



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
February 11, 2016, Part 3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 11, 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 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd like to bring the
2 meeting back to order in the -- the commissioner's absence.
3 I'd like to turn this over to Katy Anthes, and company.
4 Please. Talk to us about educator effectiveness metrics.

5 MS. ANTHES: Thank you Madam Vice Chair,
6 Members of the Board. Appreciate being here. I'm here in
7 one of my three roles. So today I'm here as the Executive
8 Director for Educator Effectiveness. And we wanted to
9 provide an update for you on -- on something we call -- we
10 like to call the educator effectiveness metrics. So today
11 is an informational item only, and it's to provide the
12 Board with the -- with requested information on the
13 implementation of evaluation systems, specifically related
14 to the public recording of educator evaluation metrics. So
15 a couple of months ago, I was here before you, just giving
16 you a general update on Senate Bill 191 implementation.
17 This goes one level deeper. We didn't have a lot of time
18 to dig into all the details in that presentation.

19 And so we're going to give you a few more
20 specifics here on the educator evaluation metrics. So
21 today we're going to just get by overview again, refresher
22 on the court purpose components, and structure of educator
23 valuation systems because that'll help you understand the
24 metrics a little bit better. Review the purpose, and
25 requirements of publicly reporting educator effectiveness



1 metrics. We're gonna review a couple of the metrics so you
2 get a sense of what those look like, and then we wanna
3 answer any questions you have, and gather feedback, and
4 share next steps.

5 I do want to introduce my colleague Dr.
6 Britt Wilkenfeld. She's next to me. She is our resident
7 data research guru on educator effectiveness. And as soon
8 as we get into the metrics, I become obsolete, and I need
9 to have right here as my phone-a-friend at all times. So
10 thank you. I do want to just let you know, and set the
11 stage for this that. This part of the reason we're
12 bringing this before to you is there is quite a bit of
13 anxiety in the field about this. So I -- I think some of
14 you I know Board Member Rankin visited, or was part of a
15 public meeting we had upon the Western Slopes where Britt
16 did a presentation on the metrics. Part of our rollout for
17 these metrics is to make superintendents aware of this, to
18 get feedback from them, to let them know what's coming.
19 And so Britt, and -- and her team, and my team we're kind
20 of on a road show for quite a few months. Going to all the
21 different superintendent meetings sharing this -- a very
22 similar presentation we're about to share with you.

23 The result of that was a lot of anxiety from
24 superintendents, and districts around the public part, the
25 public reporting of these metrics. And so you know, just



1 keep that in mind as you're listening, and toward the end
2 of the presentation we'll give you some of that feedback
3 that we've been hearing, and then we want your feedback to
4 help us craft how we want to move forward, okay? Okay.

5 So as a quick refresher. This was actually
6 mostly for Commissioner (inaudible). But -- the Senate
7 Bill 191 did establish statewide quality standards for
8 teachers, principals, and specialized service
9 professionals. So the metrics you're gonna hear about are
10 sort of the metrics measuring those standards. The 191
11 also required annual evaluations for all of these
12 professionals, and the evaluation system is really meant to
13 do a few things. First, and foremost, we like to talk
14 about it the purpose is to provide meaningful feedback for
15 educators to help them get better at their craft, and help
16 them get better at their practice. And -- and also the
17 purpose of the system is to provide information for
18 districts to be used as a basis for making decisions around
19 hiring -- hiring educators, compensation for educators,
20 assignment, professional development, a whole host of
21 things. Including whether educators have non probationary
22 status, or whether they don't, and also non-renewal of
23 contract.

24 So an important thing to note at this is the
25 only thing required in law, in terms of all of those pieces



1 that I just mentioned, is that if an educator -- if a
2 teacher receives ineffective rating for two consecutive
3 years, they would lose non-probationary status. They can
4 gain that status back if they earn effective, or higher for
5 three consecutive years. So all of those other pieces I
6 mentioned, hiring, compensation, all of those things are at
7 the discretion of the district.

8 So this is the -- the illustration of this
9 that you've seen many times before, but the basics
10 structure of evaluation. Fifty percent of the evaluation
11 rating is based on professional practice that's what you're
12 seeing in the classroom on a day to day basis, how teachers
13 teach, what they're doing. That's most often measured by
14 using a rubric, and you'll see the little fly out there
15 that is quality standards one for five in our system. The
16 other half is 50 percent based on student academic growth.
17 That is -- that part of the pie chart is based on multiple
18 measures as well that districts have the authority to
19 select. There are some guideposts around that, around what
20 types of things they need to select, but that is -- that
21 does comprise the other half of the system.

22 So before we move onto the discussion of
23 metrics, I just want to remind you all of the timeline. So
24 I often say before you, "We feel like we've been talking
25 about this for five years because we have." But remember



1 that the statewide implementation of that, actually this
2 year that we are currently, and is the first year of the
3 complete implementation. Because last year, last year was
4 supposed to be the first full year, but the legislature
5 passed some additional flexibility for districts around the
6 measures of student learning component. So districts were
7 able to select last year if they used measures of student
8 learning at all.

9 So some of our districts selected zero
10 percent for measures of student learning last year, some
11 continued to select 50 percent but it was a district des --
12 decision last year. So this year that we are currently in
13 is actually the first year of full implementation of the
14 entire Educator Effectiveness System. So what are these
15 things called Educator Effectiveness Metrics. These are a
16 series of data, and reports that help us review, help us,
17 and districts by the way, review and monitor the
18 implementation of new evaluation systems.

19 So the purpose of those metrics are several
20 fold. One, to provide districts with information to pro --
21 to help inform their continuous improvement of the system.
22 Two, to allow CDE to identify, and support districts whose
23 metrics might identify a specific need for professional
24 development around the implementation of evaluation
25 systems. And then lastly, to fulfill CDE's monitoring



1 requirements set forth in statute, and rule, and we'll talk
2 about that in a minute.

3 So two pieces, I know you all are -- are
4 always interested in sort of the authority for that work,
5 and so this -- the first part of this is the statutory
6 reference around our -- our reporting requirements, and
7 monitoring requirements. This is basically a quote from
8 22-910-6, that talks about the department may solicit, and
9 collect data related to performance evaluation systems for
10 review by the department, and we shall monitor school
11 districts, and Boards of cooperative services
12 implementation of the requirements of evaluation systems.
13 Now, you'll note that's pretty broad. That doesn't give a
14 lot of specificity, but that same statute also grants you,
15 all the authority, to promulgate rules around the
16 reporting, and monitoring of evaluation systems. So the
17 specificity comes in your rules, and you actually have a
18 copy of the excerpt of that rules on your packet. It looks
19 like this, this is a few pages.

20 And this is just an excerpt of your full
21 Senate Bill 191 rules, it's the full set of rules are about
22 50 pages. This is just the part on public reporting that
23 we've pulled out for you. So I'm going to summarize what
24 these, let's see, three pages is, which it talks about --
25 your rules talk about CDE shall report in three major



1 categories. And when I say report, the way it's written in
2 the rules right now is the publicly report. So upon our
3 school view port all, publicly report this information. It
4 talks about it in three major categories. The first
5 category is how the data is looking in terms of the
6 increases of effectiveness of educator statewide. What --
7 what correlations between educator performance evaluation
8 ratings, and student performance outcomes are. And the
9 equitable distribution of effective, and highly effective
10 teachers.

11 So those are the three broad categories that
12 are outlined in the rules. Under those three broad
13 categories -- those three broad categories are "shalls," we
14 shall do that. Underneath each of those categories, it --
15 there are maze which is the department may look at that by
16 doing X, Y, or Z. So that's going to be an important
17 distinction a little bit later. So at this point, I'm
18 going to turn it over to our data, and research guru, Britt
19 Wilkenfeld, to walk you through the details of the metrics.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Can I ask the question?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: On page six, reporting
23 requirements. It says the third thing -- the third bullet
24 point's the equitable distribution of effective, and such
25 just mean reporting of how many effective -- highly



1 effective. Is that all that means? I wasn't sure what
2 equitable (inaudible).

3 MS. WILKENFELD: Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.

5 MS. WILKENFELD: Sorry. So we have
6 interpreted equitable distribution to mean that students
7 have equal access to highly effective teachers. Not that -
8 - not about the distributions themselves. And they are --
9 it might be in a -- if you can find the section in that
10 document.

11 MS. ANTHES: It's under 6.04 (C)(III), page
12 two of the rules. Gives you a little more detail.

13 MS. WILKENFELD: So -- yeah. So 6.04
14 (C)(III)(a). The number of educators assigned to each
15 performance evaluation rating, which does get to your
16 point. But then just aggregated by certain things such as
17 educator demographics, student demographics, and school
18 demographics. So it's the distributions within the
19 distribution's broken down different ways, and actually
20 we're gonna -- we'll go through at as a metric that taps
21 into that.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you for your
23 question.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Flores?



1 MS. FLORES: Well, if we're going to go
2 really on -- on research, you know, that's -- that's
3 extent, shouldn't we really go to it, and see the amount
4 that is really related to teacher efficacy, and school
5 efficacy as far as what the research says. And the
6 research really states that -- and -- and this is a medal
7 analysis that was done on the research. It's -- it's only
8 seven percent to 20 percent at the most. If you -- if you
9 aggregate teacher, and all school of, well, all school
10 forces that really are can -- can be related to what's done
11 or -- or what can be measured that -- that's all schools,
12 and teachers can do is 20 percent. There's also all that
13 the family, and outside forces. So how can you put 50
14 percent? I'm sorry to belabor this, but I've just gone
15 through -- through the research. And when we put 50
16 percent on testing on -- on teachers, when the research
17 really says, you can't do more than seven for teachers, and
18 if you put teachers, and all the forces in public schools
19 together, it's only 20 percent. How can you make it 50
20 when it's only 20?

21 MS. ANTHERS: Dr. Flores, thank you for your
22 question. There is a lot of discussion, and debate about
23 that. Right now what we are doing in terms of our metrics,
24 and reporting are what's based on law. So the law has



1 articulated that 50 percent is based on measures of student
2 learning, and 50 percent are based on professional record.

3 MS. FLORES: I have a corollary question.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead, follow up, Dr.
5 Flores.

6 MS. FLORES: Okay. And my question is, so I
7 know that this body also comes together, and gives Jennifer
8 ideas about a law that should be passed over across the --
9 the street, and we should give them the correct -- the
10 correct research, and -- and they should be aware that it's
11 not 50 percent. So -- what we -- we have to be honest
12 about -- about what the research says, and what can be --
13 what teachers are liable for. And by liable, I mean, for
14 the amount in -- in the research, and 50 percent is not. I
15 -- it -- it's just not, it's not right. And -- and I think
16 that we should ask somebody in there to run a -- a bill
17 right now, to ask for that, to drop it to that percent. I
18 know that some districts were given the authority to do it
19 at what level they wanted to -- to put that on.

20 MS. WILKENFELD: Last year. Last year only.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Only. Okay. So --

22 MS. WILKENFELD: This coming year?

23 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible) go back to 50
24 percent.



1 MS. FLORES: Back to 50 percent, and that
2 just doesn't seem fair. We need to get it at what we know
3 the research that's available is on, and at the level that
4 -- that's available. If more research comes out, that's
5 more which I doubt then that should be the case, but 50
6 percent is outlined. Thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we (inaudible).

8 MS. WILKENFELD: Sorry. Okay. So since --
9 again, my name is Britt Wilkenfeld, I'm the Assistant
10 Director of Research on the Educator Effectiveness Team,
11 and I work a lot with the Educator Effectiveness Metrics.
12 So I'm gonna, Dr. Anthes shared a lot of the high level
13 stuff, I'm gonna kind of dig into some of the meet of what
14 we've been doing. So we did start rolling the metrics out
15 to superintendents, and both those directors in the fall,
16 and so that we asked to attend all of the SAT meetings in
17 the state, and were invited to attend most of them.
18 President Rankin was -- was -- was there for our very first
19 one, and knows how exciting it was. And along with those
20 meetings, we also sent out a semi private link to directly
21 to superintendents, and both those directors that gave them
22 access to their metrics, and school view. It is however a
23 semi private link, because it gives them access to their
24 data as well as other districts data.



1 So we are now giving them time to get used
2 to the metrics, provide a lot of feedback which we have
3 received, which I will share with you later. I know that
4 you have also received feedback as well. So we're trying
5 to collect that a little bit systematically. I'll tell you
6 a little bit more about that. And in terms of the public
7 release, the initial plan was to rollout in mid 2016. Kind
8 of give the superintendents, you know, six months, or so
9 with the metrics. We heard early on, and quite loud that
10 that did not feel like enough time. It didn't feel like
11 enough time to understand the metrics, to dig into the
12 data, to kind of check into their data. I validate all the
13 data every year, but I don't know all the nuance of every
14 single district in every single school. So we also have to
15 rely on the district to do a little bit of digging in.

16 So they just -- they felt like that wasn't
17 quite enough time. So we are trying to think about what
18 timeline feels better, but also seems reasonable.
19 Particularly given that State Board of Education rules
20 state that public reporting was supposed to start in
21 September of 2015. We do however feel like we're kind of
22 on the path to meet public reporting, we felt like a good
23 first step was reporting to superintendents, and we can
24 make incremental steps in that.



1 So we're gonna go through a few sample
2 metrics to give you an idea of what information is
3 presented. We're not gonna dig into some like the real
4 technical aspects. We could sometime, if you want to have
5 a really fun conversation, I also have a lot of technical
6 documentation that I could share if you guys are
7 interested. I'm gonna show you three different metrics.
8 These are actual screen shots from school view.

9 So this is what superintendency see, is what
10 they saw in the presentations, and now they can see live on
11 their computers. The examples focus on teacher
12 effectiveness ratings, that we do have the same metrics
13 basically for principals, and we're -- so we're looking at
14 real teacher evaluation ratings from the 2013-'14 school
15 year. We're looking at 2013-'14 data, because districts
16 submit evaluation ratings to CDE on a one year lag. So for
17 instance, right now, evaluation ratings from the 2014-'15
18 school year are being submitted. So they are being
19 submitted right now, so that's why kind of the lag in the
20 data reporting.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry, for the '14-'15
22 year being submitted now?

23 MS. WILKENFELD: Right, because they're
24 submitted through the HR collection.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.



1 MS. WILKENFELD: So here we are looking at
2 distributions of teacher effectiveness ratings for novice,
3 and experienced teachers. So kind of the most basic, or --
4 or fundamental metric that we could look at are the
5 distributions of ratings, right? So the percent of
6 educators who received a partially effective rating, the
7 percent who received an effective rating. What we've done
8 here is just look at the distributions separately for
9 novice versus experienced teachers. And if you look at the
10 graph there, you can see down the bottom left corner it's
11 says, novice versus experienced. The default actually when
12 you go to this metric is that it says all teachers, but
13 then you can click on it, and just look at novice, when you
14 can click on it to it's -- to look at novice versus
15 experienced. We're just trying to get to a little bit more
16 of the nuance of the data, and I just want you guys to know
17 that for each metric there -- there are ways to dig in a
18 little bit differently.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: May I ask you a quick
20 question. Did you say this is a actual screenshot, and a
21 actual results?

22 MS. WILKENFELD: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So we have circumstance
24 for no teachers who (inaudible)?



1 MS. WILKENFELD: So the -- the group is
2 quite small. We have to protect educator confidentiality
3 even at the state level. If the group is -- has more than
4 five educators in it, we won't display the data. And
5 that's the case there. So there are some educators but it
6 is a very small proportion.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: How many educators are
8 included in the (inaudible)?

9 MS. WILKENFELD: It's all educators in the
10 state. I don't know the number of the -- of educators at
11 the top of my head I apologize. Thousands, and thousands,
12 and thousands.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 37,000.

14 MS. WILKENFELD: 37,000. This is -- yeah
15 this is a state graph. Thank you for clarifying that.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Inaudible).

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, just for one
18 clarification. Partially effected, the way the rating
19 system works partially effective as also, you know, below
20 effective in terms of that -- (inaudible) in term of that
21 consequences, but you are correct, it's the distribution is
22 (inaudible).

23 MS. WILKENFELD: As distributing. Right.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. (Inaudible).



1 MS. WILKENFELD: We have plenty of work.
2 Okay. All right. So here we're looking at the
3 distributions of teacher effectiveness ratings within each
4 SPF plan type. So SPF is the School Performance Framework,
5 which is Colorado's Accountability Framework for evaluating
6 schools. So in this graph we've kind of turned the
7 distributions from the previous metrics on their head,
8 right. So each bar has kind of like histogram in it. And
9 so then you can see the percent of educators within each
10 performance category within each SPF plan type. So that's
11 what we're looking at here. And this is one of the ways
12 that we can look at the relationship between educator
13 performance ratings, and student performance which you may
14 recall is one of -- one of our shall recording categories
15 per state Board rule.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: So are you saying that this
17 kind of reporting would meet that requirement?

18 MS. WILKENFELD: Yes, based on our expert
19 interpretation. Now, so to add to that, here we actually
20 have another way to look at the relationship between
21 teacher effectiveness ratings, and student outcomes. So
22 here, we're still looking at teacher effectiveness, and
23 we're still looking at the school performance framework.
24 But the differences in the previous metric, we were looking
25 at the categories, every single category, every single



1 teacher was represented. Here, we changed the scale so
2 we're looking at the percent of effective or higher
3 teachers. Okay.

4 So we're isolating it to effective teachers.
5 And again, instead of SPF categories, we're looking at the
6 percent of points earned on the SPF. So it -- so we're
7 it's -- we feel like it meets a similar reporting category,
8 however it gives different information. And we've done it
9 differently. So for instance, now we have a scatter plot
10 instead of the stock bar graphs, bar graph. People are
11 more familiar with scatter plots typically, and they're a
12 little more intuitive. So they find this easier to read.
13 That is something that we do want to know. This is another
14 way to look at the relationship between teacher ratings,
15 and student outcomes.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: So explain what that graph
17 says please.

18 MS. WILKENFELD: Overall?

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

20 MS. WILKENFELD: So overall, we're looking
21 at the relationship between the percent of effective, or
22 higher teachers, and the percentage points earned on SPF.
23 We tend to have a positive relationship, such that schools
24 with -- with more points earned have more -- have higher
25 rated teachers. Overall, there are obviously exceptions,



1 and of course there are outliers, right? So we can see two
2 outliers over there on the left.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Which say what?

4 MS. WILKENFELD: So what -- So what -- and
5 also just something to note. This is a district, we have
6 been looking at state graphs. This is a district, so each
7 dot out here, this is a sample of their school, so you
8 can't figure out which district it is, but each dot is a
9 school.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: It's a school.

11 MS. WILKENFELD: Each dot is a school. We
12 do have a similar graph at the state level where each dot
13 would be a district. And as it stands now, as you can roll
14 in school view, you roll over the dot, it tells you the
15 name of the district, or the school, and tells you how many
16 effective teachers they have, and how the percentage of
17 effective, or higher teachers, and the percentage points
18 earned.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So each dot is a school.

20 MS. WILKENFELD: Right, in this (inaudible).

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So what are the two outliers
22 say? I'm trying to figure out exactly what these say.

23 MS. WILKENFELD: So -- so this is what --
24 this is something that we have really tried to talk with
25 superintendents about. For us, this is just high level.



1 So what it says from a numbers perspective is that we have
2 two schools that have either 40 percent, or nearly 80
3 percent of points are earned on SPF. However they have,
4 according to what they've reported to us, almost zero
5 effect of higher teachers.

6 So for us, in terms of monitoring us this is
7 -- this graph is a great flat, right? These outlier
8 schools are all alternatively outlier districts. You know,
9 to follow up with them what is going on there? Is this --
10 is this a reflection of -- of your teacher pool? Is this a
11 reflection of your evaluation system? And you're really
12 rigorous, you know, bar for evaluations? Or is this as is
13 often the case a function of the data that you submitted to
14 us. And -- and instead of submitting the ratings that you
15 gave your teachers you -- you did not submit the ratings,
16 you submitted something else, and so they're -- they're
17 included in the denominator, and it comes out this way. So
18 it could be -- this for us it's a flag, right? As a
19 conversation starter.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: So you expect this -- you
21 expect this to occur, and these outliers raise questions?

22 MS. WILKENFELD: Correct.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me, may I?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec.



1 MS. MAZANEC: If I have a question about
2 what you just said about the data they submitted. Can you
3 explain that what you mean?

4 MS. WILKENFELD: Sure.

5 MS. MAZANEC: How that might give you a --
6 apparently seemed to be saying --

7 MS. WILKENFELD: Yeah, of course. Thank
8 you. Great question.

9 MS. MAZANEC: -- Untrue.

10 MS. WILKENFELD: So there are the -- so as I
11 mentioned there. So the '14-'15, school year is over. The
12 evaluation cycle is over. Educators received their ratings
13 at the end of the school year. Those ratings are not
14 submitted to CDE until the following December through March
15 through the HR collection.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

17 MS. WILKENFELD: And what happens is the
18 teachers, and principals, the educators who leave the
19 district, their ratings are not submitted. And for
20 educators who are new to the district, or the -- to the
21 district, not so much of the school, they stay within the
22 district it's not a problem. If they're new to the
23 district, they're being submitted in this year's HR
24 collection, but they don't have evaluation ratings from the
25 previous year. So they get submitted with codes that --



1 that so -- so they're -- they're included as the teacher
2 pool, but they didn't receive they -- hopefully they
3 received evaluation ratings, but they were not submitted to
4 us, because of the process by which the data are submitted.
5 The other thing that happens occasionally is districts
6 don't -- even if they have evaluation ratings, they do not
7 submit them to us. They would -- those -- they'll submit
8 kind of zero values so that --

9 MS. MAZANEC: So far, but will they be
10 required to submit them?

11 MS. WILKENFELD: They are required to submit
12 them. They -- they are required to fill -- to fill out the
13 fields. And what they can do though is instead of filling
14 out actual ratings they can -- they can fill out numbers
15 that -- that do not represent ratings. But yes, they are
16 required to submit ratings. And so that is also a flag for
17 us, to follow up with them, to see if it is, you know, a
18 data issue, and if it's a compatibility issue with there.

19 MS. MAZANEC: So when you say numbers, you
20 mean they -- they fill up numbers saying, "We have this
21 many affected teachers. We have this many harshly affected
22 teachers."

23 MS. WILKENFELD: They said in the HR
24 collection they submitted.

25 MS. MAZANEC: (Inaudible) numbers are.



1 MS. WILKENFELD: Yeah, they submit a role
2 for each teacher, and their values there's -- of zero, one,
3 like a value of one, two, three, or four, for ineffective,
4 effective. And instead of submitting a value of four,
5 let's say they'll submit a value 10.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Because that's what their
7 ratings is, or because they wanna make that --

8 MS. WILKENFELD: Because it's not
9 meaningful.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They may -- some
11 districts may try to find a way to just sort of get around
12 the data collection by submitting numbers that don't mean
13 anything, so that it essentially takes out -- takes to
14 zero. You know, it doesn't come out right in our data
15 system. That is a flag for us, and we follow up with those
16 districts to say, we're not seeing this data doesn't make
17 sense to us, can you tell us about how you submitted that,
18 and can we help you submit it correctly. Just to be fair,
19 this is all very new to districts. So there is some --
20 there is a learning curve about how all of this gets put
21 in, in the different standards, and you know. So -- so
22 some of this is just a cleanup --

23 MS. MAZANEC: Some of it could be very
24 intrusive. Okay. I got it.



1 MS. WILKENFELD: Okay. So those are a few
2 metrics.

3 MS. FLORES: That's my favorite.

4 MS. WILKENFELD: Yes. That's right.

5 MS. FLORES: This is right up.

6 MS. WILKENFELD: This is right. Yeah.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Can we just put it in every
8 -- in every PowerPoint?

9 MS. WILKENFELD: It's up on my cue.

10 (Inaudible). Right. And we joke but really this is how
11 superintendents felt. That's how they felt doing -- during
12 the presentations which didn't kind of funnels into like,
13 you know, I could say some anxiety. So that's why we feel
14 that it's really important to give them a lot more time to
15 understand the metrics. We -- we're -- we're kind of
16 gauging what they need in terms of focus groups from us, or
17 office hours, whatever they need to dig into this a little
18 bit more, because the first time it's like, what am I
19 looking at? So this is what we show them. We have
20 received a lot of feedback from them. Some -- we're gonna
21 share some of that with you. Just so you know, we are
22 trying to systematically collect feedback through a
23 feedback form which some districts do participate in, but
24 most of them prefer unofficial feedback, so we receive a



1 lot of calls, and emails, and -- and you know, we see them
2 in person --

3 MS. FLORES: One on one.

4 MS. WILKENFELD: Right. They let us know.
5 So we do want you to know that a small minority of super
6 superintendents do actually feel like this is the right
7 work, and it's not what we hear the most but we do feel --
8 we do hear that they feel comfortable with the information
9 being shared. They just want to make sure that we do it
10 cautiously. And specifically, they felt that the metrics
11 were good conversation starters particularly around the
12 alignment between teacher performance, and student
13 performance. And they also felt that these would be
14 particularly useful for smaller districts who don't have
15 capacity to run their analyses.

16 MS. FLORES: How did they feel about -- how
17 did they feel about the -- the 50 percent -- 50 percent of
18 responsibility for teachers on --

19 On the test, the correlation. How did they
20 feel about that?

21 MS. COLSMAN: Dr. Flores, this -- this
22 particular feedback was very specific to the metrics, so we
23 didn't get a lot of feedback there on the actual
24 requirements in the law. We have other mechanisms for that
25 in that sort of thing.



1 MS. FLORES: That you'll be doing?

2 MS. COLSMAN: Excuse me?

3 MS. FLORES: You'll be doing that? Because
4 I've heard from them that it's not fair.

5 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah. We hear across the
6 gamut on that as well. And so I mean, one measure of that
7 is when they had the choice when district superintendents
8 had the choice to either go to zero, or stay at 50 percent,
9 or go anywhere in-between. We actually had quite a few
10 stick with 50 percent, even though they didn't have to, and
11 then we had some that went to zero. So I think there's a
12 continuum of feedback on what districts, and
13 superintendents feel about the 50 percent measure.

14 MS. FLORES: And I hope they would do it on
15 thinking instead of feeling because I think, as you said,
16 if you showed that other -- oh I guess the -- that other
17 graph, which is this, and this is how I think many of them
18 have the feeling. And so we need to give them sometime so
19 that they -- they don't feel, and they think.

20 MS. COLSMAN: Right. Yes, ma'am. Thank
21 you.

22 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

23 MS. WILKENFELD: So we have received some
24 positive feedback, but the majority of the feedback that
25 we've received come in the form of concerns that we've



1 outlined here. We just wanna be really transparent with
2 you about what we're hearing. They feel that -- and the
3 concerns really pertained to public reporting. We haven't
4 heard a lot about the metrics themselves, which is what --
5 which I'm trying to get feedback on. But right now, we're
6 really kind of stuck on public reporting, which we
7 understand. I mean that's -- that's where the fear comes
8 in. And they're really worried that the public
9 accountability is gonna provide incentives to inflate
10 ratings rather than evaluating educators honestly, and
11 giving them meaningful feedback, which the superintendents
12 feel like they've made a lot of progress on. It's slow
13 progress because it's hard work, but they're making
14 progress on giving feedback, and having tough conversations
15 with educators, and they -- they feel like this would
16 undermine that particularly because they -- they've tried
17 to build this new continuous improvement process, and build
18 trust, and they feel like that might undermine the trust
19 with their -- their educators.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Dill, do you have an
21 opinion on how roughly the statute would like, or requires
22 us to be in terms of distribution percent, and measure.

23 MR. DILL: Mr. Chair, in order to answer
24 that, I'll have to review the statutes, and questions
25 against that regulatory requirements.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

2 MS. COLSMAN: Mr. Chair, I do have a little
3 extra information on that. We have been working with some
4 of Tony's colleagues on this because this -- this question,
5 and we have it a little bit later, has been brought up
6 around authority. That statute does not talk about the
7 public reporting of these metrics, the rules do. And so
8 what we've started a conversation about with AG's office,
9 but we don't have a formal sort of conversation right now.
10 Is -- is that -- the statute clearly gives authority to the
11 State Board of Education to promulgate the rules where you
12 all have said in the past in 2011 that you did want them
13 publicly reported, but that it's within your authority to
14 either make that determination, or change that
15 determination.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

17 MS. COLSMAN: Thank you.

18 MS. WILKENFELD: So yeah. And that -- your
19 question is exactly what we're hearing from
20 superintendents. What -- what authority do we have? Have
21 we overstepped the authority? And so we have engaged the
22 Attorney General's Office to make sure that we haven't.
23 Superintendents are also concerned that the public
24 reporting of the metrics would feed the public narrative of
25 failure in schools, and that people wouldn't understand the



1 context, and would make inappropriate inferences. So we
2 had a great question about the two outliers on that scatter
3 plot, you know? It's -- you can jump to a lot of
4 conclusions, and they're -- they're worried that people
5 will, and -- and those are -- we understand those concerns.
6 As in other areas that you're quite aware of, people are
7 always concerned about data confidentiality, and the misuse
8 of data. We have -- a minimum N of five, which is in the
9 State Board of Education rules, which -- which means we
10 cannot report if there aren't at least five educators in
11 the group.

12 Some people feel that in small schools, and
13 small districts that -- that -- that N is not small enough,
14 or not high enough rather, and that you would still be able
15 to identify educators, and so they're obviously very
16 concerned about that. And then pertaining to reliability,
17 and comparability, knowing that there is quite a bit of
18 variation both within, and across districts, and how their
19 evaluation systems are being implemented, superintendents
20 feel like it doesn't make a lot of sense to put up graphs
21 for their district, or another district. And though the
22 way school view works, it's not -- it doesn't facilitate
23 comparisons but it doesn't mean that comparisons can't be
24 made, that people couldn't look at them separately, and you
25 know, cut, and paste themselves, and make some comparisons,



1 and they were -- they were worried that those comparisons
2 didn't make sense, and also didn't account for the local
3 context.

4 So we are trying obviously to avoid these
5 undesirable outcomes while also meeting the intent of the
6 law, and the State Board of Education role. So we're
7 trying to kind of find that balance, which is part of why
8 we're here today. A point that I do wanna touch on, and
9 get kind of gets to what Dr. Flores was asking about, as
10 researchers, and representatives, and other policy folks,
11 we're -- we're always interested in whether our policies
12 are effective, right? And for right, or wrong, people are
13 gonna look to the educator effectiveness metrics as
14 indicators of success for new evaluation systems because
15 they're gonna be out there, it's kind of the easiest data,
16 and we just want to make sure that you guys know, and maybe
17 we can work on making sure other people know that there are
18 other indicators of success that are -- that aren't quite
19 readily available. In particular, we have a lot of
20 qualitative data, which I've just summarized here on one
21 slide. It could kind of be it's own presentation, but we -
22 - lot of it indicates that the new evaluation systems are
23 improving teaching, and are improving conversations around
24 teaching. And this information is based on surveys of our
25 pilot districts that we have kind of deep relationships



1 with, statewide surveys, focus groups, anecdotal
2 conversations, all of this.

3 And it's not on the slide, but we have --
4 there's a recent report out of the Colorado education
5 initiative that looked -- did a survey of the state on the
6 measures of student learning, which are the student
7 academic growth side. And they actually found that of the
8 districts that responded, 70 percent said that they would
9 continue to administer the student growth side of
10 evaluation even if it wasn't required by legislation. So
11 we thought that was really interesting. It's a really good
12 indication that districts are embarking on this really hard
13 work, and they see the value in it, and we just don't wanna
14 undermine that, of course.

15 So here's where we are now. We primarily
16 are determining when, and how to report publicly. This
17 includes engaging the Attorney General's Office, which
18 we've talked about, and you asked about. We are also
19 conducting a survey of other states to see what their
20 policies are for public reporting. While we're doing this,
21 we're giving districts additional time to become more
22 familiar with the metrics, knowing that this time will help
23 with their comfort level, and we're also asking them to
24 provide concrete, and constructive feedback on any changes
25 they like to see to the metrics themselves, not just



1 necessarily the reporting. And we have mapped out some
2 possible options for the future, sorry, all of which would
3 require a change to State Board of Education rule.

4 So we could report the metrics to district
5 as we are now but not publicly, and this would not prohibit
6 us from using the metrics for our monitoring purposes,
7 which is in statute. We could report only at the district,
8 and state level. Meaning we would not report the data on
9 individual schools. Relatedly, we could increase the
10 minimum number of educators for a metric to be displayed.
11 And then the last option may not require rule change, but
12 that is to only report one metric per shell reporting
13 category. So I gave two examples of ways that we could
14 look at the relationship between educator performance, and
15 student performance. You get different information from
16 each one, that's why we've done it two ways, but maybe we
17 could just pick one. And doing that, we could pare down
18 our -- our suite of metrics. So these are some actions we
19 have come up with. We'd love any feedback that you have on
20 them, or any -- any other ideas. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions? Yes, Dr.
22 Schroeder.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Not entirely sure it's a
24 question, but I'm just remembering the incident in
25 California where teachers names were published along with



1 the student's scores. So that to me is one extreme.
2 That's never been on the -- it's never been on the table in
3 Colorado if we would do that. Now, we're talking about at
4 what level is it useful in terms of public reporting, and
5 I'm thinking here about -- about families as well as the
6 general public in finding that sweet spot that says, yes,
7 the district is evaluating it's teachers, yes, they are
8 having the conversations, there's some level of agree -- in
9 other words, there might be some qualitative reporting that
10 we should expand on prior to a lot of the quantitative in
11 order to give assurances that the educator effectiveness
12 efforts are underway.

13 I think we can spend a lifetime arguing
14 about whether growth in assessments should be one percent,
15 or 99 percent. The reality is there tends to be a pay high
16 correlation between a lot of growth than a high evaluation,
17 and the opposite is also true. Just about every by --
18 every principal will tell you that. So I don't know if
19 it's one worth spending a ton of time believing that there
20 is a magic spot there. I don't think that's the important
21 part. I think what the intent of 191 was -- was to have --
22 to have important conversations, and to have assurances.
23 And it's in the reporting that we're trying to get to the
24 ensure -- assurances part. But you want us to maybe think
25 about qua -- qualitative reporting maybe at the district,



1 and school level so the parents know that these
2 conversations are going on. There are some other things
3 that could be done, but we're not -- I don't wanna open
4 that can of worm right now to give some assurances.

5 But I'd like to hear from the
6 superintendents, and principals what's sorts of things in
7 that direction might give them a little more comfort. And
8 the other thing that I worry about a little bit is we're
9 just embarking on this, you know? We're learning stuff
10 from other states, and other school districts, but don't
11 need the hammer, and don't really need a big hammer at this
12 point, I don't think. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's quite all right.
14 Any other -- any questions or comments? Yes, Ms. Rankin.

15 MS. RANKIN: Dr. Wilkenfeld, I know how
16 difficult this was out in the western slope when you
17 presented this. I thought it was extremely interesting,
18 but I think the more we come forth, and explain what's
19 going on like you did today, I think the better it is for
20 everyone. I have received some calls from superintendents,
21 and shockingly, to me, because I had some preconceived
22 notions, that conversation getting started as to what
23 exactly it is they're looking for has been very beneficial,
24 and eye-opening, not just for the superintends, for the
25 teachers too. I understand they're concerned with making



1 it public, but I think getting that conversation going in a
2 positive way has been extremely helpful, and thank you for
3 your research.

4 MS. WILKENFELD: Thank you for that
5 feedback. It's wonderful to hear.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other comments for the
7 discussion? Seeing that, and thank you very much. I think
8 this is a very important area, and I encourage you to keep
9 moving forward.

10 MS. WILKENFELD: We'll do that.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, thank you.

12 MS. WILKENFELD: Thank you for your time.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We'll -- I think
14 we'll try, and then proceed to rule district item 6.01
15 school district performance, and targeting -- target
16 setting. Dr. Anthes, are you also in charge here?

17 MS. ANTHERS: No, I'm not actually.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Let's see. It
19 should be --

20 MS. ANTHERS: Sorry. I'm usually the texter,
21 but since I was presenting a lot of texting.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, it's Melissa. I'm
23 sorry. She's on her way, I believe.

24 MS. ANTHERS: So she might -- she's on her
25 way.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Right, correct.
2 These are actually required on this item?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. The next two items
4 on this information.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The information. We'll
6 probably try, and get through this, and then take item 11
7 out of order, and then have a lunch break. That's all
8 right.

9 MS. COLSMAN: I'm slow moving, and we were
10 like quick in getting out.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Scheme?

12 MS. COLSMAN: I wish.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I see. We won't inquire
14 further.

15 MS. COLSMAN: Okay. Are you ready to go?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We are.

17 MS. COLSMAN: Thank you. Okay. So today,
18 I'm gonna talk with you all about just information item,
19 try, and give you some background information on how the
20 targets are set in the school, and district performance
21 frameworks. It is your role to approve those targets every
22 year. We need to think about them for upcoming years
23 frameworks, but I just wanna kind of give you the
24 background information on how we've done them in the past,
25 and how we've been thinking about doing them for this



1 coming year, okay? So let me talk to you about your role,
2 I'm gonna show the past practice, and I'm gonna share some
3 possible recommendations for the next iteration of
4 performance frameworks.

5 So this is your role, as laid out in
6 statute, I think focusing on the part that says "The State
7 Board shall set, reaffirm, or revise, as appropriate,
8 ambitious yet attainable statewide targets for the measures
9 used to determine the levels of attainment of performance
10 indicators for the coming academic year." So usually, you
11 do this every November. Because we didn't have our new
12 data back in November, it didn't make sense to do that.
13 We've been digging into the new results, trying to
14 understand it. I wanna share some of that learning with
15 you today, and then hopefully in March, talk to you about
16 approving those targets for next school year.

17 So in the past, how we've done this, the
18 achievement targets we originally set back in 2010, by
19 looking at the norms of the percentile ranks of schools,
20 and districts around the state. And we have those four
21 levels of cut points that does not meet approaching meets,
22 and exceeds, and those were at the 15th, 50th, 90th
23 percentiles. They were set separately for schools, and
24 districts. They were set separately for reading, writing,
25 math, and science. They were set separately for a one-year



1 framework, and a three-year framework, and separately for
2 elementary, middle, and high school levels. And then you
3 all affirm those annually since 2014, but we kept them
4 steady. We never changed the targets because we wanted to
5 be able to see the progress schools, and districts were
6 meeting in the system.

7 So even though they were set by a norm at
8 the beginning, they were held steady so everyone could get
9 to meets reading if we saw improvement everywhere, and
10 wouldn't automatically mean schools were always in the
11 bottom. So this is a little picture of it. We don't need
12 to go into the details. You guys just would dig deep in
13 data, but basically it's a normative way of setting
14 expectations.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This one is that's
16 middle school achievement. Yes, this is just illustrative,
17 it's from 2014, so it wasn't the actual date I used to set
18 targets. But it's just the idea of you look at the
19 percentile ranks. So then, you know we also have growth in
20 our frameworks, and the growth targets were set. We used
21 both normative, and adequate growth in the frameworks,
22 which means how well did students grow compared to students
23 like them, and then also was it enough growth to get them
24 to levels of proficiency that we wanted to see them out, or
25 to maintain proficiency if they were already there.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So like are we talking
2 about our subjects?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're -- So I thank you
4 for clarifying that. We're talking about academically like
5 them, so the same score history, and the state assessment.
6 So we don't look at demographics. It's really -- kids that
7 were in the unsatisfactorily category, and specific scale
8 scores over time are compared to other kids that had that
9 same scale score history on the student assessments. So
10 high achieving advanced kids were compared to other high
11 achieving advanced students.

12 So -- so targets were set that, or were the
13 -- the metric was looked at with both normative, and
14 adequate in mind. And then the expectations that were set,
15 they were the same for elementary, middle, and high school
16 for all content areas, and those were set with a norm based
17 in mind. And again, that kind of that 15, 50, 90. It
18 wasn't quite as exact as it was for achievement but it was
19 about that norm, normative distribution. And then no
20 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness targets or graduation
21 rate, dropout rates in ACT, those were set in a combination
22 of ways. The grad rates were set with some goals in mind
23 that we had set as a state, long-term goals of 80 percent.
24 And then some norm, and pieces in between. Dropout rate
25 was set normatively based on where the state was at, and



1 the composite Colorado ACT score was set with expectations
2 from Colorado colleges in mind, for those entrance
3 requirements.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Scheffel?

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could you just clarify that
6 previous slide, previous targets? Was that -- so we had --
7 I can't remember when we had -- was that CSAP, or TCAP in
8 2010? What tests again are encompassed in those that
9 period?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. I think in 2010,
11 where in fact, we were still on TCAP then, right? Or CSAP,
12 and then moved to TCAP.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: So did -- did that adjust
14 when you said where's the language that says determining
15 performance at the 15th, 50th, and 90th percentile?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was not when we sat
17 with the switch to TCAP, I think --

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Joyce, you looked at it. The
19 blueprints between the CSAP, and TCAP when we made that
20 transition were similar enough that those tests could be
21 considered comparable, and the performance didn't change.

22 MS. RANKIN: And then with park coming in,
23 how did that change?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Exactly. And that's exactly
2 why we're here talking to you today because we know it's
3 very different with (inaudible).

4 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: So -- so where we are now? I
6 wanna make sure we have some time to talk about this more
7 in depth at this that we do have new assessments with new
8 outcomes, with some new metrics that we can look at the
9 time to really rethink our system. Especially after
10 holding target steady for five years, it's a really good
11 time to look at what do we want to have for our
12 expectations as a state. Also we've seen prior to this
13 year, some really big gains with our decreases in dropout
14 rate, increases in graduation rate over time, and it may be
15 time that we want to reset, and start reaching for another
16 level of expectations with those. And we've also received,
17 we've been working with our accountability workgroup for
18 over a year now talking about revisions to the frameworks,
19 and with the technical advisory panel for longitudinal
20 growth, and they have some suggestions for the measures and
21 metrics going forward. So I will we'll talk about those
22 today, too.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: May I ask you how many
24 test scores are a metric, correct? Or a major in



1 graduation rates, dropout rates, how many components are
2 there department time?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: So in the frameworks that the
4 present time, we've got achievement measures in there,
5 which is just the state test scores. We have growth
6 measures which looks at the core content areas in English
7 language proficiency. And then for Postsecondary Workforce
8 Readiness, we look at graduation rate, disaggregated
9 graduation rate, dropout rates in the Colorado composite
10 ACT score. There are some changes with legislation from
11 last year adding another PWR metric, and I'll talk about
12 that in a little bit as well.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So for overall target
15 setting, one of the recommendations that we've heard loud,
16 and clear from the state is that we want to align the
17 school on district targets. At the beginning, I told you
18 that she targets were set separately, and that was to
19 compare schools to schools, and districts to districts,
20 which makes a lot of sense. The challenge we have is we
21 have a lot of schools, and districts that are one, and the
22 same in a state, right? One elementary school, one middle,
23 one high school seem same kids same schools. Data should
24 be the same. When the targets resets separately, then we
25 sometimes got mixed messages. Where in elementary school,



1 we get an approaching rating for reading, and the district,
2 we get a mixed reading, and it was simply because of the
3 norming, so we went align those targets together, and we'll
4 bring that to you that way. And we've heard widespread
5 support across the state for doing that.

6 Another thing a big overall thing to think
7 about is the methodology for determining targets. We've
8 mostly done this based on norms like percentile ranks, and
9 then holding those steady. You could do it more if a
10 criterion based like we did with the ACT. For college
11 entrance, you could do that -- you could think about that
12 for all metrics for the state assessments as well. I think
13 we just need to figure out how we would set those
14 expectations, but it's a possibility to think about. And
15 then we had a recommendation from the Technical Advisory
16 Panel, that if we're using a norm-based system to think
17 about instead of the 90th percentile going to the 85th, so
18 that it's symmetrical with the 50th, to the (inaudible) so
19 small detail, but we thought we would share that. So for
20 the achievement indicator, we've been having a lot of
21 conversations about this, especially around the metric to
22 use.

23 So historically, we see mass in TCAP. We
24 used -- or CSAP, and TCAP, the most -- we use the percent
25 of students proficient advanced at these top two levels.



1 We could do that again using the percent of students that
2 are at benchmark level four, or level five. There's also
3 an option to look at the percent, the mean scale score of
4 students, and so there's pros, and cons to both of those
5 different metrics. A lot we've been getting
6 recommendations that means scale score makes a lot of
7 sense, and that what you see there, you get -- you get a
8 better chance of seeing students, or students at all levels
9 of performance are included, and there is less of a focus
10 on just those, and we used to call 'em level kids under
11 AYP. The kids are right below the cut score, that
12 pushover.

13 So it's more of a focus on all students, and
14 where they are -- where they're working. The other benefit
15 of mean scale score is around data privacy. If you report
16 100 percent of your students are at benchmark, then all of
17 a sudden, everybody in the community knows every kid score,
18 right? They are all at benchmark to celebrate that, but --
19 but it's a privacy issue. If you report mean scale score
20 as long as you're above minimum, it's really hard. You
21 really can't figure out what an individual student's scale
22 score is.

23 So -- so that's one decision point that
24 we'll have to make. Then determining the target, we'll
25 have to think if we want to do normative target setting, or



1 using criteria. We'll have to look at targets for English
2 language, arts, math, and science, separately. There's
3 been a recommendation not to include social studies since
4 it will be tested on a rotating basis in the frameworks
5 themselves but have it be information that could get used
6 in the request to reconsider process. So if districts want
7 to use it as additional evidence, they could bring it
8 forward, but that we wouldn't put it out there since we
9 don't have it for everyone every year. And then we'll
10 think -- we want to think about setting targets separately
11 for elementary, middle, and high school. We're not seeing
12 as much of a difference in performance by grade level as we
13 did with the math on the TCAP, for example, but I think we
14 still want to make sure those targets are specific to those
15 grade levels.

16 In terms of growth, we have a recommendation
17 both from the accountability work group, and the Technical
18 Advisory Panel, and have heard a lot of positive feedback
19 from around the state to separate those measures of
20 normative growth, and adequate growth, that compares
21 comparative growth to how much growth is enough. How
22 adequate growth is defined currently in the state, it makes
23 -- it's a much harder target for students that are not
24 currently proficient or at benchmark. And it's a much



1 easier target for students that are already proficient, and
2 so that plays out with different demographics of schools.

3 So we've heard that it would be good to
4 separate those two. Additionally, we think it might make
5 sense to hold on adequate growth for a little bit. This
6 year, we clearly can't. You need at least two years of the
7 same assessment to determine how much growth is enough to
8 reach certain levels. We'll have two years at the end of
9 this summer, but we think it might make sense to wait some
10 time. Think about how adequate growth can most -- be used
11 most meaningfully in the performance frameworks. Again, we
12 can think about growth expectations by norms, sounding like
13 the 15, 50, 90th, or 85th percentiles, or think about some
14 criteria that we want to use as well, or instead.

15 We'll have targets for English language,
16 arts, math, and English language proficiency. We won't
17 have science that we don't test in consecutive grades for
18 science, or for social studies, so it mix of measuring
19 growth pretty challenging. And traditionally, we have had
20 the same targets for elementary, middle, and high school
21 level, probably makes sense to do that. That's another
22 decision point to make. So then, for the Postsecondary
23 Workforce Readiness indicators, the accountability work
24 group had recommended using the completion rate instead of
25 graduation rate. There's a few differences between



1 completion rate, and graduation rate. Completion rate
2 includes GED completers, and it also includes students that
3 may get a certificate of (inaudible).

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. (inaudible) has a
5 question.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So a lot of the
7 measures we're talking about are common measures.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yup.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's been pointed out
10 to me by one of my superintendents that graduation rate is
11 really not a common measure. So all of my districts are
12 going through the process of setting graduation guidelines,
13 and so they're struggling with. We want to set really high
14 standards for our community because we believe that that's
15 what we should be doing for kids is to set very high
16 standards, and then we will be deemed on graduation rates
17 at least initially, until we know that that's an
18 internalized culture in our community. And there is that
19 concern, and I don't know how we're going to address that
20 in our state. But at some point, and I think we need to be
21 sensitive to that in our accountability measures.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Absolutely.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we study it? Or
24 just exactly how do we look at this in order to not gain
25 the system, which is what the risk is.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Absolutely. And that's been
2 an existing challenge that we've heard too, because number
3 four guidelines were passed, everybody had their own.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. It's just a
5 topic. It's a -- it's the most significant topic of
6 conversation right now as the school districts work with
7 their communities to see what -- what -- what are the best
8 expectations for kids.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there -- there's a
10 few things we can think about doing with that. One we can
11 think about, the weighting of the grad rate indicator, and
12 how much that should be weighed in the frameworks, and
13 that's something we'll talk with all of you about. And the
14 other thing is we can think of some checks, and balances in
15 the system. We could add in something around what your
16 requirements are, or we can think about some other
17 indicators we've been talking about college credit
18 completion before graduation. There's some other ways to
19 balance it out as well in there, so I think that's a really
20 good conversation that we can all have as we move forward.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

22 MS. FLORES: I think it's important to have
23 high standards, certainly. But for some kids, if we set
24 standards at such a level that we don't get kids that
25 graduate, we really do have a life, and death situation for



1 our student population in some districts, so we -- we want
2 to have, we -- we really do wanna have high standards. We
3 don't want to think of kids not working, you know, hard to
4 achieve those high standards, but we don't want to have
5 them so high that we just forget about a large population
6 of our kids, who are if we set the standards too high and -
7 - and they'll never get it.

8 And we know that a high school diploma is so
9 important now for just getting a job, digging ditches, so
10 we have to remember that. Keep that in mind. And also,
11 can I -- I mean, we're going, and saying we going to talk
12 about this. I think this is so important, and we kind of
13 bringing out. But I think this is worthy of possibly
14 sitting down, actually sitting down for -- for a day, and -
15 - and just working on, and thinking about this, and maybe
16 having more input from -- from the department, and maybe
17 from outside sources where we bring in experts to really
18 think over these. I think it's -- it's that time we go
19 over it, but we really need to get down to deeper
20 understanding, I think, for all of us.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think Commissioner
22 Crandall's task for all of us has been try to think about
23 where we want to be, where we want the state to be in -- in
24 the future in five years, and -- and these are the kinds of
25 things these last two reports are things that are certainly



1 going to be critical elements. We're going to have to
2 devote more time to them in a more deliberative basis, and
3 I'm sure we'll have the opportunity to get that done as the
4 year progresses. Dr. Scheffel, did you have a comment?

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: I was going to comment on
6 when we have high school graduation requirements, and
7 everything on the list, but two is a standardized test, and
8 schools are trying to set high standards. We have to look
9 at the implications of districts that will use largely
10 standardized tests, you know, to as a -- as a gate to exit
11 from high school. And we know that those tests load
12 heavily on language, and we know that lots of LOS and
13 others that struggle with language, so we have to think
14 about whether, or not standardized testing is a proxy for
15 content knowledge, and the kind of maturity we expect
16 students to be experiencing during their four years in high
17 school. So this is a broader discussion. It's a broader
18 discussion.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible)
20 conversations at the -- at the local level exactly
21 regarding this and what are some of these (inaudible)
22 engage in --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My concern is that the
24 districts don't have to choose one of the two options that
25 are not standardized test. I mean, districts can choose



1 five things on that menu, two things, depending on their
2 resources, and many of the districts don't have resources
3 to provide a lot of good options, and that's my concern.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I was -- I was thinking of
5 making a similar comment to the board labored long, and
6 hard, and it was certainly a difficult decision to try, and
7 provide as much flexibility in those graduation standards
8 as possible. I'm not sure we necessarily provided enough
9 flexibility, but we certainly reached consensus on it, and
10 I wouldn't wanna see any of that undone by essentially
11 using of -- changing the rating system to remove any of
12 that flexibility that we did provide. So okay. Go ahead,
13 Ms. Pearson.

14 MS. PEARSON: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, yes. Yes, Dr.
16 Scheffel.

17 DR. SCHEFFEL: I just have one more
18 question that's kind of a broad question. We talked about
19 this once several meetings ago, the idea that when we're
20 determining performance at these percentile levels, right?
21 You could almost make it a zero sum game where you're
22 constantly moving the mean, so you're always gonna have
23 some students in the lower quartile, and upper quartile,
24 just move mean around, right? But we haven't done that,



1 right? You've said we'd held it steady with how we've
2 defined those targets, right?

3 MS. PEARSON: Exactly.

4 DR. SCHEFFEL: But, I mean is that, when we
5 compare our data with other states, or even -- even other
6 countries, do you have a sense of, I've never seen that
7 explicated in the data, which would be a really important
8 way to interpret it because if some are moving the mean
9 around, and some are not, then it's not apples to apples.
10 So can you comment on that, and is there a point at which
11 you do move the mean, and do we know them? I mean, I -- I
12 just talked to -- there's just a lot of detail implicit in
13 these ratings, and the buckets which are the labels of
14 where kids fall. Can you speak to that kind of broad
15 question?

16 MS. PEARSON: I mean, I think broadly
17 comparing states accountability systems is never apples to
18 apples. I think there's so many different decisions. I
19 mean, even with AYP, when it was that prescriptive with
20 federal law, you still couldn't compare a state to a state
21 what that really meant. I think we could do some more
22 research to see if we see the impact of changing, renorming
23 every year, batching up your targets every year has an
24 impact. I mean, that could be a really interesting thing
25 to look into.



1 DR. SCHEFFEL: 'Cause I think we're getting
2 ready to lower the mean because of the huge gaps that PARCC
3 has -- has really created that artifact.

4 MS. PEARSON: I think it depends on how --
5 how you all wanna set the targets. I think we could say,
6 we wanna -- we wanna set targets again at 15, 50, 85, or
7 15, 50, 90 based on the new assessment results, and then
8 hold those for a little bit. I've heard some people are
9 suggesting we keep the exact same percent proficient in
10 advanced targets that we had previously for the new
11 assessments. I think then you're going to see lots, and
12 lots of schools, and districts at those lower levels.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: But are we creating the
14 conditions such that only a certain percentage of kids can
15 fall in each bucket?

16 MS. PEARSON: If we -- if we norm the cut
17 points, we would norm it so a certain percentage of
18 schools, or districts fell in those cut points, if you set
19 them on a normative basis. If you set it by criterion, and
20 say, this is our expectation first. The state right now we
21 think it's sufficient for 70 percent of kids in a school to
22 be at benchmark, or have this mean scale score, whenever we
23 decide we want to do. Then you set it on that criterion.
24 My hunch is that based on the criterion we may set, they'd



1 be probably more on the lower levels than if you set it
2 normative.

3 DR. SCHEFFEL: We were doing a combination
4 of those two as I understand it, is that right?

5 MS. PEARSON: Right now -- right now what
6 happened with 2010 with those targets, they were mostly all
7 normatively set, and held. There was a few with ACT, and
8 with grad rate that were criterion referenced.

9 DR. SCHEFFEL: As we discussed this. We're
10 thinking through all those issues.

11 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

12 DR. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. I think that we need
13 to make sure we understand all those issues 'cause they
14 have huge implications for the buckets that districts end
15 up in, and why they are there, 'cause they're trying to get
16 out of the lower buckets.

17 MS. PEARSON: Exactly. And then there is
18 another level. This is where it gets complicated, and I'm
19 sorry guys, and I'm glad you want to dig into it. These
20 are talking about the cut points for the individual
21 measures. So for achievement, and for growth, and
22 graduation rate. At the end, the way the system has worked
23 that's all rolled up into points, and then there's been
24 another set of cut points for those overall points for the
25 levels, the schools, and the districts get designed to for



1 their ratings. And that's another decision point that
2 we'll need to make at some point too. You all need to
3 think about, do you wanna set it to a certain percent is in
4 turnaround, or do you wanna set it normatively that if
5 you're below this percentage of points earned, you're in
6 turnaround. So that's a longer discussion. I think maybe
7 doing a study session, or something for those interested,
8 we could dig in to that conversation tomorrow.

9 DR. SCHEFFEL: When there's huge
10 implications for how we're using the data. Thank you.

11 MS. PEARSON: So quickly back to the
12 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness. Just so you know, there
13 had been recommendations to use completion rate instead of
14 grad rate. That's a little bit different. Since that --
15 that recommendation was made, there's been some changes.
16 Part of that recommendation came from the GED cut scores, I
17 guess I'd heard that before, had been raised to a higher
18 level of expectations. Since then those GED cut scores I
19 believe they've been lowered. So I think we're gonna want
20 to be really careful about looking at completion rate, and
21 maybe an end, like another additional measure to use. We
22 use it already for the alternative education campuses but
23 we may wanna think about using that for our schools.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How did we get to the
25 point that we couldn't use GED? Is that a federal?



1 MS. PEARSON: It's -- it's been in fact, the
2 feds traditionally, or historically have said, only grad
3 rate, we're not taking completion rate.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that law still in
5 place?

6 MS. PEARSON: It still says graduation
7 explicitly any SSA will have to see how they interpret
8 that, and if they hold to that interpretation now that
9 there's more flexibility with state accountability. So
10 that's a piece I think regardless, I think we wanna look at
11 the grad rate, and dropout rate data, and see where that's
12 gone over time, if you wanna adjust those expectations from
13 the state. We'll have to, we won't be able to do it this
14 spring but we'll need to in 2017 look at the cut scores for
15 the new 11th grade for SAT assessment, and we'll have to
16 set targets for the new 10th grade PSAT. And we'll have to
17 discuss if we want to include that next fall after the
18 first year of use. And finally, we'll need to set targets
19 for that new matriculation measure which is the one that
20 came from House Bill 15-011-70 last session that says, that
21 looks at the percentage of students that the year after
22 they graduate are enrolled in either a CTE program two year
23 college, or four year college. So we're working with
24 Higher Ed to get that data pulled together so we can look
25 at it, and propose some cut points to it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we get that for our
2 state?

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. So that's what we're
4 working.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

6 MS. PEARSON: Oh, sorry. We'll get it for
7 instate colleges, and colleges that participate in the
8 national clearing house data. So there will still be
9 colleges across the country that, and students who go to
10 those colleges who's data we will not have. So it's not
11 100 percent complete dataset.

12 DR. SCHEFFEL: So then schools will be
13 trying to track up their graduates.

14 MS. PEARSON: Yes, it's -- it's gonna be a
15 little bit challenging.

16 DR. SCHEFFEL: Yeah.

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. So that's why we wanna
18 get the data, we wanna get it out to districts so they can
19 see it, they can start evaluating the quality of it, see
20 how much that indicator again should be weighted, how much
21 they wanna put that in their frameworks. To touch on Every
22 Student Succeeds Act, 'cause we wanna make sure we're as
23 integrated as possible as long as it makes sense for our
24 state. ESSA requires long term goals, and then interim
25 measures of progress. So those interim measures are



1 probably what we would wanna align, or have our proposed
2 for our cut scores. Actually sorry, let me say that I
3 again.

4 Our cut scores are what we would send to the
5 feds for the interim measures of progress, and then we'll
6 want to discuss what our -- our long term goals are. The
7 secretary of education is limited on prescribing a specific
8 long term goals, or measures of interim progress, so I
9 think we can set what makes sense to us here at the Board,
10 and then send it to them, so it's in alignment with what
11 makes sense for Colorado. And so next steps, we're going
12 to do some more data analysis on those new measures like
13 the matriculation rate, the percentile rankings, and having
14 that conversation. We are, just today, actually yesterday,
15 districts can now access reports with their percentile
16 rankings on our website, and I've got sample reports if you
17 all would like to see those for you.

18 So they can start getting used to where they
19 are in terms of percentile ranks, using them in scale
20 score. So we're just trying to build capacity in the
21 districts to understand some of the data. We would love to
22 have more conversations with you all. If you would like to
23 do that, we could set up a study session time around that,
24 and provide more clarification. It would be helpful for
25 schools, and districts if we can set targets this spring.



1 Next meeting might be a little bit too early. We are
2 trying to get them information, or reports out this spring
3 with the data that came from 2015, so they can kind of get
4 a sense of where they would look, and what the new
5 frameworks might look like for them. If we could have
6 those cut scores in them so they can see where they fall,
7 that would be really helpful for them. But these are heavy
8 topics, and they require or they -- they were in a lot of
9 good discussion, and so I don't know that we want to rush
10 it for that purpose. So again, that's a good conversation
11 for us all to have together. That's the big goal review.
12 What other questions do you all have?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Additional questions from
14 members of the Board. Seeing none? Yes. Ms. Goff.

15 MS. GOFF: Sorry. I'm sorry. I guess we --
16 we mentioned, we haven't gone there real deeply yet, about
17 the schools currently on the clock. How we're gonna start
18 that, where -- what -- how that intertwines here, and then
19 in light of state -- state statute that's, I would call it
20 still a little influx about where we're going to be at a
21 certain point on the calendar. So I'm just curious if you
22 guys have had a chance to, you -- you folks have had a
23 chance to talk about that a little bit, and what are some
24 possibilities where we can, if we can, where does
25 everything come together at the fork, at the road? That's



1 -- that's what's on my mind right now with all of this.

2 And -- and considering that we will be, we have to, we have
3 to talk about this new -- this implementation of the ESSA,
4 and those timelines kind of inherent in that as well, some
5 of which we don't know yet. So any thoughts on that?

6 MS. PEARSON: We'll talk a little bit more
7 this afternoon about the accountability clock, and where
8 we're at with that, but yeah, I think you're seeing exactly
9 that alignment challenge that when we reset these targets,
10 and we really think about the distribution, the targets for
11 the overall ratings, you could think about setting them in
12 a way that schools that have worked really hard, and have
13 come off the clock, and they're back on, you could do it so
14 that you don't have anybody, new percentages go back on,
15 but I've been struggling with it and talking about it a
16 lot, because it's something we're really gonna have to
17 wrestle with. You could set them in a way that nobody is
18 on the clock anymore and then, so there's a lot of options
19 that are available.

20 MS. GOFF: And how's that going up with five
21 percent?

22 MS. PEARSON: Yes. And then -- and then
23 you've got the lowest five percent for ESSA, and had to
24 think about that too. So yeah, there's a lot of moving
25 parts but I think there's a lot of opportunity for



1 alignment, and more this time than previously in most
2 aspects of ESSA accountability that we can use what we
3 already have for the state system, it aligns really well.
4 What we already have, or where we wanna go, looks like it
5 fits right into the law. So there are some areas that we
6 may need to work on, and adjust on, and push back on a
7 little bit but --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

9 DR. SCHEFFEL: So are you saying we need to
10 vote on something in March? You said best by March 16.

11 MS. PEARSON: I would love it if you all
12 would be willing to, or wanna set some tentative targets,
13 so we could get reports to schools, and districts in the
14 spring. We don't have to, because we don't have a
15 statutory requirement to get those reports out, or we could
16 provide those reports without an indication of the
17 performance. But it would be helpful for them to know what
18 those targets are. I think it's state board rule that says
19 target should be set in November. We clearly couldn't do
20 that because we didn't have new data at that point. So I
21 think there's pros, and cons to all of it.

22 DR. SCHEFFEL: And so by that time we have
23 to decide if we're taking a normative, or a criterion
24 approach or a combined approach, and look at each bucket
25 with each cut score and look at how many schools fall in



1 each one and what the implications are for the five year
2 clock, and all of that?

3 MS. PEARSON: We don't need to set those
4 overall targets by March for the reports to be helpful for
5 the district. I think it's just looking at the cut scores
6 for achievement, and for growth, and PWR. If we can do the
7 -- the detail pieces, and not the big overall piece of
8 ratings, or distribution of ratings, we could do those
9 details sooner than later would be really helpful. But if
10 you all aren't ready that's totally fine, and we can send
11 out reports without those indicators of performance levels.
12 They can get their information that way, and then we'll
13 just need to have those targets set by the fall for when we
14 release the school, and district performance frameworks.

15 DR. SCHEFFEL: So maybe I'll just ask
16 others to, let's think through the mechanism of really
17 thinking through all that detail 'cause there's a lot of
18 implications behind, you know, voting in March on
19 something, or determining something in March.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's just next month.

21 DR. SCHEFFEL: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's just next month.

23 DR. SCHEFFEL: I know, that's my point.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Soon. Okay. Any other
25 questions, or comments? All right.



1 MS. PEARSON: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you Ms. Pearson. I
3 appreciate it. Why don't we this time take a recess for
4 lunch, and we'll plan on 30 minutes, you want more than 30
5 minutes? 45?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. 30.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would like to go
8 home.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thirty. Okay. All right,
10 we'll try 30 minutes. And does anybody see a need for an
11 executive session? Anything you wanna tell us Mr. Dill?
12 Are you -- we're up to date on that?

13 MR. DILL: That actually might be advisable
14 at this point.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Ms. Burdsall if you
16 wouldn't mind.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yeah.

19 MS. BURDSALL: An executive session has been
20 noticed for today's State Board Meeting in conformance with
21 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice on specific
22 legal -- legal questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(II) CRS
23 in matters required to be kept confidential by federal law,
24 rules, or state statute pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III)
25 CRS.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Is there a motion
2 for executive session? Dr. Schroeder moves, any second.
3 Yes. Ms. Mazanec seconds. Is there objection to the
4 adoption of that motion? Seeing none, that motion is
5 unanimously adopted. Thank you very much. We'll stay in
6 recess for at least 30 minutes.
7 (Meeting adjourned)



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