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| **Decision Points and Areas of Misalignment** | Green font represents comments submitted by more than one group or person |
| Considerations Recommended forthe Spoke Committee | Data or Information That WouldHelp Decision-Making | Questions |
| **English learner progress measure(s) and English learner assessment policy (1st year in US)**In collaboration with assessment spoke | * Would like to see where we are.
* Baseline is first year and growth in future years
* What data do we have on each district re when they engage in testing?  Options A or B?
* Consider an additional subgroup of these students; consider common arguments
 | * How many do not complete assessment due to frustration?
* Which districts have the most/highest percentage of these students?
* How many district opt not to test these students in the first year and why?
* Is it beneficial to separate 1st year El kids to see growth & achievement faster?
* How many districts have a high # of newly arrived ELs?
* How many districts opt out of first year?
 | * What data loss do we have with each racial group?
* What would be the additional cost of requiring all students to take?
* What would a sub-subgroup of these students looks like?
* Is this feasible?
 |
| **“Other indicator” of school quality or student success** | * Student & parent satisfaction
* Attendance/chronic absenteeism
* Certificates / Industry credentials, AP, Concurrent enrollment – might have to be phased in as a flexible package (like grad guidelines)
* What measures we already have?
* Consider ways to incorporate parental satisfaction
* Consider ways to incorporate parent and student satisfaction surveys
 | * Other states considering or using this data (precedent)?
* Cost of survey work annual in each district
* Satisfaction research in other educational fields & over seas
 | * Are there funds available to do surveys?
 |
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| **Decision Points and Areas of Misalignment** | Green font represents comments submitted by more than one group or person |
| Considerations Recommended forthe Spoke Committee | Data or Information That WouldHelp Decision-Making | Questions |
| **Participation requirements*** Parent excuses counted as non- proficient and non-participants
* 95% participation (including parent excusals) included as an impact in accountability ratings
 | * Consider Colo’s current law & SBE policy
* Consider positive incentives for 95% participation
* Require student posting of scores on transcript
* What are the pieces / waivers we can go after with USDE?
* Kids should be counted even if they do not test to avoid incentivizing systematic encouragement of opt out
* Is there a way to turn high participation into a positive incentive instead of a punitive issue?
* Kids who don’t take tests have to be counted.
 | * Success stories in reducing opt out percentages at the district level? Salida? Jeffco?
* Any districts that have turned around low participation rates?
 | How do we address contradiction in statute itself?§1111(b)(2)(K): “Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as preempting a State or local law regarding the decision of a parent to not have the parent’s child participate in the academic assessments.”* What wiggle room does the state have?
* Is there a way to get valid/reliable data at a lower percentage?
* Can we prove it to USDE?
* Is a waiver here possible?
* How might that work?
* How could we sell it?
* Is there a % other than 95 that would allow/satisfy the validity to calculate data,

achievement, etc. |
| **Long-term goals and interim measures** | * Justify current policy
* Should consider raising expectations
* How is grad rate calculated? 4? 5? 6? 7?
 | * Possibility of formative assessments as interim measurements?
 | * What are other states doing here?
* Is there a way to tie these goals to AGP? Or is that already the case?
* Can we measure growth goals?
 |
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| **Decision Points and Areas of Misalignment** | Green font represents comments submitted by more than one group or person |
| Considerations Recommended forthe Spoke Committee | Data or Information That WouldHelp Decision-Making | Questions |
| **N size and reporting rules** | * Should stick to 16
* Impact on small rural districts on reporting? what is the impact on reporting for 16 v. 20?
* Stick with 16
 | * Impact analysis – show the # of schools that would have data suppressed if minority group is divided up into each major race/ethnicity.
* How we can maximize into to the public
 | * How does this affect data suppression?
* What are the effects of increasing/decreasing this number on privacy & district/school ratings?
 |
| **Method for identifying and exiting comprehensive and targeted support schools**In collaboration with school improvement committee | * When public reporting, use easier to understand ratings
* Summative rating that is easy to understand
	+ this should be an additional consideration
* Do we need 5 levels to id accountability? Do we need to change SB 163? Do we need another criteria to consider: External factors, migration, FRL, EL, etc.
* Parent friendly / public facing easier to read ratings
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