those hard
23 conversations with people when they have to recalibrate.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, sure.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the A plus detailed



1 report on Denver --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- indicated with a
4 slight sense of disbelief, that the park scores last year
5 were dramatic --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- dramatically higher
8 than their T caps had ever been.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In terms of the
10 percentile rankings.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In terms of the
12 percentile rankings. And they were you know, cautious
13 about whether that would continue next -- in the next
14 iteration. But if it did it would show that their
15 emphasis on curriculum, and on the standards has really
16 made a difference across the district. And that would --
17 that would probably be great news for them but it would
18 be great news. That despite the challenges they've had
19 in supporting their teachers with the new standards, that
20 they've really been able -- being able to implement them
21 to a point where it's making a difference.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that was -- that was
24 one of the very positive -- A plus doesn't often say as
25 positive but --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- overall, the report
3 did suggest a lot of hope for some significant changes
4 there.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: This will -- will --
6 hopefully anybody that has questions, we'll try and get
7 them answered before the Board meeting, because we will
8 have to make some decisions. So we'll be -- be ready to
9 go on that. And any other business to come before the
10 Board? Ms. Burdsall, have we forgotten anything?

11 MS. BURDSALL: No, sir.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, good. Any Board
13 Member have any other closing comments?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. It was not 50
15 minutes. I lost that bet.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I wouldn't have taken that
17 bet. Okay. So we'll stand adjourned then and we're
18 meeting June 8th and 9th in Pueblo, Colorado, and so I
19 look forward to seeing you all there.

20 (Meeting adjourned)

21

22

23

24

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 October, 2018.

/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