



Feedback from COVID-19 Policy Implications Stakeholder Group on Guiding Questions

Section 1: High Level Themes by Review of Impact of the Pandemic during 2019-20 (green), State Assessment (blue), State Accountability and Accreditation (Purple) and Educator Effectiveness (Orange)

Section 2: Context

Section 3: Individual Stakeholder Member Responses

Section 1: High Level Themes

Themes on the Review of the Impact of the Pandemic during 2019-20

General Themes	Advice
General approach to this section	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide a high altitude review• No additional data collection necessary – focus SG’s time on future. Not sure that the SG has time to collect more data.
Specific advice for shaping a response to this section	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Items in the draft guiding questions should be answered.• Start with requirements and non-negotiables. Identify points of consensus• Create a shared document to gather responses – this will help SG members capture feedback from the groups they are representing• Add review of previously conducted research on COVID impact. Review CEI needs assessment and any other sources CDE can identify. Consult national research. CDE should work with other partners to collect data on experience of the spring.• Bring in data that CDE already collects (e.g., attendance) to provide a summary of all districts and schools. Other data (e.g., TLCC, UIPs) may be helpful in providing context.• Brainstorm on impact of no SPF, no assessment. Consider impact on instructional time (e.g., more time for safety protocols).
Lingering Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What shifts is CDE making under ESSA?• Curious about whether online schools are included.
Role Clarification	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Members should not be the sole reporters of the impact of COVID – no one story• CDE is the convener but should also share insights.
General Advice	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We are still in the pandemic – its not over yet. We need to be careful about talking about it in the past tense.

Themes Regarding State Assessment

General Themes	Feedback from the Stakeholder Group
Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The ongoing pandemic will have long term educational and budget impacts• Timelines for work of this group and school/district work are not aligned
General approach to this section	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stay grounded in legislation• Provide specific questions and options• Consider all impacted parties and perspectives

Specific advice for shaping a response to this section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target conversation on areas of influence without current consensus by identifying non-negotiables and areas of agreement • Consider role that local assessments can serve • Consider PSAT/SAT and CMAS separately • Consider historical priorities (growth)
Lingering Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we fill in for the missing 2020 state data? • Can remote administration happen reliably? • What about ACCESS, READ Act, kindergarten readiness, and local interim and performance-based assessments? • What does participation look like in Colorado?
Role Clarification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a technical advisory group
General Issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity of the assessments and their results versus validity of the inferences that may be made

Themes Regarding State Accountability and Accreditation

General Themes	Feedback from the Stakeholder Group
Performance Frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to keep ratings meaningful to wide set of stakeholders? • What are implications for growth model? • What data is still available for use in the frameworks? Other ways to collect data? Are all current metrics on the frameworks needed? Use different data points/data sources in frameworks? With so many new demands on schools, is there a way to provide credit (e.g., health, safety)? • Difficult to imagine moving forward without state assessment data or only some student participation. Need to consider implications of “opt out” in state assessments • Tracking student learning context? Implications for accountability and reporting within frameworks. • State Board revisit decisions on cut scores? • What are budget implications on expectations around performance and supports? • What are implications of multiple pause years on the accountability system?
Accountability Clock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the impact of the pause on students in schools on the clock? • How to honor school improvement work in schools on the accountability clock? • Allow schools to move forward with no repercussions or use other data sources to exit clock.
Improvement Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of state assessments and framework may have impact on improvement planning. • Can UIPs be used to provide information on response to COVID? • With focus on keeping students safe, schools may not have capacity for improvement planning
Accreditation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the accreditation process need to change?
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to reimagine accountability • More information needed on adjustments made in school improvement and planning. How are schools on the clock being supported and managed? • Consult with other groups (e.g., TAP, AWG) tackling these issues? Consult on other state approaches? • More information needed on how CO may navigate running the growth model. • More information needed on how state has responded to previous accountability pause. • Add “Under what conditions school and district accountability data be reported?”

Themes Regarding Educator Effectiveness

General Themes	Feedback from the Stakeholder Group
Timing of recommendations for districts/BOCES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educator effectiveness systems were developed over the summer and shared with educators now and the timing of any recommendations from this group and possible needed legislative decisions are problematic for districts/BOCES • What needs to be done to address CDE's communication of non-reporting of Measures of Student Learning and how that might be confusing/complicating for districts/BOCES right now? • Does CDE have the authority to make educator evaluations 100% professional practices? • Need for legislation to codify CDE's guidance around the 50% student measures not being monitored or reported to the state
Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes (MSL/O)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to lack of data from last spring (both state and district) as well as this year's data opportunities possibly being interrupted for local assessments, for 2020-21 school year do not include MSL/O in educator evaluation ratings • Since CDE already announced no monitoring of MSL/Os, is this a decision point for this group? • Pause legislative mandate of state summative data use in evaluations, is this needed?
Professional Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2020-21 evaluation should be based 100% on professional practices • Allow focus/time for evaluators and educators on observation, feedback, and coaching support • Timely, local assessments can be used to drive coaching conversations and aligned to professional practice outcomes • Teachers are focusing on their own learning and instructional strategies during varied modes of delivery right now, and administrators should be supporting that growth with observation and feedback in any model.
Non-Probationary Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counting years towards earning or losing Non-Probationary status • Questions or concerns about statewide consistency if changes to statute for 2020-21 year • Idea that no harm should be done to educators because of any modifications to the process • Do not need to address non-probationary status issues until after we know full recommendations coming from this group

Section 2: Context

COVID-19 Policy Implications Stakeholder Group **DRAFT** Guiding Questions

Building off the responsibilities of the stakeholder group outlined in HB 20-1418, this document offers some potential underlying questions to help guide and deepen conversations around (1) the second portion to discuss how the cancellation of state assessments in 2019-20 impact accountability, accreditation and educator evaluation and (2) the third portion in making recommendations for 2020-21.

These draft questions were shared with the stakeholder group. The contents of this document provide information on their feedback to the draft questions. High level themes of the feedback are in section 1. Individual responses along with the original questions are available in section 3.

Stakeholder Group Responsibilities from HB 20-1418:

(I) REVIEW THE IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC AND THE RESULTING DISRUPTION OF THE 2019-20 SCHOOL YEAR, INCLUDING STUDENT TRANSITION TO REMOTE LEARNING AND THE CANCELLATION OF THE STATE ASSESSMENTS, ACCOUNTABILITY, ACCREDITATION, AND EDUCATOR EVALUATION SYSTEMS FOR THE 2019-20 SCHOOL YEAR;

(II) DISCUSS HOW THE CANCELLATION OF STATE ASSESSMENTS WILL IMPACT ACCOUNTABILITY, ACCREDITATION, AND EDUCATOR EVALUATIONS DURING THE 2020-21 SCHOOL YEAR AND WHETHER FUTURE MODIFICATIONS ARE NEEDED REGARDING THE ACCOUNTABILITY, ACCREDITATION, AND EDUCATOR EVALUATION SYSTEMS AS A RESULT OF, AND IN RESPONSE TO, THE COVID- 19 PANDEMIC AND POSSIBLE FURTHER DISRUPTIONS; AND

(III) MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING WHETHER AND HOW TO PROCEED WITH STATE ASSESSMENTS, ACCOUNTABILITY, ACCREDITATION, AND EDUCATOR EVALUATIONS DURING THE 2020-21 SCHOOL YEAR AND HOW THE SYSTEMS CAN CONTINUE TO EFFECTIVELY MEASURE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH AND PROVIDE AN ACCURATE, CREDIBLE, AND COMPARABLE ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM THROUGHOUT THE STATE FOLLOWING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC.

Map of Timeline by Stakeholder Group Responsibilities



Section 3: Individual Stakeholder Member Feedback (as of 9/17/20)

Note: Two additional responses were submitted after the meeting. They were not included in the high level themes, but the individual responses were included in this section.

Review of the Impact of the Pandemic in 2019-20

1. What impact did COVID-19 have the 2019-20 school year?
 - a. What were your own experiences and observations? The observations of the group you represent?
 - b. Should CDE systematically document these observations from a broader group (e.g., all districts, charter schools), if CDE has the authority and capacity to collect additional information? If so, what will be important to capture?

Individual Responses from Stakeholder Group Members (14 respondents as of 9/17/2020)

Start with the requirements or non-negotiables in every category and then seek input about the negotiable pieces

A high altitude review, similar to that provided by CDE staff on accountability, assessment and evaluation during the first meeting is all that is necessary/required. No additional data collections are necessary or authorized and, I believe, such a discussion could/would be highly disruptive to the group.

We need to focus limited resources on looking forward. Towards that end, our time would be well spent discussing intended outcomes for the group, identifying points of consenses and/or areas where the group might come to consensus. Subsequent meetings could then focuses on these areas.

I would caution against an over reliance on the statutory language which was written a t a time when we all hoped/believed that the pandemic would be over by now and we could sit back and assess policy implications.

As the impact of COVID-19 is an ongoing concern, I would hope that we could take each of the areas the group is tasked with analyzing and start a shared document to gather responses. Each of the 19 members the Stakeholder Group could reach out to members of their organizations to gather a wider range of impacts. I further hope that we don't speak about COVID-19 and its impacts on schools in the past tense as though we are done seeing new or different effects on students, teachers, schools and communities. At least not yet. Need to add review of previously conducted research on impacts of school closures (both short term and long term impacts).

Recognition that the impact will vary wildly from family to family. There is no "one story" Have some concerns about members of the group being the sole source in providing impacts as each has a very specific constituency or state reach. In order to get a more full picture would like to understand CEI/CDE needs assessment and any additional information CDE has to share on district needs, concerns or implications of pandemic pause in Spring and what they understand to be the statewide story of the spring educational landscape. While CDE is the convener of the stakeholder group I think they should also be a participant at times to share insights.

I believe the impact of COVID-19 on the 2019-20 school year has been well-documented at this point and many of the impacts that relate to the work of this committee were effectively captured by CDE in their introductory presentation. As such, I donâ€™t believe any further information gathering from 2019-20 is necessary at this time.

I think it will be important for the group to address the questions already included in the document. I wonder if online schools are also included in the broader group for systematically



documenting observations. The CEI and CDE joint survey was helpful to capture the beginning of the pandemic when there was a lot of uncertainty, but schools and districts have figured out a way to operate that works for them. I believe it will be important to capture similar information from multiple iterations of the joint survey.

Where possible, CDE should use the data that it already captures (e.g., attendance data through the safety and discipline data submission) to provide a summary of the experiences of the 181 districts and 1914 schools across the state.

Additionally, via mechanisms already established (TLCC and UIPs) it would be helpful to have stakeholders provide descriptive information on their experiences during the 2019-20 school year.

CDE should also collaborate and partner with professional organizations and universities that have already collected data about the experiences of different groups during the spring shift to remote learning.

What shifts can CDE make/is making under its ESSA program to ensure schools in need are supported?

Should the state be thinking more about professionalism, since eval will be based on professional practice?

We likely don't have time to do a stakeholder survey or input process given the short timeline for this group's work. We could review the feedback already collected from statewide and local meetings/surveys to inform our work. This is a national and global pandemic -- we can also consider national research to inform the impact.

It is important to think about the range of impacts on different populations and communities -- differentiate the impacts on learning since that is the focus of this work (assessment, accountability, and evaluation of teaching). Perhaps a brainstorm session on what was the impact of no SPF, no state assessments and no evaluation on different stakeholder groups would be a good exercise? And perhaps consider the impact on instructional time -- how much time in reality is there for instruction given all the other demands on the school day now around safety protocols and logistics? How has instruction changed with remote, in-person and hybrid options and what does that mean for the way assessments have been designed and normed, the way accountability is standardized (or not), and the way all teachers are sometimes like a first year teacher in this work for evaluation?

Also remember that it is on-going. The impacts are not all yet known as we are in the middle of the crisis. And the health impact will be compounded with an economic one for students and schools/districts. Budget cuts should also be considered as an impact along with physical and mental health concerns.

COVID 19 created a major disruption to the education of children throughout the state and the country. That said, it has the potential of becoming a beneficial disruption if we use it as an opportunity to reflect on what is working in education and what tools we have now in 2020 that can support us providing students with a high quality education going forward. As far as addressing this task, I believe we need to identify the dynamics that were disrupted - then whether we were getting the outcomes/results we wanted in each of those dynamics, basically determine effectiveness and if not, take the opportunity to explore ways that we could redefine that dynamic experience. i.e. I left CO for six years to serve as superintendent in another state. When I left, we were just implementing SPFs, teacher effectiveness ratings etc. In returning it feels like we have implemented so many mandated requirements, systems and frankly time intensive processes and yet I really can't see any qualitative difference in

data on any of the areas that require significantly more time now than when I left 8 years ago..... I am absolutely a data oriented, data driven leader and our system feels a bit too heavy even for me.

Since we are still in the middle of the pandemic, I believe it is challenging to identify the "impact" of COVID-19 and our current realities might skew perceptions /perspectives. With that, we do have some baseline data from the CEI survey regarding needs and gaps for remote learning.

I think that it is important to find a way to get everyone's voice in the room or at least heard in some way. This can be accomplished in break out groups, but perhaps also in the big room by having every person complete or answer a sentence stem.

A collaborative working document

State Assessments

1. For spring 2021, under what school and district conditions should Colorado proceed with state assessments that are solely required by Colorado? CMAS/CoAlt Social Studies? PSAT/CoAlt 9 and 10?
 - a. How do you think the assessment results could be used by students and parents? By schools? By the public?
 - b. What cautions do you have?
2. For spring 2021, under what school and district conditions should Colorado proceed with state assessments (CMAS/CoAlt and SAT/CoAlt) that are required by both state and federal law if federal waivers are an option?
 - a. How do you think the assessment results could be used by students and parents? By schools? By the public?
 - b. What cautions do you have?
3. For spring 2021, under what school and district conditions [HC2] should Colorado proceed with state assessments (CMAS/CoAlt and SAT/CoAlt) that are required by both state and federal law if federal waivers are NOT an option?
 - a. How do you think the assessment results could be used by students and parents? By schools? By the public?
 - b. What cautions do you have?
4. For spring 2021, under what school and district conditions would remote (i.e., home based) administration of CMAS/CoAlt be an option?
 - a. How do you think the assessment results could be used by students and parents? By schools? By the public?
 - b. What cautions do you have?
5. Assuming that at least some state assessments will be administered in Colorado in spring 2021, prioritize the following:
 - a. CMAS/CoAlt ELA
 - b. CMAS/CoAlt Mathematics
 - c. CMAS/CoAlt Social Studies
 - d. CMAS/CoAlt Science
 - e. PSAT/CoAlt
 - f. SAT/CoAlt

Individual Responses from Stakeholder Group Members (14 respondents as of 9/17/2020)

Students achievement and growth score are impacted - schools cannot compare data - impact the body of evidence for placements like GT groupings, Students cannot exit ReadPlans - individual student data is missing

Here again the discussion around impact, in light of the fact that we are still in the midst of the pandemic with ongoing disruptions to learning, should be limited to report from CDE and any clarifying questions. The focus of the discussion should be looking forward and whether future modifications are required. Points of agreement should be identified and areas for possible consensus pending discussion should be targeted. The questions as posed seem somewhat biased and presume a continuation of (at least) 191 evaluations and additional data reporting. This is not the right group to discuss implications of pause last year, that is more of a data driven discussion by appropriate experts once the data is available.

The cancellation of the state assessments affords us the opportunity to examine whether the results of these tests tell us what we want and need them to tell us. Are opt outs at a level where we can accurately tell how ALL students are doing in the tested content areas or whether we are now "sampling" the abilities of Colorado's students? Do the results of a test that has no bearing on grades or other student academic outcomes inform parents, students and schools about student needs when we know that not all students take said test?

For each area, we need to ask what the impact on students was/will be. For instance, if accountability was paused, what is the impact for students in a PITA school district?

Think there should also be an acknowledgement that state assessments also have value for students and families and often lead into district level information for communities. How are schools and districts responding to this lack of information?

These look fine to me.

Please provide more specific questions. This is a very broad and vast topic that could be answered in many ways. This is a multi-barreled question that needs to be explicitly broken into different components.

State required locally administered assessments (e.g., Kindergarten Readiness assessments and K-3 literacy assessments) should also be addressed in this section.

Another question that needs to be addressed is: "To what degree is the current and varied student learning contexts across districts, schools and classrooms within schools being tracked for the 2020-21 school year?" What is the comparability of instructional experiences across individual students, classrooms, grade levels, schools, and districts?

What about MAP data used for AECs?

What about ACCESS and Read Act assessments?

It would be helpful to expand the thinking beyond 2020-21 since these impacts are multi-year. We can learn from historical "pauses" in assessments when we switched vendors (TCAP to CMAS and ACT to SAT) to better understand what happened before and then layer on the unique COVID impacts. I am concerned that we have now lost the ability to track student assessment data over time. As both a district leader and principal, I used our achievement and growth data to track student patterns of performance and to set goals for the following year. I wonder whether we might now have the need to utilize an assessment system that uses beginning of the year, mid-year and end of year data...rather than once in the spring that compares to the previous spring. Having the three measures in the same year, with some flexibility within a window to administer, might be helpful in this COVID climate. If I take three steps back, I wonder if we need to go back a bit and wrestle with the question - what data do we absolutely NEED to determine if a student is where they should be and if they are making appropriate progress? What are all the ways we could collect that data? what instruments exist to collect that data or what would we need to create to collect that data? How could we be confident that data is accurate and reflective of what the student is capable of doing?



This gap in data will be like the transition year before CMAS data. We need look back at how that impacted accountability and ed effectiveness. Then we should decide if we want to do something similar or not.

I think that the biggest questions that we need to answer with assessment are, what are we wanting to "learn" or gather from giving statewide assessments. And once we determine that, we need to have an honest conversation about whether or not giving statewide assessments who actually do that. And we need to weigh the cost benefit of the the actual financial cost of the giving the assessments, the social/emotional cost benefit (anxiety, stress, fear people are experiencing), etc. I do believe that there are other measures or indicators that we could come up with in order to determine how schools are meeting the needs to kids in the midst of a global pandemic. If the state assessment is going to be given this year, then the results should not be used for accountability purposes or for educator evaluation purposes. Again, IF the conditions exist that it makes sense to give statewide assessments, then the results should only be shard with parents and students and for informational purposes. I think that we need to be real about the fact that disrupted learning has already occurred this year and will most likely just continue for the remainder of the year. Test results from this year would provide fuzzy data at best. They certainly would be a touch point, but should not be considered to accountability purposes. We would not be measuring what it intended to be measured. My priority would be: f, e, a, b, c, d. I am wondering if we would/should consider a sampling strategy IF we move forward with spring assessments. I would be VERY cautious about remote assessments just given everything that can (and most likely) will go wrong with that and therefore the implications that would have on the validity of the data.

Cancellation of state assessments impacted accountability, accreditation, and educator evaluations in the area of data collection which impacts the areas listed and future planning.

This may be an opportunity to find different assessments that are less costly and more timely with results. Could use an electronic version that gives the end user an immediate, nationally normed score that could be used for achievement, growth, as body if evidence etc. Assessments must be standardized, standards based.

Seems these could be collapsed and simplified as to conditions and use for all

I feel that the assessments that must be offered/completed are the PSAT/SAT series. Students need those assessment scores for some their post secondary options. All others should be held off until schools have enough instruction time with students to make the assessments a fair grade level assessment of skills. This year, of all years, students need as much time as possible with their teachers and classmates engaged in learning, rather than taking assessments. Schools can manage local assessments, all of which take far less time to complete, to gauge growth and make needed real time adjustments to their students' instructional needs.

If waivers are available, take advantage of all of them. If waivers are not available, the federal minimum testing requirements should be the the extent of the testing regimen. Remote CMAS/CoAlt would not be something I would recommend even considering.

Prioritized Assessments: 1. SAT; 2. PSAT; (All of the following only if absolutely required); 3. CMAS/CoAlt ELA; 4. CMAS/CoAlt Mathematics; 5. CMAS/CoAlt Science; 6. CMAS/CoAlt Social Studies

What will be lost in future years if these assessments are not conducted in spring 2021 in terms of accountability and growth data?

How will we know how far students are behind without the assessments?

Appreciate the call out here to student and families use of assessment data, but concerned that educators and practitioners are not included in the guided questions 1-4. How will schools and districts work with assessment information, how will they ensure participation? Prioritization question in number 5 could be different for assessment audience and we should be able to prioritize accordingly. Students may prioritize SAT higher, while families may be interested in others, the same with educators. Depends on the audience and we may need to consider implications for each group when making recommendations.

These questions look good.

Again, these questions need to be more explicit and provide explicit options of how things may occur.

Questions regarding the appropriateness of administration should also examine the context of instruction and student learning during the 2020-21 school year. These questions also need to examine appropriateness of not only administration, but also use of data. If we will not gain valid data to draw needed inferences about students learning then it is not appropriate to administer very expensive (both financially and in terms of students time away from learning) assessments.

The same questions should be brought to bear on state required district assessments (e.g., K-3 literacy assessments and Kindergarten readiness).

Comment about the Map of Timeline for Stakeholder Group Responsibilities on bottom of page 1: Questions about the 2021 assessments need to be finished sooner than the image implies.

Should academic growth (therefore, trendable tests over time) be prioritized for assessments long-term?

How should the norming/scoring of tests change if given remotely? Will all administrations (remote and in person) yield similar results? What research studies have been done in this area that we can learn from?

What happens to participation if a student cannot access an online test due to tech issues?

Can data reliably be trended pre-pandemic to current and post-pandemic?

Should there be other assessments added for socio-emotional health and wellness, given the needs of students?

Can we reduce the compliance load of assessments (e.g., eliminate non-federally mandated tests like CMAS Social Studies) to alleviate workload, impacts and costs?

I believe I offered some insight on my thinking around this in the previous section. I question whether there are tools that could be used more periodically rather than one time in the spring and with a more flexible window so that if we are in and out of school there is still the potential for getting data on kids' academic skills and growth. Are there performance tasks in some areas that could be administered with students and assessed by groups of teachers for demonstration of mastery of standards? (basically the portfolio idea from other states)

The validity of the assessments would be in question as students will not have had a full year of instruction and therefore the data would not be comparable to previous year's data. The amount of stress, anxiety, and trauma in our students' and teachers' lives right now does not bode well for taking assessments in the spring. I would caution us to think that we would even be able to have state assessments in the middle of a pandemic. Creating a safe environment for testing and all of the rules of assessment would require substantial man hours to prepare for and administer. Remote administration would invalidate the results. Are the results worth the amount of instructional time that would be lost?

I read this wrong and answered the assessment questions on the previous page :). Sorry!
When proceeding with the guidance in section three, will equitable opportunities exist for each educator and student?

State Accountability and Accreditation (2020-21)

1. Knowing that the performance frameworks were paused in the 2020-21 school year and plan types rolled over from 2019, what additional implications are there?
2. School improvement and planning efforts have continued for the 2020-21 school year with some modifications (e.g., timeline flexibility for plan submissions, pause on state board hearings for schools on the accountability clock). What additional opportunities or issues are there?
3. The accreditation contract process remained the same. What implications are there?

Individual Responses from Stakeholder Group Members (14 respondents as of 9/17/2020)

No state assessments impacted the SPF since no data or little data exists. Will interrupt the growth metrics, School ratings cannot be assigned - this will impact the award system on the high end and the turnaround efforts on the low end. Could impact the UIP process - Schools and districts may have to consider a different accreditation system. Will not be able to evaluate the efforts of some schools with regards to improvement.

see above

How can the accountability/accreditation systems continue as before with a skip year in state testing? Will growth scoring be created through an algorithm? How will teachers, students and parents have trust in numbers that are created rather than merely reported? We already have schools in the SCAP system who do not take state assessments and still attend a school that is accredited with a Performance Plan. Will we now have students attending schools where the accreditation rating is based on a prediction or interpretation until true growth scores can be computed?

This time, again, offers us an opportunity to examine and potentially re-imagine accountability and accreditation. I fear we may spend a lot of time simply fortifying a system that many educators do not feel fairly reflects their work or their students' achievement and growth and that parents find so complicated that they have long since given up trying to understand. If this group could come to an agreement on what information is needed (tests scores, teacher/parent surveys, etc.) to fairly and equitably hold all schools accountable to the various communities and governments they serve, we may be able to make a reasoned recommendation to the legislature.

Since accountability was paused, what is the impact for students in a PITA school district?

How should the UIP process be modified if the plan type remains the same? Should we use the UIP to gather more important information on pandemic response?

I think question 2 here should probably be more specific, laying out the existing circumstances and asking directly what adjustments should be made/or not to the state clock.

What does this mean for external managing organizations and their relationships with the districts?

How are schools/districts that are on priority improvement or turnaround being supported to manage these contracts?

These questions are misleading. The insinuation that things have remained the same (e.g., the accreditation process) ignores the fact that instructional intervals have been interrupted, and traditional cut points are questionable at best. There are many moving parts that need to be considered and surfaced.

A better question might be, given the uncertainty in the data and limitations to the inferences that can be made using the data, how might the accreditation contract process need to change?

What new expectations for schools and districts have emerged that are not measured on the SPF (safety, mental health, remote/hybrid options, technology use, etc.)? With so much time and resources going to new efforts, how are they represented in accountability and accreditation?

Do we absolutely need and use all the data from the SPFs? Is there any data that we all use informally to determine success that cannot be found on our SPFs? Do the metrics that are currently used in the

SPF tell the true/accurate/defensible story of a school's success or struggle? What part of a school's perceived effectiveness cannot or is not captured by the measures we currently use? If we believe the factors in the SPF are the accurate ones to determine performance of a school, are there any other ways we could collect or measure those factors? Is that data available anywhere else?

Districts may not be able to focus on accountability planning as their resources are tied up with constant management of the COVID pandemic. The focus right now is to keep students and staff safe and in-person as much as possible, where it is possible.

Because there are such high stakes with the accountability system, there is a lot of increased fear and anxiety in the system right now about these implications and what the proposed "solutions" will be. One of the implications is that there will be lowered morale, burn out and exhaustion due to all of this by adding on the pressures of ratings. It would be helpful to come at this from a supportive frame, rather than a punitive one. One of the things perhaps that we should be doing, is looking at more data points in order to get a fuller picture of what happened or is happening to districts who are on the clock- how many students were able to access remote learning (in the spring and now); how many students were engaging in remote learning; how many students left the district; how many educators left the district, etc. Perhaps thinking through what these data collection points could and should be can be the start for a discussion.

Because of the cancellations, how are educators going to be impacted? Will they be expected to grow students more? Will student expected growth norms increase? If norms grow, will accreditation standards be raised?

State Accountability and Accreditation (2021-22)

1. While the process surrounding the 2020 accountability pause is underway, are there other recommendations that should be considered?
2. Under what conditions should state accountability ratings be calculated for 2021-22 (fall 2021)?
 - a. If most students, schools and districts have state assessment results? What defines "most?"
 - b. If only some students, schools and districts have state assessment results?
 - c. Consider TAP's recommendations on calculating growth with a skip year
3. Under what conditions should CDE continue to carry-forward the 2019 and 2020 state performance ratings?
 - a. Should a request process be available to change 2021 plan types if a pause remains?
 - i. Under what conditions should a request to reconsider the process be available? For example, all schools and districts v. limited option for districts with schools on Performance Watch (i.e., Priority Improvement, Turnaround, On Watch).
 - ii. How will comparability across the state be ensured (e.g., avoid supplanting state measures with local measures)?
 - iii. For schools under directed action, should options be available to show progress in addition to items on the current framework? Should the board/CDE consider options for changes to the state board's orders?
 - iv. With what implications of allowing requests for accountability in 2022-23 and beyond?
3. If performance frameworks are paused for a second year, what are the implications for the accreditation process? Are there ways to strengthen accreditation contracts in the interim?
4. If performance frameworks are paused for a second year, how can the continuous improvement process be leveraged to highlight local data and focus on areas for improvement?
 - a. For systems that have transitioned to online and/or hybrid learning models?

- b. To keep focus on communities and populations most impacted by the public health crisis and resulting learning interruptions?
- c. To identify emerging best practices, particularly for serving students most impacted?
- d. What kinds of data and information could local districts gather and share to be accountable to their local communities?
- e. How can CDE support schools and districts in these efforts?

5. Does the time-bound clock part of our accountability system need to shift if there is a two-year pause? Would a school in year 9 be presumed to stay at year 9 or would the clock “pick up” at year 11? Specifically do we need to re-examine the “consecutive or no consecutive years part of 1355?”

6. For any decisions made about state accountability in Colorado, are there any implications for the state’s plan for meeting Federal accountability requirements under ESSA (e.g., identifying schools for support and improvement, equitable distribution of teachers, comparability)? Note: the ESSA Committee of Practitioners (CoP) and the Accountability Working Group (AWG) are advising the department on implementing ESSA requirements during the accountability pause.

Individual Responses from Stakeholder Group Members (14 respondents as of 9/17/2020)

Maybe an opportunity to revisit the different data points, redefine the SPF and metrics. Find something that will allow continuation of accountability clock honoring the improvement efforts that school undertook to change ratings

Are there other CDE groups working on these questions? Accountability work group, TAP, AC? If so, reports from those groups and/or other experts should be provided

With state assessments constituting a major portion of a district performance framework, it is hard to imagine using them without this data. It would be harmful to the integrity of the accountability/accreditation system if “some” or “most” students’ results are used to develop a framework that is meant to be a reflection of “ALL” students’ results. Although, in some ways we have this scenario now (opt outs) and it will only get worse with families/schools wanting to maximize learning time and minimize interruptions to learning following the school closure.

Accountability/Accreditation should be something we do fully or don’t do at all. We shouldn’t attempt to rate schools and districts simply to be able to say we did so. The ratings ought to be meaningful, accurate and useful to all stakeholders across the state.

As far as the accountability clock is concerned, either pause it with no repercussions to the schools/districts or let schools use local data and other measures to show improvement. There isn’t going to be an easy and easily understood solution to these issues. Pounding a normal peg into a COVID-19 shaped hole seems futile.

Need full understanding of implications to Colorado growth model and not just TAP recommendations. How has state responded when we had pauses in the past? What lessons did we learn from those situations? Questions are much more comprehensive for this section.

On 2c) I think we should be much more specific, and ask a similar question to other formats: “under what conditions can growth be calculated, and how” or something of that nature.

ADD: Under what conditions should school and district performance data used in accountability be reported?

What’s appropriate to report and what is inappropriate to report?

School and district performance data should only be used for rating if the context of students’ learning during the 20-21 school year has been tracked and is attached to the students’ assessment results. Is

the context of students learning during the 2020-21 school year being tracked in a standardized and systemic way?

Should there be some consideration of adjusting the accountability system to not be completely dependent on a statewide assessment system?

Should the state board revise their recent decision to place a higher emphasis on achievement (higher cut scores) on the SPF due to pandemic considerations?

Should the SPF include more information about pandemic impact by school (e.g., equity lens regarding multimodal learning, impacts to subgroup communities, COVID breakout shutdowns, etc.)?

Given expected deep cuts to K-12 budgets, how can accountability expectations be aligned to reduced resources for CDE, district and school supports?

Are there portions of our current accountability/accreditation frameworks that we have data for? Is it enough to give us some process with validity? Could we look at other states' performance systems to determine ideas for reframing ours? What data do we truly need to tell us a school is performing well or now? Can we work backwards from that?

The pandemic is a major disruption to learning. Are there indicators or thresholds to consider for another skipped year? What would happen if we had multiple years without assessments? What guidance has TAP given beyond the growth calculation in a skip year?

1. While the process surrounding the 2020 accountability pause is underway, are there other recommendations that should be considered?

2. Under what conditions should state accountability ratings be calculated for 2021-22 (fall 2021)?

a. If most students, schools and districts have state assessment results? What defines "most?"

b. If only some students, schools and districts have state assessment results?

c. Consider TAP's recommendations on calculating growth with a skip year

I think that it will be very challenging to use assessments scores in a valid and reliable way in accountability. Even if spring assessments are given, the data is going to be fuzzy. I think using it, would just cause distrust and delegitimize the system. I think that C would be the best option here, but I would love for TAP to come and present to this group so that we can all be grounded on their recommendation and have an opportunity to ask questions of them as experts in this area.

3. Under what conditions should CDE continue to carry-forward the 2019 and 2020 state performance ratings?

a. Should a request process be available to change 2021 plan types if a pause remains?

i. Under what conditions should a request to reconsider the process be available? For example, all schools and districts v. limited option for districts with schools on Performance Watch (i.e., Priority Improvement, Turnaround, On Watch).

ii. How will comparability across the state be ensured (e.g., avoid supplanting state measures with local measures)? I guess I would ask the question, what would the purpose of comparability across the state be needed for in the middle of a global pandemic?

iii. For schools under directed action, should options be available to show progress in addition to items on the current framework? Should the board/CDE consider options for changes to the state board's orders? Yes, I do believe that comping up with other indicators to show progress, especially during a pandemic is worth discussing.

iv. With what implications of allowing requests for accountability in 2022-23 and beyond? The reality is that there are going to be long term implications of the pandemic. Already it is going beyond the pause of last spring as we are STILL in the middle of pandemic schooling. While I know that there are those who do not want to look at long term changes to the system, we should be realistic about the limitations of upholding the current system and what changes we need to put in place to move forward with a system to maintain integrity and credibility.

3. If performance frameworks are paused for a second year, what are the implications for the accreditation process? Are there ways to strengthen accreditation contracts in the interim? I do think

that there are other measures that we could and should look at that perhaps we could get agreement on to utilize in the accreditation process.

d. What kinds of data and information could local districts gather and share to be accountable to their local communities? Number of students in each model; number of students who left the district; number of educators who left the district; access to mental health supports; access to food; access to technology/internet; model of learning- in person; hybrid; remote; number of students and educators impacted by quarantine (how many, how long, how often); what innovative practices districts implemented to support students and families; I think that it is extremely important to collect educator perception data as we need to learn from teachers' experiences (as well as administrator and student). I feel like we need a neutral party, similar to TELL to survey everyone. Even the CEI survey feels biased to some as I know that CEA, CASE, CASB surveys do to others as well. But I feel that if we are not looking deeply at how educators are experiencing all of this then we will miss out on major insights to move forward and improve and grow.

N/A

Educator Evaluation (2020-21)

1. Acknowledging that the 2020-21 educator evaluation cycle began in August 2020, and with consideration of existing systems, structures, and supports for educator evaluations:
 - a. What else is needed to help the field meet requirements for educator evaluations in the 2020-21 school year?
 - b. What additional resources and support will educators, schools, districts, and BOCES need to fulfill?

Individual Responses from Stakeholder Group Members (14 respondents as of 9/17/2020)

Educator effectiveness measures for MLO are not available - this brings the system back to pre-SB 191 days. Possible this will give time back to evaluators to do the observation and feedback cycle better. Must rely on professional standards.

see above

I don't think anything besides the already now optional inclusion of MSL/MSO data is needed for the 2020-2021 school year. However, state testing data impacts teacher evaluation and movement between Probationary-Non-Probationary status. That fact means that all of the concerns stakeholders may have with state assessments flow right through to teacher evaluation. The areas that this Stakeholder Group is tasked with making recommendations on are all interrelated and therefore must be analyzed as a whole of school community issue.

Which school districts still conducted evaluations? What did they use for metrics?

Since accountability was paused, what is the impact for students when teachers do not receive evaluations?

How can schools and districts meet the professional development needs of their educators when the evaluation only captures one component? How are school leaders meeting the observation component of the evaluation if there is a possibility of the continuation of remote learning?

These look fine. There should probably be a review of current practice here to see what has been effective to support educators during this time, but I don't think the guiding questions need to change. Are there recommendations from the rubric technical workgroup that we can revisit?

Further streamlining, clarification of language, category relabeling, and more flexible scoring?

What other indicators could be considered in evaluation to provide a holistic picture of teacher performance and support needs (i.e. student perception surveys, etc.)?

Even if accommodating social-emotional learning and development needs isn't a primary focus of this

group, I hope that this can be framed as a critical need across systems (i.e. teachers should be equipped to address SEL needs of kids and processes for assessing kids should account for the fact that emotional well-being is paramount)

What complications have arisen due to the fact that the guidance from CDE regarding CDE's Measures of Academic Success does not follow Board Rules or CRS. How might we mitigate those complications as quickly as possible?

An additional/better question might be, "How should the educator evaluation system be adjusted given the changed and variable context of instruction and the changed context through which evaluation can be conducted (e.g., evaluators not allowed in the classroom due to cohorting) during the 2020-21 school year".

Can you clarify Question 2? Are you asking whether the state had the authority to make educator evaluation based 100% on professional practice?

How have expectations for teachers changed due to changes from COVID? How should the teacher evaluation process change to reflect those new expectations?

There was an "other" listed on page 3 about additional data to track - perhaps add a question about how much additional data reporting can stakeholders manage during a pandemic? Also what privacy concerns for students, families and staff should be considered with extra data collection?

Can we qualitatively or quantitatively say that teacher performance and effectiveness has improved or even correlates to student and school success as a result of the current system of educator effectiveness?

Are there any data sets that are currently available that could be used to build the body of evidence that an educator is effective, without the data from 2019-20? Has our current system increased teacher effectiveness? How would we defend an answer of yes or no? What data would we use....can that data be used to help us reimagine evaluation going forward? Are there any components within this process that could be eliminated by examining how they do or do not contribute to a defensible effectiveness rating? Are there any areas or components of the evaluation process that correlate highly to the student achievement/outcomes portion of the evaluation process, thus still allowing a defensible rating without student data in the mix?

There are substantial implications for probationary teachers. In addition, each district's decision does not allow for uniformity across the state for how evaluations were handled last year. Going forward - each district is starting with their own learning model that may shift and change. There are many implications for the amount of pivoting teachers are required to do right now. Many teachers are just trying to survive.

There is a HUGE need for training for the field- very few, if any, districts have trained their evaluators on how to evaluate in a remote, hybrid, or even in person under very changed circumstances. What I am seeing is that people are just trying to evaluate as if nothing has changed, when in fact, a great deal has changed. Both administrators and educators are feeling stress and strain due to the fact that they feel they don't have the training or the tool to evaluate effectively or in some cases, even appropriately in these environments (again, remote, hybrid, in person, back and forth, etc.). So training and then clear and consistent expectations for evaluators and evaluatees if greatly needed right now. I think that also clearly defining flexibilities for this year is also greatly needed. And I am not sure if it is this group that will be addressing this, but we also need to determine implications and process for status (this is a carry over from last year).

What will be the norms for educator effectiveness, giving that learning platforms look different since COVID-19?

Educator Evaluation (2021-22)

1. Acknowledging that the 2020-21 educator evaluation cycle began in August 2020, and with consideration of existing systems, structures, and supports for educator evaluations:
 - a. How might educators receive meaningful feedback for professional growth in the 2020-21 school year (e.g., observations and feedback based on professional practices)?

- b. How might schools/districts/BOCES obtain meaningful and useful information regarding educators' performance based on student performance during the 2020-21 school year (e.g., local assessments of measures on student learning/outcomes)?
2. Given the timeline of this Stakeholder group recommendations and any legislative decisions in the spring 2021 session, CDE announced in early August that it will not be monitoring the measures of student learning/outcomes (MSL/MSO) for educator evaluations in the 2020-21 evaluation cycle:
 - a. What recommendations and legislative decisions might be necessary to support this decision and ensure compliance with state statute and rule?
3. What are the anticipated impacts (i.e., benefits and burdens) to educators, schools, districts, and BOCES if the recommendations from this Stakeholder Group are implemented?
 - a. How might districts consider how the final effectiveness ratings that were or were not given in 2019-20 and the ones anticipated for 2020-21, be used for educators in earning or losing non-probationary status per state statute?

Individual Responses from Stakeholder Group Members (14 respondents as of 9/17/2020)

Go back to professional practices only - take this opportunity to dig deeper in the rubrics for increased understanding - this will allow evaluators more time for observation and feedback which will lead to more coaching and better outcomes.

Again, these seem to presume a recommendation supporting 191 evaluations for 2020-21. Would be more appropriate to discuss whether that makes sense in this context of disruption and different approaches (hybrid, remote in person) around the state. Does focus on uniformity still make sense in this context? CDE has already told districts no growth measure, not sure why this group is discussing that piece.

Meaningful feedback for professional growth: This should happen exactly how it always has, through observation (admin and peer) and consultation. Feedback based on student performance should be derived from ongoing local assessment (NWEA, iStation, etc.) and locally developed formative assessments. These are the areas that drive learning and instructional changes and therefore have larger effect sizes due to the speed at which results can be obtained and analyzed.

Recommendations and Legislative decisions regarding MSL/MSOs: This aspect of teacher evaluation looks so different school to school right now, I don't know that adding more flexibility would change much. There may need to be a legislative pause to state assessment data and its use in teacher evaluations.

Benefits and Burdens of doing or not doing final effectiveness rating: I think both teachers and administrators need to be careful not to use this time to take advantage. Teachers should be focused on learning and growing into the best educators they can become. And administrators should be focused on supporting the growth of their teachers' instructional skills. If the extent of the teacher evaluation system is to sort teachers into probationary teachers who are eventually sloughed off the rolls and non-probationary teachers who can never be terminated, then the system is already beyond repair. So, if a school chose to not do final effectiveness ratings then that was their choice and the decision should not adversely effect teachers.

Regardless of state requirements, how are districts going to evaluate educator performance this year?

These look fine.

Questions are too open ended and do not allow for clear articulation of the challenges, nuances, and potential unintended consequences. An additional question might be, "Given the dynamic and changing context of the educational environment during the COVID-19 pandemic, is it appropriate to use



feedback on professional practices for high stakes decision regarding employee retention, promotion, etc."

In general, a question about the appropriateness of using MSL on EE needs to be addressed prior to addressing any questions about using MSL.

Question 3 in this document cannot be addressed until recommendations are known.

How should Ed Effectiveness change (rubrics, expectations, evaluation) in this new multi-modal learning and teaching environment?

Given the implications for assessment data in the section above (scoring and norming changes, new baseline for post-pandemic), are state data appropriate to use for MSL/MSO? Should other metrics be added like socio-emotional support and other pandemic student needs that teachers are expected to provide?

How will disruptions in learning (e.g., students moving to in person and remote environments from week-to-week, teachers and students out sick, attendance lapses) be considered in MSL and MSO data?

Other (page 6): For the future data tracking question, how should CDE be considering the impact of additional reporting workload in a time of resource reduction? How should the legislature be considering new laws for K-12 compliance in light of reduced funding for schools? How can older compliance burdens be eliminated whenever a new one is added?

Can we run an analysis for each area of data/question we have within the RANDA system to correlate that item to outcomes we want? (student success, school success?) then perhaps skinny down the process to include those that correlate to the outcomes we are looking for?

How can we support teachers and school leaders right now? We are still in the middle of the pandemic and many people are in survival mode. Our most at-risk communities are being hit the hardest. How can we ensure students are safe and having their basic needs met first? We should look to see if SB191 has created more effective teachers and ask ourselves if it is time to make some changes.

1. Acknowledging that the 2020-21 educator evaluation cycle began in August 2020, and with consideration of existing systems, structures, and supports for educator evaluations:

a. How might educators receive meaningful feedback for professional growth in the 2020-21 school year (e.g., observations and feedback based on professional practices)? Identify core values, such as connecting with students and families and provide input on how educators are doing that. I have honestly NEVER seen the amount of stress in the system that I am seeing now. I am deeply worried about the mental health of educators as I have seen and heard from many who are at their breaking point. I think that our focus needs to be on how we are supporting people in this environment.

Obviously we should never ignore egregious behavior or harm to students, but as far as evaluating professional practice, I think that we need to be thoughtful about what we need to know and why and how we are going to evaluate that.

b. How might schools/districts/BOCES obtain meaningful and useful information regarding educators' performance based on student performance during the 2020-21 school year (e.g., local assessments of measures on student learning/outcomes)? I think that great caution should be taken with this. Even veteran educators are feeling like first year teachers in this new environment (even in person learning is not like is "normally" was). I think that feedback should be around supports and help. There is great worry that administrators are not trained to evaluate in remote environments and that you simply can't just do what you would do in an in person situation in a remote environment. I think that we should be very concerned if a large number of educators (more than the norm) become identified as ineffective. We should have a do no harm approach.

Given the timeline of this Stakeholder group recommendations and any legislative decisions in the spring 2021 session, CDE announced in early August that it will not be monitoring the measures of student learning/outcomes (MSL/MSO) for educator evaluations in the 2020-21 evaluation cycle:



a. What recommendations and legislative decisions might be necessary to support this decision and ensure compliance with state statute and rule? Right now the legislation says that 50% of an educators evaluation is based on student growth measures. That may need to change legislatively (at least in a time-out fashion). We may also need to look legislatively at the three years to earn non-probationary and two years to lose as well.

3. What are the anticipated impacts (i.e., benefits and burdens) to educators, schools, districts, and BOCES if the recommendations from this Stakeholder Group are implemented? The stress and the strain that educators, schools, districts and BOCES are feeling and experiencing right now is palatable. I believe that the decisions we make can ease that burden or significantly add to it and that is why we need to think beyond political agendas and truly think of the people and systemic impacts.

a. How might districts consider how the final effectiveness ratings that were or were not given in 2019-20 and the ones anticipated for 2020-21, be used for educators in earning or losing non-probationary status per state statute? This is something that I believe that we need to dig into deeply and come to an agreement on. There was dissatisfaction this past spring allowing this to be a district decision because some people felt that there were unduly penalized if their district decided not to let ratings count but it would have moved them out of probationary status. This is certainly a complex issue and one that requires a lot of discussion as it deals with employment rights.

N/A