



Colorado State Board of Education

---

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

June 8, 2016, Part 3, SPDF Weightings

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 8, 2016, the  
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

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



1 MS. PEARSON: A recommendation on one of  
2 these three or if there there's something else you'd like  
3 to recommend to us instead do we absolutely and stop the  
4 questions?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think this is a  
6 really difficult issue, because I think all of us want to  
7 be fair to the small districts. My question is -- is it  
8 possible to have the transparency, oh, you can't hear me?  
9 Can you hear me now? Is it impossible to have the  
10 transparency without punishment, or is it possible to have  
11 both? If you have -- if you get -- if you do assign  
12 points, because as I understand that points are assigned  
13 when children do well too. I mean, they're double counted  
14 whether they're doing well or whether they're not doing as  
15 well as we would like.

16 So that is already there, but is it possible  
17 to assign only one point per child or to show it in two  
18 ways or a -- a footnote that says, "This is their rating  
19 based on the points assigned, but you should know how many  
20 children in each category were counted twice." You know  
21 with some explanation, so but -- but it concerns me though  
22 because does that take away the incentive for districts to  
23 improve if we don't, you know we wanna make sure that it's  
24 a fair representation that it provides an incentive for  
25 improvement and is an incentive to use those -- those



1 dollars which are a considerable amount of dollars wisely  
2 and hopefully to improve. Do we have any of those options?

3 MS. PEARSON: So I think some of what you're  
4 saying is where we were trying to get with what was on the  
5 --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

7 MS. PEARSON: -- report by having the  
8 transparency of the individual groups and the color coded  
9 ratings and having all that there with you I pay. I think  
10 your point about transparency without the punishment like I  
11 think, you've been listening to districts really well  
12 because I think that's where they're feeling not maybe all  
13 of them, but a lot. That's what we hear this shame and  
14 blame kind of system that you have these two students you -  
15 - you're getting blamed and shamed into the performance,  
16 and that by reporting and encouraging through improvement  
17 planning, you've got a way to really be able to emphasize  
18 the continuous improvement part of this and here's the data  
19 you need, the actionable data you need to be able to start  
20 moving forward and making a plan for students. We could  
21 work on reporting a number of children that would count  
22 twice. I don't know that we can get it in the framework  
23 report, but we could put it in the dish we can look to get  
24 that data out there more publicly so people can know that.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's no getting  
2 around them, so the counting them because -- because of  
3 exactly the reason.

4 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I after the funding  
6 they are being counted more than once but they're also  
7 getting.

8 MS. PEARSON: -- different types.

9 (Overlapping)

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Different packets of  
11 dollars on top of that. I think that you know I think it's  
12 hard for small districts but it is what it is.

13 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I'd actually say where  
14 we've heard more from is not so much the really small  
15 districts on this, it's more the ones that have highly  
16 impacted student population.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly.

18 MS. PEARSON: That's what we're really  
19 getting from this. They're just feeling like, "Yes,  
20 they're getting funding for different groups of kids. I  
21 think that they don't always feel that there's a  
22 recognition of the amount of work and the amount of  
23 distance they need to move their children that are English  
24 learners and students of poverty and may have a disability  
25 as well, like there's a lot of work to do for a kid that



1 may come in super far behind compared to another district  
2 that you come -- comes in and I feel like a lot of this is  
3 about that recognition as well.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, I'd see. Then we  
5 have Dr. Schroeder.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Just a couple things like.  
7 Is this on?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You need to pull it  
9 closer I think. It's like it only works when you're act  
10 like a rock star.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: I know, I'm pressing it but  
12 it's not responding.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE : It doesn't sound like  
14 it's on.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: It might be.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 5: Oh, I see.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, it's up. Somebody  
18 came up and busted it.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Somebody (inaudible) see.

20 (Overlapping)

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Something was missing.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: I'll do one thing. It might  
23 have been switched. Hello. Oh.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much. Just a  
2 couple of items now that I may have some more comments  
3 after I hear from my colleagues. Well, first of all I  
4 always forget to thank you all for the depth of information  
5 that you've provided on this. This is what I call deeper  
6 learning and I'm still struggling with it, but you guys  
7 have really tried very hard to help us understand this. I  
8 did -- I did attend the meeting on the 31st as did a couple  
9 of my colleagues. My feeling about that meeting was that  
10 there was a lot of agreement on what everyone wants for  
11 kids and I think there were people there who felt that  
12 there was a solution that could be worked out together  
13 between the groups.

14 So I would hope that that opportunity would  
15 at least be presented, maybe that won't happen. The level  
16 of emotion for example that we even heard today from as  
17 though it's two different sides, I didn't get that sense of  
18 that meeting. It wasn't really two different sides, and so  
19 having an opportunity to get that -- get a broader group  
20 together might actually help us do a better job, and  
21 actually come up with something that assures all of us that  
22 we're accomplishing what you want accomplish. I guess what  
23 we're doing is measuring the success of the adults in  
24 addressing all of the various student needs, and it's hard  
25 when you're measuring.



1                   Two things and the one I brought up earlier,  
2 the subgroups are intended for to identify groups of kids  
3 that are consistently under performing, and in the minority  
4 subgroup when we're including Asian students who  
5 consistently outperform all other groups of students, I  
6 think we might be misrepresenting that group and if you  
7 look at the examples you gave us, it's the minority group  
8 that's has the highest achievement, and I think we need to  
9 tease out whether that particular group of students is  
10 affecting that. I'm told that there are some districts that  
11 have automatically taken that out must be simply because  
12 they recognize that that's not a consistently under  
13 performing subgroup. I'm struggling as I know you guys are  
14 about counting students twice.

15                   I'm trying to figure out, is that what we're  
16 doing or are we measuring the depth of the needs so that a  
17 student that is in all four categories is a four, in the  
18 sense that these here we have a challenge of a student that  
19 has these four different challenges as opposed to just one  
20 or two, and can we have a conversation that thinks about  
21 that as -- as an issue of severity of need as opposed to  
22 just number of kids, because maybe we can come up with a --  
23 with a solution to this accountability piece if we  
24 recognize it as an issue of severity.



1                   That's the severity aligns with the dollars  
2 and maybe we don't have the right numbers or scores or  
3 however this. I'm still digging deeper in all this to  
4 understand it better, but I'm thinking that is -- it's seen  
5 by the administrators as a punishment, and that's not the  
6 intent. It's really to recognize what the needs are, and I  
7 think that's what the -- what some other folks are bringing  
8 to us, but maybe we don't have this system designed to  
9 recognize that. There might be a different way to express  
10 that. I know that complicates things, but I'd appreciate  
11 you looking at it that way.

12                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

13                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, I would echo Angelika's  
14 comments just as a great report deep thinking really, I  
15 appreciate the time you put into. I guess I like the idea  
16 of the hybrid even though it takes more time just because  
17 we need to do the hard work that issues from the reality  
18 that one size doesn't fit all and you've done a lot of work  
19 already, and it sounds like this is more work obviously.

20                   But I mean, we're -- we're trying to not  
21 penalize schools by double counting and that -- that's a  
22 fairness issue, and we've all heard it from our  
23 constituents, I certainly have. Then we know that PARCC is  
24 a test that really is an assessment that disproportionately  
25 penalizes special -- students of special needs and also



1 English language learner kids because the language load on  
2 the test so you know when we combine the groups that  
3 essentially hides the flaws in test which doesn't serve us  
4 well either.

5                   On the other hand, if we don't -- if we  
6 don't combine and we desegregate then we have data privacy  
7 issues that I'm concerned about that I've heard a lot  
8 about, and so you know where are the contracts that, I mean  
9 where does these -- where does these data go when it's  
10 disaggregated, who has access to it, where are the  
11 contracts, how's the data used and so forth. There's a  
12 host of issues there. So there's good and bad things about  
13 desegregating not desegregating and strikes me that the  
14 whole end piece is really important, because if we know  
15 enough about psychometrics to know that if you don't have  
16 enough N, that your results are spurious, and we don't want  
17 that. So I guess I would argue either for the hybrid  
18 approach or I need to understand the Adams-12 compromised  
19 proposal a little better. Have -- have you looked into  
20 that? Then was or what comments did you hear on that  
21 Adams-12 proposal?

22                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Pearson.

23                   MS. PEARSON: So we just got that yesterday.  
24 I think what Adams was saying or suggesting was that you  
25 could, that city he would run both that we'd run with



1 points for combine and then we do another report with the  
2 points for the desegregated, and then whichever points were  
3 higher is with the rating of the district we get, for the  
4 school we get.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: So you haven't had a lot of  
6 feedback on that yet.

7 MS. PEARSON: We haven't gotten a lot of  
8 feedback on that yet. Again, that takes -- that'll take us  
9 some more time to get out the --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- implications of that.

11 MS. PEARSON: They're calculations done and  
12 the implications and the reporting and the guidance for  
13 that are ready, but it's something we could do. We don't  
14 know that that's going to appease the concerns because what  
15 that really does is it just defaults to whatever is  
16 highest, and then in some ways it makes it harder in terms  
17 of transparency because you're not going to know which,  
18 it's going to be can have to dig in to understand which report  
19 or which rating you know is it based off of as these stuff  
20 combined or is the big stuff to disaggregated, but it's --  
21 it's possible to do that.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it seems like some version  
23 of the hybrid could actually address the concerns in both -  
24 - from both sides. So I like some version of that. Thank  
25 you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Other questions.

2 Yes, Ms. Rankin.

3 MS. RANKIN: I just I didn't hear that last  
4 sentence.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So.

6 MS. RANKIN: So some version.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just like some version  
8 of hybrid C. This the C approach only because it -- it  
9 asks us to do the hard work of addressing the fact that the  
10 districts are not a one size fits all, there are problems  
11 psychometrically with any one approach and this allows us  
12 to address those differences, I think we need to do that to  
13 be fair.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: I -- I just would like to add  
15 to this. It doesn't, whether we -- whichever one we decide  
16 on A, B, and C; A, B, or C, I would like to see some dollar  
17 amounts next to that if -- if possible, and I know it is  
18 just because if there is this big discrepancy into how much  
19 money might be affecting some of the smaller districts  
20 because of the level that the students are yet, I think  
21 that should be part of the transparency. I -- I also I  
22 have a hard time with hybrid although in my district I have  
23 so many small school districts and I understand that, but I  
24 do like accountability. I like that, and I worry if we are  
25 -- are combining apples and oranges if we have a split. So



1 I'm kind of conflicted, but I would like dollar amounts. I  
2 would like it broken down into federal and state dollars,  
3 and -- and I know that can be done. I mean it is  
4 somewhere, but I think it should be a part of this report  
5 for transparency.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: I guess one more thought  
8 that I have is, we're not talking all that much about the  
9 users of these reports. Yes, they're are online and  
10 parents you can go to them, but Colorado succeeds also uses  
11 these in order to put the letter grades which apparently  
12 are still popular with some folks. So we really need to  
13 keep thinking about how these reports are being used by our  
14 public and by our parents in the issue of choice for  
15 example.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have said Colorado  
17 succeeds, excuse me. Use them.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: I think it's on the 9 --  
19 9News web site. Is that where they published it?

20 MS. PEARSON: It's Colorado --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: School grades.

22 MS. PEARSON: -- school grades, and they --  
23 they use this done by us.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Is that done by us? It's  
25 done by.



1 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, Colorado succeeds works  
2 and creates this Colorado school grades website, they use  
3 the data file that Excel file I was talking about with all  
4 the other components of it, they use that information from  
5 CDE and then instead of using the ratings that come out  
6 from the board, they renorm, and so then they assign better  
7 grades based on the percentage of points earned, and that's  
8 where the Colorado school grades come from. At least  
9 that's what they've done in the past.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Any further  
11 questions or discussions? You have, Jane to do.

12 MS. GOFF: Do we have time?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. Ms.  
14 Goff.

15 MS. GOFF: Thank you so much time talking  
16 about what. Appreciate everything you do every day. Yeah,  
17 everything you do every day. Apologies. I guess my own  
18 tendency is always to look for the compromise as long as  
19 there's equal value on both ends of it. I -- I know we,  
20 and I we have to pay attention to the -- the first of all  
21 the purpose and who is supposed to be served here  
22 ultimately, but unfortunately and realistically, a lot of  
23 that depends on what -- what is the capacity for the people  
24 who know how to do this to do it, meaning personnel, and  
25 resources, and time, and a somewhat even distribution of



1 priorities that maybe if we're lucky every day kind of fit  
2 together.

3                   So I think we do have that opportunity right  
4 now. I just want to go back to where I always end up and  
5 that is there at some point there has to be, there's got to  
6 be a definite choice a little pot of people or groups or  
7 places that have to take some responsibility, And with this  
8 change, with the SSA, we're facing probably the first time.  
9 Most of us in our working lives have ever had a pretty  
10 equal balance between flexibility and opportunity to be  
11 creative, and a responsibility to do something about it. I  
12 don't -- I don't remember having that equal of pressure  
13 ever before. So if the combined idea becomes the  
14 predominant use, if -- if me if we go full route towards  
15 something like that, the fact that local school districts  
16 and individual schools except for the n number thing, but -  
17 - but ultimately every single school district and every  
18 single building which means every single classroom, it's  
19 taken to its full benefit has a responsibility to do  
20 something about that.

21                   I think one of our -- one of our decisions  
22 down the road even is where should the main message be  
23 crafted? What is the volcano from which our main message  
24 spouts? Are we -- are we trying to develop a message and  
25 as a state, system, or do we -- do we put equal value on



1 locals. We are a local controlled state, I think we  
2 believe in that, and does that mean believes in what the  
3 locals should be doing along with what the local has the  
4 ability to decide they're going to do. If we've got a  
5 mechanism where local school districts and -- and it's  
6 public, and people can will find a good simple way to for  
7 everybody to find it, then there's a big responsibility,  
8 and I -- I think with all of us, all the way around, 360  
9 degrees questions of each other, are you willing, do you  
10 understand what your responsibility is and are you willing  
11 to accept it?

12                   That's -- that I think is probably, it's  
13 easy but it's not. You know we have a big state, we have a  
14 lot of variety, and how do we wanna become monitors? Well,  
15 not in the sense of the watch, watching every move  
16 everybody's making, except we should be happy to watch  
17 every bit move everybody's making, because if progress is  
18 happening that's a good thing. I am concerned about going  
19 full -- full and unanimity. I identify with a lot of the  
20 shortcomings you all see with the combined subgroup idea,  
21 but I also I acknowledge that there within that is also the  
22 opportunity for districts of any size where those subgroups  
23 children in those subgroups are really doing well, and how  
24 there is a way to show that they are often responsible for  
25 bringing it up.



1                   They're -- they're not -- They should always  
2 be viewed as the punitive measure that happens to everybody  
3 else. It's just not true. And I'd love to see some other  
4 subgroups, we can talk about different ideas all the time.  
5 But for now, that's where -- that's where I'm torn on.  
6 Maybe it's obvious, I'm having a hard time with this. I do  
7 think there is value in doing the combined for buildup  
8 purposes rather than punitive. I'd like to see us use it  
9 that way. I do think with the uncertainty about what ESSA  
10 is gonna tell us we have to do, pretty much, or not do.  
11 Maybe this -- if we could get through this year with some  
12 kind of a compromise, if it's a little bit more work, we  
13 maybe -- we get some help to show how it looks without our  
14 districts feeling, anybody feeling they're treated unfairly  
15 or this is setting us up for a bad -- another bad run.

16                   I -- I -- I totally appreciate the  
17 accountability work groups' recommendation. We've all been  
18 following that and if we haven't been paying close  
19 attention, then, it's our fault. It's been a really  
20 productive conversation. We've all learned a lot. Thank  
21 you all who were involved and districts of any size. I --  
22 I represent the second largest school district in the state  
23 and I -- I do know that the concerns and the thoughts  
24 around all of this are really not that much different. If  
25 we keep in mind this is accountability, who's -- who's



1 being held accountable here? Are we putting an emphasis on  
2 adults or are we putting an emphasis on adults working on  
3 behalf of kids? That's -- to me that's -- that's the key  
4 here. Do we wanna go with accountability for adult system  
5 that serves everybody well?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Let's try and  
7 bring this to conclusion. We have three options in front  
8 of us they've asked for a recommendation. I would observe  
9 that the hybrid option is difficult to -- it's difficult  
10 for staff to -- to reach a appropriate conclusion on in a  
11 timely fashion since we're kind of up against the gun for  
12 this. So I will personally be supporting that but let's  
13 just start with a show of hands. The department's looking  
14 for guidance, so is there any support on show of hands for  
15 recommendations A?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible)  
17 recommendation A.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. It's the -- the  
19 combined group. Does anybody wanna be for the combined  
20 group, going once, going twice? Doesn't seem to be overly  
21 popular. Any support for the use of the approach B  
22 desegregation of groups. Two, three, two, three, four,  
23 one, two, three, four. Okay. And then for some hybrid  
24 approach, one, two. You can't vote twice.

25 ALL: You can't vote twice.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think I did B because  
2 Steve said we can't do both.

3 MS. GOFF: What did we say that we do agree  
4 with -- with but you know we're working towards the --  
5 (inaudible).

6 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely. I agree with  
7 that.

8 MS. GOFF: -- I mean we could say we're  
9 working towards this.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Absolutely.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think the -- I think  
12 that -- I think that's a possibility. I mean we -- we have  
13 to -- we're gonna have to produce results reasonably soon  
14 and staffing has plenty to do on this topic. I would  
15 simply observe, one problem we've seen at least has not  
16 been discussed is if you're trying to compare apples and  
17 apples and you have a crate full of apples and oranges  
18 because some -- some are choosing A to B compared with and  
19 some are choosing B. I think it makes your -- your  
20 district comparisons very difficult and I'm not sure that's  
21 fair either to those that get re-ranked as a result of  
22 using a comparison that arguably may be easier.

23 I think the problem with the small groups is  
24 one we really have to think through that. I don't know  
25 quite what the solution to that is but in Colorado we have



1 that in a number of areas because we have a number of very  
2 small school districts so we try to think through that.  
3 But I think -- I think the answer to your question is -- is  
4 number B and -- and after we get through this years -- and  
5 I think the advantage of that is consistently point where  
6 the federal rules are which I am not excited about  
7 following federal rules but -- but the reality is we might  
8 be stuck there. So at least -- at least we're -- we won't  
9 have to redo it if they come out in a different direction.  
10 So I think that the -- I think the consensus (inaudible) a  
11 narrow one is for number B. Yes.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The other thing is  
13 that, you know, we compare too much when you just said it  
14 we can't compare apples to oranges. We just can't. And  
15 sometimes the essence of -- of A is great, the essence of B  
16 is great and comparing just makes it less, you know, less  
17 real less -- so can we think about and keep thinking about  
18 it and not knowing, you know exactly what the Feds are  
19 doing that you know I'm hoping for -- for that -- that  
20 scene.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now I -- I -- I think  
22 we'll be able to work with the accountability work group as  
23 we were gonna with ESSA plan and really dive in and see  
24 what other options there are there as we go forward and



1 especially once we have a better sense of what the  
2 regulations are gonna land.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. And then you also  
4 need a decision then on indicator weightings?

5 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse Mr. Chair, can I  
7 ask a quick question?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I ask a question  
10 about the timeline?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You were saying that  
13 we're up against a timeline, could you speak to that? I  
14 mean how much time do we have? If you are to build more  
15 nuance into this system.

16 MS. PEARSON: So we -- in your Board rules  
17 the school industry performance frameworks are supposed to  
18 be released August 15, with the fact that we're still  
19 getting newish data, we need to do some analysis before we  
20 put things out in terms of growth, how growth looks from  
21 PARCC 15 to PARCC 16. It's not going to be August 15th. I  
22 mean, if things went beyond smoothly maybe but we want to  
23 have time to be able to make sure we look at the data first  
24 and make some good recommendations for how it's used and  
25 what we want to consider before it goes out to schools and



1 districts. So we're thinking probably mid September we'll  
2 be able to give the preliminary school district performance  
3 frameworks to the districts.

4 We're working on a detailed timeline for you  
5 all, I wanted to get through this Board meeting and -- but  
6 we've been working on it but we'll get you on in the next  
7 few weeks on exactly what we think the timeline will look  
8 like. Then we have the request to reconsider process in  
9 there. After that, then in the past it's been November and  
10 December that the final ratings have come to you all we  
11 will see it -- we're hoping that we can keep that timeline  
12 that may need to be bumped a month at that frameworks come  
13 out a month if.

14 We want to spend some time and really dig in  
15 about an option C and think about different approaches and  
16 run the data and all that in fact we won't be able to meet  
17 the mid September deadline. We just need more time for  
18 that and we need to talk to schools and districts about it  
19 first to really figure out how it's going to play out  
20 before we just throw something out there and we really put  
21 the spring frameworks out so we could learn, so we don't do  
22 something that has real consequences without being having a  
23 chance to learn first.

24 So I think we'd be concerned without giving  
25 them a chance to look at data and seeing the impact of



1 going forward. I think that the concern about delaying  
2 much past January, I've talked to that chair a little bit  
3 about this with the final ratings is that you all then have  
4 approximately 30 schools and eight districts to hear than  
5 have -- may at the end of the five year clock. Some of  
6 them may come off but that's a lot of work we know is on  
7 your plate and that has to be done by the end of June. And  
8 so we -- you know had kind of mapped out spreading them out  
9 if we put this to far then it punches them up again. We  
10 can do all of that, that's -- it's all your discretion to  
11 do that but I think it will just be a tight timeline for  
12 you all.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel, go ahead.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could I just go first?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. So if we go with B,  
18 then we will do the -- we will be fair to those small  
19 school districts.

20 MS. PEARSON: It will be the same way it's  
21 always been basically in terms of just aggregating at the  
22 individual group level. It will be different in that  
23 achievements desegregated but it will be the same going as  
24 the system has been in terms of combined versus, you know,  
25 using disaggregated and also will be the same in that some



1 schools won't have combined while others have just  
2 desegregated.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

4 MS. PEARSON: Which is then you've got a  
5 little bit more consistency in the system.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then can I just ask a  
7 follow up on the data privacy issue in terms of who  
8 accesses these data since it's right now desegregated  
9 system, do we have contracts with the entities that use  
10 these data so that we know how they use them?

11 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: And do we have access to  
13 those, somewhere? Do we have a list of those entities?

14 MS. PEARSON: Tony? Do you -- Tony you may  
15 be better able to -- do you know? You don't know. I know  
16 that all the contracts have all the data privacy language  
17 in them. Joyce is the best person to answer in terms of  
18 the assessment vendor. In terms of our work, we have a  
19 contract with the Center for Assessment to help us validate  
20 the growth calculations and we have all of the privacy  
21 language in there about how they're allowed to use it, how  
22 it's not allowed to be stored, how to access, who can have  
23 access to all the confidentiality and background check sign  
24 ups that have gone on with it, and not just posted on the  
25 website. So --



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I could connect with Joyce.  
2 I mean I think Angelika mentioned that children's campaign  
3 uses the data. There are other advocacy organizations that  
4 use it but I don't know that I've seen contracts with those  
5 entities --

6 MS. PEARSON: That's just in the public.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- and how they use those  
8 data?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, they're just the  
10 public data.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: This is the public  
12 desegregated data.

13 MS. PEARSON: And so the public level data  
14 doesn't go out unless we meet a minimum n size for students  
15 and some of the public level data from 15 hasn't been  
16 released yet because we're working on -- you could --  
17 people could spend a lot of time and do a lot of math and  
18 subtracting the numbers from the districts, from a school,  
19 and figuring out another school or subtracting one group  
20 from another group and so we're trying to make sure we work  
21 through all those rules which is why some of the results  
22 from last year haven't been released yet. The desegregated  
23 results of -- of percent at level four and five at school  
24 district level haven't been released because we're trying



1 to make sure we have all those things in place so that the  
2 public data that goes out ensures data privacy.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there's no --  
4 there's the PII did is defined really expansively in our  
5 legislation is there no PII data?

6 MS. PEARSON: No.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's identifiable?

8 MS. PEARSON: And it's just saying like if  
9 you have, you know 16 students you -- actually get Mary to  
10 answer this better than me because Mary has been digging  
11 deep, deep on the logic of it but if you have 16 students  
12 but then you could end for another group that's less than  
13 16 because of the other information that's out there. We  
14 don't want that. So either we blur or we don't report,  
15 makes it a lot harder to use that data and you're going to  
16 hear -- and you probably already have heard concerns on  
17 that side of the data that's getting put out now isn't it  
18 easy to use. That's the assessment reporting data, the  
19 mean scale score with the accountability because we went to  
20 that other metric that's a little bit more accessible and  
21 protects student privacy at the same time. But it's the --  
22 the raw assessment data, meaning the percentage that  
23 benchmark that we're working through those rules on to  
24 ensure nothing -- you can't do any math and do all the  
25 subtraction and figure anything out.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So I could also  
2 follow up with Joyce then?

3 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. Okay,  
6 any -- now.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You want to move on to  
8 the next two. These two should be easier. Doing that.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You are hungry?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No I'm not, actually but  
12 we -- we've got some time frames we need to try and keep.  
13 How long is your presentation on this motion?

14 MS. MAUREEN: We can make it really short.

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. We could probably do  
16 the next part with you and have time to talk in 30 to 40  
17 minutes. You've more, you think more -- you think less?  
18 Okay. You all have heard pretty much all of this already.  
19 It's just solidifying what we've heard from you, making  
20 sure that's the direction you want to go in. We can also -  
21 - Maureen needs to leave because she's going to a meeting  
22 for CTE on ESSA accountability and needs to catch a plane  
23 later today, but we could move later on. I can -- if you -  
24 - if you don't want to do this right now I can do that  
25 later?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're not holding  
2 anything up --

3 MS. PEARSON: What?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We need to finish this.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we'll need to do  
6 that (inaudible).

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let me -- let me ask --  
8 let me I ask how much controversy there is in this -- the  
9 indicator ratings, apparently there is -- there are no  
10 controversy on the elementary, middle school, correct?

11 MS. PEARSON: No. That's -- that's where we  
12 (inaudible).

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So that's done. Then on -  
14 - on the high school is the only one that's left and we've  
15 got two options, give me the nickel version or the  
16 difference between the two options which appears to me to  
17 be unanimous.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The difference is  
19 minimal. We have heard very clearly that growth needs to  
20 be weighted most heavily and then there's -- there's sort  
21 of a difference of opinion about the weighting of  
22 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness for high school and  
23 whether the data should continue -- should be weighted  
24 equal to growth or it should be weighted a little bit less



1 and more equal to achievement. So that's really what the  
2 two options are.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could you repeat that,  
5 the two options?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry. Yes.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right here, in  
8 the middle.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we have -- and --  
10 and -- and I mean I -- I did -- I made pictures and  
11 everything but don't just get through it -- to get through  
12 it really fast. It's really about how much we want to  
13 wait. PWR and whether PWR should be given equal weight to  
14 grow or equal weight to achievement, because we've heard --  
15 we've -- we've generally heard as I said that like, you  
16 know growth should have the most weight and also people  
17 feel that PWR should generally be weighed heavily but there  
18 are also concerns that maybe PWR is weighted too much in  
19 our current system.

20 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's weighted too  
23 much?

24 MR. STEVE: I think PWR is weighted too  
25 much.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think achievement is  
2 the critical piece.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's my personal  
5 opinion.

6 MS. PEARSON: Just to point out for you on  
7 this year in terms of achievement, we're gonna have ninth  
8 grade results for English language arts and math and we'll  
9 have 11th grade science. That's what's going to be in the  
10 achievement indicator and what I've heard anecdotally we  
11 don't have the actual participation numbers yet, is that  
12 there is a lot of parents choosing to excuse their students  
13 from 11th grade science or students choosing to excuse  
14 themselves from 11th grade science and as well as ninth  
15 grade. So just know that there's going to be --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: SAT in there.

17 MS. PEARSON: SAT is in that PWR indicator.  
18 Well, SAT.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: SAT.

20 MS. PEARSON: SAT is in PWR because it's  
21 that -- that's where it's always been.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So it's Post Workforce  
23 Ratings. (Inaudible).

24 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Exactly.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.



1 MS. PEARSON: As kind of college entrance.

2 So --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- just know this year  
5 we can revisit it too because this is limited

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can I ask this question about  
8 Post Workforce Readiness? When you look at the standards,  
9 they're woven into the standards. But in other words  
10 outcomes on those metrics do not figure into this metric.  
11 This is strictly graduation rate, dropout rate, ACT, and  
12 matriculation rate. That's what comprises Post Workforce  
13 Readiness, right?

14 MS. PEARSON: Yap.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Those four metrics?

16 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So is there -- is there  
19 preference in the Board for option one or two, any strong  
20 preferences?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm in struggle. I'm  
22 kinda struggling with it.

23 MS. PEARSON: And we can revisit this with  
24 you or we can bring this back next year, we'll have a new -  
25 - we'll -- we will need to at the ESSA state plan because



1 we'll have that other indicator of school quality or  
2 student success, so you'll be able to have a civil  
3 conversation again.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what have we done  
5 before?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: What -- what do we use to  
7 do?

8 MS. PEARSON: In the past, high school was  
9 15 percent achievement. Let me figure one, 35 percent  
10 overall growth, 15 percent growth gaps. So combined it was  
11 50 percent growth and then 35 percent Postsecondary  
12 Workforce Readiness. And at that point we didn't have  
13 matriculation rate in there.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

15 MS. PEARSON: Right.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I make a statement?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So -- yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know it seems  
19 like now that we're -- we're -- we have limited high  
20 school, everything in this, you only up ninth grade and we  
21 have made -- we have some grades with science (inaudible)  
22 that it. So even with, you know, set the college entrance  
23 exam aside, with only one content area at some grade, what  
24 that means is that's -- that's a little short on being able  
25 to say, we're measuring Postsecondary Readiness. You know



1 we do have the ACT and or ACT team coming out but from now  
2 on it only got one content area of our own -- I don't know  
3 --

4 MS. PEARSON: And the achievement indicator,  
5 you mean?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

7 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well and growth I mean  
9 --

10 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, and growth.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What are we putting on?  
12 Attaching it on to? I just --

13 MS. PEARSON: Next year we'll -- we'll have  
14 PSAT results we just -- in terms of knowing what's going to  
15 be in the frameworks and the timeline and how things are  
16 gonna go, the recommendation was to wait on PSAT to use it  
17 for a request reconsider instead of putting the frameworks  
18 in future years will be able to have it in there and we  
19 anticipate that we will investigate being able to measure  
20 growth on PSAT and having that included as well. But this  
21 coming year it is limited in the amount of data especially  
22 understanding who's actually participating in the tests,  
23 what percentage of kids are?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's why I'm  
2 thinking that maybe we are for now at least not to go with  
3 a higher achievement rather than do what currently it  
4 really feels a little flimsy on PWR until we get this  
5 (inaudible).

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. How many people on  
7 the Board prefer option one? Just go through it for  
8 achievement 20 -- yes.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can I ask a question? It's  
10 hard to hear I'm sorry.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So we have -- you're pointing  
13 to scenario one and two for high school, is that what  
14 you're looking at?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Correct.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I -- I and can we think  
17 differently? I mean do we only have these two options? I  
18 just think it weights too much on post --

19 (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