



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
March 4, 2016, SPFDPF

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on March 4, 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: (Inaudible) Today is Friday, March 4,  
2 2016 (inaudible) at 2:00 PM.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll just start the  
4 study session (inaudible). So ready? All right, are we  
5 ready?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we are.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. All right. You  
8 wanna start?

9 MS. HUTCHINS: Yeah, I can talk. So thank  
10 you all. I know it's Friday afternoon after a really long  
11 week. We really appreciate your time being here today.  
12 What we really wanted to do -- Oh, first let me do  
13 introductions. Do you know me, I'm Marie Hutchins, worked  
14 at CDE for six, seven, eight years?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Seven or eight years  
16 now.

17 MS. HUTCHINS: Long time. How was with the  
18 first deliberation of the performance (inaudible) really  
19 did all that work so we have a lot of history, and a lot of  
20 knowledge with different ways we could do this.

21 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry. I -- I can't  
22 understand her.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.



1 MS. HUTCHINS: Sorry, Pam. Is that any  
2 better? (Inaudible). It's because we have microphones,  
3 and telephone thing, and I was talking into the microphone.

4 MS. MAZANEC: There you go.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think you speak very  
6 rapidly.

7 MS. HUTCHINS: I will slow down.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

10 MS. HUTCHINS: Yeah well, you just let me  
11 know if you can't hear me okay. Okay? Hello?

12 MS. MAZANEC: You sound great right now.  
13 Thank you.

14 MS. HUTCHINS: Okay. Sounds good. So  
15 Marie, and Elena is with the Center for Assessment Design  
16 Research and Evaluation through the University of Colorado  
17 at Boulder. Previously, she was at the Center for  
18 Assessment based in New Hampshire that helped us with the  
19 growth model, and the performance frameworks for years. Do  
20 you want to say anything else?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. That's good,  
22 really.

23 MS. HUTCHINS: Really?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.



1 MS. HUTCHINS: So our goals for today,  
2 first, we want to just review what your role is in the  
3 process of target setting. We want to describe some  
4 possible methods for setting expectations in the  
5 performance frameworks. Discuss the -- discuss the  
6 challenges, and advantages of each of those, and then  
7 really have time to answer your questions. So we can get a  
8 sense of which direction you'd like to go in, and if  
9 there's additional work you'd like us to do to bring back  
10 to you so you'd feel comfortable making a decision about  
11 the target. We made Marie, and Elena, especially dug in,  
12 and made a very detailed PowerPoint, so that you could have  
13 all your questions answered, and we have preference. We do  
14 not need to get into that level of detail if you all do not  
15 want to. We just wanted to have it there available for you  
16 if you wanted that kind of information.

17 MS. MAZANEC: That's great.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What is the foundation  
19 (inaudible).

20 MS. HUTCHINS: Sure.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So really, the statute  
22 claimed for the level 201. The board shown were able to  
23 review the performance of statewide public on occasion, and  
24 then following review, set statewide targets. Did we do  
25 this last year (inaudible) my memory is failing.



1 MS. HUTCHINS: No. It's not failing. We  
2 usually do this in November of every year. So -- but the  
3 last time we did it with the board was November of 14  
4 because we didn't have the team target, and we didn't do it  
5 in November because we were willing to finalize, and get  
6 all our final assessment data out. So now that we have  
7 that data, we wanted to bring it to you.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So just (inaudible).

9 MS. HUTCHINS: To get things out. So you  
10 didn't forget anything. Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. HUTCHINS: And in the past, the Board --  
13 reaffirmed the targets every year. They didn't change from  
14 the first year of the performance framework. So we brought  
15 the same targets where we held a study so that we could see  
16 change in the system, over time.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In which can you tell  
18 me which of task, or measures (inaudible).

19 MS. HUTCHINS: Absolutely, and we -- we can  
20 go through it but it's all --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Hold on. Okay.  
22 If I may ask (inaudible) to recover later unless --

23 MS. HUTCHINS: -- the next slide is perfect.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.



1 MS. HUTCHINS: So really, what we're talking  
2 about today is where this red circle is. This is a screen  
3 shot from the school or district performance framework.  
4 Now it's really hard to see, but we're talking about the  
5 specific small little targets. For ac -- academic  
6 achievement is this first part up here, and for the  
7 different content area. This is the old one, so there's  
8 reading separate from writing, Math, and Science, and then  
9 academic growth, and all the content area, English language  
10 proficiency, and then this picture doesn't have the post  
11 secondary workforce readiness targets on it but those are  
12 graduation rate, dropped-out rate, and currently the  
13 composite ACT score.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Those are from the high school  
15 zone?

16 MS. HUTCHINS: Those are high school, and  
17 the districts.

18 MS. MAZANEC: And the districts.

19 MS. HUTCHINS: Yeah.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

21 MS. HUTCHINS: Yeah, so (inaudible) in the  
22 next slide. So it's all of the youth targets specifically  
23 that we're gonna talk about. You see the ones for  
24 elementary, and middle, and then all of them for high  
25 school, and the ones with the green are new or that we have



1 a new assessment from that area or it's a new measure of  
2 the matriculation rate with the new measuring (inaudible).

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you just -- you  
4 just said what for?

5 MS. HUTCHINS: Oh, I'm sorry (inaudible) and  
6 (inaudible). So but just to clarify that on slide five.  
7 We're not today talking about the targets for determining  
8 what color, or what level of rating a school or district  
9 has. Those are another set of targets. So all of these  
10 points in here from the details get added up together, and  
11 we calculate the percentage of targets earned. After that,  
12 that percentage is applied to another kind of rubric, where  
13 we decide if that the turnaround rating if it's partly  
14 improvement rating, if it's improvement performance, or for  
15 districts distinction. I'll just keep -- keep jumping on.

16 So that -- we'll have that conversation with  
17 you all at another time, like what will -- what will be  
18 done next, but right now, we want to do the detail on.  
19 It's because we're working on information, or reports for  
20 school districts to have this spring so that you can just  
21 get a sense of what the data looks like whether a new  
22 frameworks might look like, and kind of build up their  
23 capacity with the work. We're not intending to put overall  
24 ratings on, or just finger point because they're just  
25 information. There's no accountability from the 2015 data.



1                   So we don't need to have that overall  
2 decision, but in the future you know, in the coming months,  
3 and over the summer only to decide what you want just cut  
4 scores to be what the cutoff is for turnaround, and for  
5 priority improvement -- improvement, performance, and  
6 distinction. So that's something that'll come but  
7 actually, it's -- it's technical as this is that probably  
8 it'll be more difficult in terms of policy, and what to do.  
9 So like we said, these are the targets in a set on.

10                   Recommendations, we've been talking with our  
11 accountability work group which we have a few members here  
12 today in the audience, and collected feedback across the  
13 state over the fall, and there was a recommendation from  
14 all that not to include Social Studies in the achievement  
15 targets right now. Use another request to reconsider, and  
16 then they can sub -- submit supplemental information to us.  
17 To not include it as an automatic inclusion just because  
18 schools are taking it on a rotating-based assessment. So  
19 we may not have the most up to date information, and then  
20 we're trying to determine the availability of the PSAT  
21 scores. (Inaudible) for all assessment questions you all  
22 may have today. But that -- with the timing of that, we'll  
23 decide whether it makes sense to get them into the  
24 frameworks, or for those who like a framework release, or  
25 what we'll do with the PSAT.





1 MS. MAZANEC: Are they still be gonna given  
2 in the fall rather in the spring?

3 MS. HUTCHINS: PSAT?

4 MS. MAZANEC: For test. Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. The PSAT is going  
6 to be given this spring.

7 MS. MAZANEC: This spring? So it'll -- will  
8 change to spring or will there still be a fall version for  
9 the kids who are applying for --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we are -- so we are  
11 administering the PSAT 10 which will be given in the  
12 spring, and that plans on an ongoing basis. There is also  
13 the PSAT/NMSQT which is the National Merit --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: National Merit?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- Scholarship  
16 Qualifying Test which is (inaudible). So what we know at  
17 least some schools, and districts are doing is they're  
18 going to use the PSAT 10 results to inform some of their  
19 tutoring of students prior to them having to take that  
20 high-stake test for them, in the fall.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And they have to pay  
22 for that?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that is still paid  
24 for through normal means. We are working with college



1 boards to be able to -- so that College Board will actually  
2 offer a discount to Colorado schools, and districts.

3 MS. HUTCHINS: Pam, and Deb, do you guys  
4 have any questions so far?

5 MS. MAZANEC: No, thank you.

6 MS. HUTCHINS: Okay. So what we want to  
7 talk about next is possible methods for determining those  
8 specific cut scores for achievement, and growth, and post  
9 secondary work for spreading into the framework. So  
10 there's three major ideas. We gave you all a handout today  
11 too that kind of has it laid out a little bit more. First  
12 name methodology is doing norm reference. Set some  
13 criteria, like you look according to the distribution of  
14 the population, and how people are doing, and you say the  
15 50th percentile is the benchmark, and you can pick  
16 different other percentiles to do. We'll get into details  
17 on each of these. You could do Criterion-reference.

18 So for example, for our ACT cut score of --  
19 for exceeds right now, what we have in the frameworks that  
20 was, that based on the entrance requirements for four-year  
21 colleges in 2002. So that's a Criterion-reference, that we  
22 base that on. And then there's also been a suggestion  
23 about keeping previous targets. We wanna just talk about  
24 that idea of what that would look like. So if we kept the  
25 ones that were previously in the frameworks.



1                   So we taught norm criteria, and I'm going to  
2 turn it over now to Marie now, and she's gonna talk through  
3 the Normative approach, and how we could do it. There as  
4 you see on this paper it gets into some details about four  
5 different options for doing norm. This is where we can get  
6 really, really, witty, or we can stop, and just talk hi --  
7 high level. So you all let us know, if you want to do the  
8 high level stuff first, if you wanna keep going deeper we  
9 can do that, if you're done, and wanna move on, we're happy  
10 to do that too. So just give us an indication of what  
11 you'd like.

12                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. So -- so --  
13 again to frame what a Norm reference target setting is. So  
14 the -- the idea that you set standards on a distribution of  
15 scores, that sort of define where the unit of interest. In  
16 this case, a particular school is located relative to a  
17 comparison group, so all schools in Colorado. And I've --  
18 I've heard that this is the slowest turtle analogy. This  
19 is that situation where you know, you're looking at your  
20 population of turtles, and saying, "Well you were, you were  
21 third from the front."

22                   So that is something that has meaning to  
23 you, and really were indicating how well the system is  
24 performing in comparison to other systems that we've deemed  
25 equivalent. And -- and this method sort of explicitly



1 bases our value judgments on the observed performance of  
2 Colorado students, schools, and districts, and this is what  
3 we've previously used to set our achievement growth, and a  
4 lot of the dropout rate performance targets on a prior  
5 performance frameworks. And so I go into a lot of detail.

6 I live in the weeds, so let you know if you  
7 guys don't want to come, and learn that much detail with  
8 me. But just let you know how we sort of operationalize  
9 this, and you know, when we have the assessments, and they  
10 sort of create a normal curve when you look at the average  
11 scale scores, and then we have turned those or -- converted  
12 them into percentile ranks because somehow you know when  
13 you have a test score that goes from 650 to 850, that  
14 doesn't have any inherent meaning, and people have a hard  
15 time interpreting that. But we'll say one to 99, people  
16 have some experience with that, and it's a little more  
17 intuitively obvious for them.

18 So we kind of transform everything that  
19 we're doing into percentile ranks, and then, thus far we  
20 have done is we have set expectations on those percentile  
21 ranks. Saying that the 15th percentile, is where you have  
22 to be to get an approaching rating. Anything below the  
23 15th, is considered not meeting expectations. So when  
24 after 15th, you're approaching expectation. If you get to  
25 the 50th percentile, now you're meeting state expectations,



1 and then the 85th percentile is sort of exceeding state  
2 expectations.

3                   And so this is kind of, a slide that, that I  
4 showed the color coding that we have tended to use with the  
5 frameworks to give people a really sort of quick clear you  
6 know, visual signal as to whether their results are, you  
7 know, in need of improvement or if they're somehow you know  
8 extra astounding. And so we also, just for your  
9 information sort of the meet expectations that the 50th  
10 percentile. That is pretty much average results for the  
11 state. The approaching expectations cut is about one  
12 standard deviation below, and then the exceeds cut is about  
13 one standard deviation above. And the intention of this  
14 really is to differentiate among the performance of our  
15 schools. So we really can't say, you know, these are our  
16 highest flyers, sort of our average schools, and then sort  
17 of our lower performers that we wanna look at. Yeah, that.

18                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But 84 percent is  
19 closer to 85 percent. So how could you say if somebody at  
20 the 84th percentile is meeting their expectations, and just  
21 one point above exceeds the expectations?

22                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that is the whole  
23 point of a Norm in a lot of ways. It winds up admittedly  
24 studying a kind of arbitrary bar that we have determined,  
25 that the performance from 50th to 84th percentile is



1 meeting our expectations, and then because we're looking  
2 for a certain number of schools or districts to identify as  
3 exceeding expectations, that becomes sort of that 85th to  
4 100 bucket. It is true that like when you look at the  
5 difference between 84, and 85 there's not necessarily a lot  
6 of meaning to that, but that's the thing about a normative  
7 system is you're trying to identify a certain number of  
8 systems as being exceed or as being does not meet.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. If it's the  
10 arbitrary, I call that arbitrary. Then, I will just give  
11 it the percentile, and leave it at that, and then do that  
12 so that people can say, "Well, you know, it's 74 so that  
13 leads to expectations, it's not important to decide."  
14 Because it's really -- it doesn't seem very fair.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So then what is the  
16 83rd percentile, and then you sort of, then the 82nd, then  
17 the 81st? Like this always becomes a slippery slope that  
18 you have to at some point decide that you're just going to  
19 set a cut score. And at least that is what we've done in  
20 the past. To do that or we have some options for some of  
21 the Criterion-referenced --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think it's  
23 important to know too that when you're using a Criterion-  
24 referenced approach, you still have to make a determination  
25 of what the cut is. So there's always a cut, and there's



1 always going to be people below the bar, people above the  
2 bar, and that's the part that's a little bit -- there's  
3 going to be some policy decisions that needs to be made  
4 about that. But yeah, your concerns are absolutely valid.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I wouldn't give  
6 that Criterion-referenced, I would just test Norm-reference  
7 taking the percentile score.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you saying like add  
9 up the percentile rank to say like that -- like, so instead  
10 of determining if it does not meet, meet approaching, or  
11 exceed you just say, there are at the 12 percentile, and  
12 the 14th percentile, and the 16th percentile, and the 20th  
13 percentile, and we'll add up all those, and that gives us a  
14 number, and we use that number to tell what's our overall  
15 rating, is that what you think? Like because at some  
16 point, the way our system is now, because we have to have  
17 an overall rating at the end of this, we need some way of  
18 saying it's good enough, or it's not good enough. We can't  
19 just have one number on the drill.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I (inaudible) my  
21 question?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You are asking about  
24 whether, or not we have to identify buckets? In other



1 words, are you saying can we jump reports percentile ranks  
2 with --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right, that's  
4 what I'm asking?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And are you saying, is  
6 it Alisa who is speaking I guess?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, go ahead.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you saying we have  
9 to have categories, and buckets, or there are other ways to  
10 think about those buckets? I mean, I'd need to go back,  
11 and revisit the statute the one that precisely said we have  
12 to do for an overall rating.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the statute is  
14 explicit that we need an overall rating at the end --. In  
15 the statute it says the levels of schools, or districts  
16 need to be assigned to. I think the way that we've  
17 defeated that to try, and give schools, and districts an  
18 indicator of how they're performance is in terms of reading  
19 achieve -- our English Language achievement, and then  
20 achievement overall, and then growth in the individual  
21 growth measures, and growth overall, as having created some  
22 of those categories of performance. Then I don't think  
23 that is inherent in law, that it needs to be done that way.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not but a -- a lot  
25 of -- our unified improvement planning has been built





1 around sort of, the problem with the 15th percentile, or  
2 the 14th, or the 50th, is there's not an inherent value  
3 judgment for that, and by doing these cuts we're sort of  
4 adding, "This is something that you should be paying  
5 attention to because it is worrisome, or this is something  
6 that you should be celebrating because it is impressive."  
7 And so in general, sort of putting these ranges that are  
8 implying, you know, a value about that. Like that's the  
9 purpose for that, and we're using that for our improvement  
10 planning process, and so I think regardless we would have  
11 to set some ranges of concern, and then some -- some range  
12 of -- of percentile rates that would indicate high  
13 performing as well.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, obviously an 84th  
16 percentile is high. A 6 -- 15, a 15 percentile is low.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But I think people can  
19 figure out but, and -- and I just don't think that when you  
20 have an 84th, 83rd, 82nd, percentile at the -- what is it?  
21 Almost meets expectations?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Meets exceed, it's  
23 almost to exceed. Now I see what you're saying. That's a  
24 really good suggestion.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's (inaudible).



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a range -- is  
2 there a range for the buckets like -- or you're saying is  
3 he can get percentile range, but ultimately you have to  
4 group some meaningfully, put them in the bucket, and label  
5 the bucket?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we say go, go for  
8 the bucket that's on top, on the floor, and the ceiling of  
9 that bucket, is there like an error measure or a range that  
10 determines where that line gets drawn, or is it just a  
11 bright line? And if you're one point under it, so it's too  
12 bad, if you're one point over it, it's good for you. Then,  
13 how does -- how does the -- what's on either side of the  
14 line?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) let me  
16 answer that question, we've been having that conversation.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, you can certainly  
18 build in like a air -- well, like a standard error around  
19 the CAT score itself. That's certainly a possibility, and  
20 that's something that could be explored.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what's the standard  
22 deviation? What -- how many (inaudible)?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well you -- you'd have  
24 to actually investigate that.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In this particular  
2 case, one standard deviation gets you to the 15th, and 85th  
3 percentile.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that's not the  
5 error around it?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that is not the  
7 error around the CAT score. You're absolutely right.  
8 Like, so if you're looking for confidence intervals, that  
9 is a different conversation. And the problem that we  
10 usually have with the confidence intervals is we have  
11 systems that are of vastly different sizes. So a  
12 technically confidence intervals should really take into  
13 consideration sort of how large the system is to determine,  
14 you know, if the difference between an 84, and 85 is  
15 meaningful, or if it's not. And we have had a lot of  
16 conversations with our Technical Advisory Panel about sort  
17 of doing confidence intervals, and so doing some of those,  
18 and weighted measures, and there are a lot of technical,  
19 and messaging challenges involved in doing those different  
20 approaches.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think I just  
22 wanna emphasize on messaging challenges. So think the  
23 communication of that becomes a little difficult. So I  
24 think that was a sticky point, especially in terms of the  
25 Technical Advisory Panel to consider implementing that



1 because of having to go to all the Districts at schools,  
2 and explaining with this error vantage consistence, and  
3 why. That was certainly a challenging issue.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm thinking about  
5 explaining it to the Districts, and then explaining it to  
6 each individual parent now.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the other thing  
8 to think about the -- the frameworks while they're standing  
9 there, on their -- also part of the request. There's a  
10 request to reconsider process. So if schools, and  
11 Districts are feeling like the framework doesn't accurately  
12 represent their performance, they're able to bring  
13 additional evidence for it. When we do that process, a lot  
14 of what we look at is how close we are to this CAT point,  
15 and see if your -- if your school, and you're consistently  
16 up the 80th, or above percentile, you're almost to the  
17 85th. We've got some additional evidence that shows you  
18 that, that -- that's something we take into consideration,  
19 and that determines the overall rating afterwards when we  
20 do that request to reconsider process.

21 So that's the way we can take it into  
22 consideration. I think we can go back, and look at your  
23 suggestion on that. I think it's a really interesting idea  
24 to think about. I think we also want to think about how it  
25 interacts with that every students exceed that (inaudible).



1 Because that requires some targets that I need to look, and  
2 see if those targets are required in the accountability  
3 itself, or if it's something you reported, how that fits  
4 in. But I think there's an investigation we could go do  
5 into that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think from my  
7 perspective, and I think from all of our perspectives --,  
8 we hear a lot about the fairness factor, of this I mean  
9 what I hear is psychometrically there are issues before the  
10 CAT scores get set, and that, you know, it was a small end  
11 for some Districts that wanted two kids that could've made  
12 the difference between in one bucket, or another bucket.  
13 And I mean, I don't know, whatever we can do to really  
14 uncover fairly what's going on, so that it's meaningful,  
15 helpful information, but not just sort of arbitrary. Not  
16 that it would be arbitrary, but it could be partially  
17 arbitrary if we don't look deeply into what (inaudible)  
18 numbers represent.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, I see technically,  
21 tell me if I'm wrong, if really after this year starting in  
22 '17, '18, the -- the only obligation we have to are UIP,  
23 right? It was for next year. So how is -- how is this in  
24 pinup? This is for messaging --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean messaging is  
2 being incredibly (inaudible). How -- how did we talk to  
3 Districts, and communities now? After -- after this year,  
4 we -- we're gonna have to have a message this coming year,  
5 but we're still targeting with UIP, how they've been  
6 thinking, that's going to go away in essence, I mean it's  
7 gonna look different than it does now.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. It will look  
9 different.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So how -- ? I guess  
11 the idea is, what's -- what is a -- there can be two  
12 pathways to this. You know, part of it knowing, and part  
13 of it criterion. How do we coagulate this message for  
14 people? (Inaudible) a problem, I see that the advantages  
15 (inaudible) . The other -- so I'm just concerned about us  
16 getting too deep into UIP, and ignoring the long term  
17 (inaudible). But the other part of it is the percents, you  
18 know, I don't know, you look at this, and a lot of its are  
19 open up to go (inaudible). You don't wanna hold that too  
20 much, but it's still getting ahead. So then we need to  
21 attach who sends ranges to them. This is where (inaudible)  
22 an A is 90-100, a B is 80-89, whatever, we can go back to  
23 the traditional letter grade, and how to use of scales, and  
24 how -- how is that these days? How is that received these  
25 days?



1                               So I'm just -- I -- I don't know, this one  
2 is actually kind of -- this one is resonated more with B to  
3 -- to drop it this way. But even then, it looks like so  
4 where do you cut a point? Where do you put the point, so  
5 that you have a pretty clear absolution of what still needs  
6 to be done. And this is where my UIP thinking comes in.  
7 How much the incentive for -- there will always be  
8 incentives. Districts will always find their little --  
9 their goals, but just wanna be quick (inaudible). I think  
10 I -- I agree with -- I agree there has to be some sort of a  
11 plan. I also agree that from (inaudible) 84 whatever that  
12 (inaudible) that's huge. There's -- there are 34 points  
13 difference between -- between approaching, and these.  
14 Yeah, and from -- that -- that's not being too approaching  
15 (inaudible).

16                               UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Yes. I know you  
17 don't like the (inaudible) but it is kind of that idea that  
18 like the majority of our schools, and Districts sort of  
19 fall in that middle sort of approaching in needs. And then  
20 you have sort of a two tail, and that are more extreme that  
21 we feel that we can actually sort of differentiate a little  
22 bit more. And the idea which the -- the way the whole  
23 system works is that, in -- in any one particular metrics  
24 sort of that (inaudible) is not that meaningful. But when  
25 you have a whole bunch of those metrics added together, the



1 systems that consistently pop as being extreme, sort of  
2 become more, and more extreme, and you really get to see  
3 that they do function very differently from the majority of  
4 your inner school, and District population in that. At  
5 least best part, we've previously done with the performance  
6 frameworks, has been what we've been doing trying to  
7 identify is particularly the systems that are at the very  
8 bottom, and that really needs something significant, needs  
9 to happen to shift their performance. And -- and so being  
10 able to have sort of just those extreme tails is -- is kind  
11 of how we -- we rent around that -- that about building  
12 system that could identify the bottom five percent as turn  
13 around, and the next 10 percent is for the improvement.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which I know  
15 (inaudible) conversation is.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And it's a -- but it's  
18 really hard to accept with, and totally a (inaudible) start  
19 thinking about what if -- what is the final message  
20 (inaudible) created (inaudible) and when we get into that  
21 conversation, I must -- just how I'm gonna come back to my  
22 --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So from a  
25 technical perspective like it's kind of trying to build a





1 system that allows us to -- differentiate, so that when we  
2 do have that conversation we can say something meaningful  
3 about what that would look like to be accredited --  
4 accredited with improvements.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If we can go through  
6 that little bit more just kind of talk about big ideas from  
7 here on, and then we'll -- we can go back talk whenever you  
8 guys want from a conversation just because it's an  
9 important topic to talk about.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So just, so you  
11 know that we have been -- previously we had baseline the  
12 target that we set. So the baselining is the process of  
13 sort of setting expectation from the current year, and then  
14 holding future years to the same expectations, so that  
15 we're not recalculating the target every single year. And  
16 so the important part about baseline is that it allows  
17 systems to show improvement over time, and so the previous  
18 frameworks we had baseline then using 2009, and 2010 data.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because was that the  
20 first year?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's was the first  
22 year. Although it was the first year we get the  
23 performance framework.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it was -- it was at  
2 that time that was the current year, and it was (inaudible)  
3 even at the time.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But at least they had  
5 (inaudible) while.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, okay. Go ahead.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, exactly. So we  
9 are kind of proposing this right now because we do have new  
10 assessments. We do need to reset all of our baselines, and  
11 sort of set them using this 2014-15 data with the caveat  
12 that we will probably have to revisit them once we have a  
13 second year of park data available? Maybe even a third  
14 depending on what we see into the consistency of our  
15 results over time. And then just in general with sort of  
16 baselining, you do have to occasionally re-examine, and  
17 (inaudible) this target just because your systems shift it  
18 on, and make sure that you maintaining the (inaudible)  
19 under your accountability system. So you have a periodic  
20 process of revamping them. And this is a good opportunity  
21 for us obviously with the transition to revamp.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what (inaudible).

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Shoppers?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- shoppers will say  
25 that in assessments is that there is always, almost always



1 a growth in year one, in year two, and in year one, two,  
2 and three because of the nature of the assessments. So we  
3 are hanging out a little bit by (inaudible) I don't have a  
4 choice --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- but we are hanging  
7 out, and I think we should make that pretty important  
8 consideration.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Otherwise, we're going  
11 to tell ourselves next year, "Wow", when is that, the wow  
12 is about finding familiarity with this kind of assessment  
13 as opposed to dramatic increase (inaudible).

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know -- is  
16 there -- something with my question though -- is there a  
17 time period? Is it the second time you take the test? Is  
18 it the third time you test? What is the best time to be  
19 using it as a baseline right now?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't want to answer.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think it's a fair  
22 question, and I think you are absolutely right. As we're  
23 looking at some of the changes, we expected to see between  
24 year one, and two, some of it turning be just pure  
25 familiarity with the task but with different kind of



1 question types. In our case, we also have the technology  
2 issue. After year three, I would suggest that now you're  
3 seeing true change in terms of student achievement.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you agree it would  
5 probably be an appropriate time to say maybe this --  
6 especially if that baseline is dramatically different.  
7 Just reading reports on -- on technology, you make it as if  
8 it's not very important for people who talk to people who  
9 took the paper-and-pencil test saying that, you know there  
10 was a huge difference between people who took paper-and-  
11 pencil, and people who took -- took it online (inaudible)  
12 district school -- took online last year, and now going  
13 back to paper-pencil, so I think that is -- you're right.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is a big, big issue.  
15 Yeah.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just the nature of the  
17 test.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just as a point of  
19 clarification. There are obviously a lot of conversations  
20 about our differences in terms of mode for Colorado. We  
21 did not have the same issues that other states had in parts  
22 because for grades four through 11, the only students we  
23 allowed to take the assessment on paper were students with  
24 disabilities, or English learners, and I got an English  
25 language arts, and that's one of the areas where other



1 states actually saw paper outperforming online. Colorado  
2 did not see that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We didn't have that  
4 option.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But now, when we get to  
6 your (inaudible) we called you to look at what's still  
7 (inaudible).

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, that's not the case  
9 with Denver. (Inaudible). They had much fewer people.  
10 There are -- are a lot more kids in Denver that are English  
11 second language learners, and there were very few kids who  
12 took paper-and-pencil test in Denver. Very few kids took  
13 it last year (inaudible) very few. This year, with that  
14 option I'm hearing about districts that are changing  
15 (inaudible).

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well no, but was  
17 talking only about figures. (Inaudible).

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the attention  
19 is that sort of with this first year data, will that --  
20 what targets reform? And then the next couple of years, we  
21 will reinvestigate them, and then decide when the  
22 appropriate time to actually set that permanent baseline  
23 that we want to use moving forward it's going to be. And  
24 then there is also some of the other future consideration,  
25 in that the federal legislation from the Every Student



1 Succeeds Act requires states to set long term goals, and  
2 then including measures of interim progress for all of our  
3 accountability indicators.

4                   And so I will say that the secretary is  
5 limited in prescribing but the specific long term goals  
6 are, and how we want to do those interim measures, but  
7 there is a pretty clear expectation that we must increase  
8 our performance over time. So we don't have a lot of  
9 conversations about how to do this in a way that is ideally  
10 integrated into a single system instead of having sort of  
11 separate AYP targets, and separate state targets to think  
12 there is a way that we can make them sort of mesh together.  
13 And so my proposal is instead of using the norm  
14 distributions, and to create targets, they (inaudible) all  
15 the data, and then increase incrementally over time, and  
16 sort of compared to that initial baseline, and so that we  
17 can ensure that our -- Colorado can have ambitious yet  
18 attainable long term goals.

19                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) a question?

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes?

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there any -- Is  
22 there any -- (inaudible) the infusion of refugee kids when  
23 we look at what village were going to give, growth versus  
24 static targets, and how those change over time (inaudible)  
25 with population of some of the school's changing pretty



1 systematically. With certain percentage of kids coming  
2 from (inaudible) even some of them don't have a stable  
3 written language, and some of those needs of the kids were  
4 very substantial. I'm worrying how that figures into how  
5 we think about these -- these targets?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So in general we've  
7 been looking at is when we set the individual targets on  
8 say, you know, reading, actually not our English language  
9 arts for elementary school. We're setting it on the entire  
10 elementary school population, there's not different  
11 targets, for different subgroups of students. In ESSA the  
12 feds are pretty clear that they do it ex -- from my  
13 reading, they expect all students to be held to the same  
14 set of expectations. But then, when it comes into how we  
15 decide we want to weigh achievement versus growth be -- we  
16 do have quite a bit of latitude in making those decisions.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) So can we  
18 set, when we think of the overall student population in  
19 Colorado versus some Districts which have more refugees,  
20 you know, is more needs -- needy kids than others. Can we  
21 -- can we set the (inaudible) different between static  
22 achievement, and growth in different districts depending on  
23 their bio-demographics, or does it have to be the same for  
24 all the districts?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It has to be a single  
2 set of expectations applied to all schools, and Districts  
3 in the States.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So that means  
5 we'd have to be looking at those percentages, and averaging  
6 them, and using that to inform the (inaudible) or you know,  
7 relatively either achievement or growth, right? And are we  
8 doing that?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would say that --  
10 that the deciding how we want to weigh achievements, and  
11 growth is a future conversation that we're gonna have with  
12 this group. It's once we've decided on sort of these  
13 individual components, we'll get to figure out how we want  
14 the whole system to add together, and what we want the  
15 outcomes to look like.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just so you know  
18 there's some flexibility, and probably not an enough  
19 students that have come without any formal education, but  
20 there is some flexibility for testing for recently arrived  
21 English learners that come from out of country. For the --  
22 those in their first year. But I know if a kid comes in 11  
23 through 12th grade, or 10th grade even they've never been  
24 in school before. That's a very different situation.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. Thank you.





1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So when we're setting  
2 goals, these incremental goals. We're talking about is  
3 hoping to shift this.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Holding to -- expecting  
6 the -- kind of -- distribution of where nor were accustomed  
7 to is just having this bell curve being relieved to the  
8 right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, I do. We want the  
10 entire population to be shifting up so that we have better  
11 performance across all of our students in Colorado, that's  
12 our goal.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any part of the  
14 baselining idea. And that's -- then we've got new  
15 assessments with that idea so that everybody can improve,  
16 that you don't always have this bottom five percent, but  
17 you kind of set what these expectations are, and then you -  
18 - you leave it so you can show the people I'm making  
19 progress (inaudible)

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Challenges that when  
21 you have a conversation about all kids are going to reach a  
22 certain level.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that's not the  
25 conversation we're having.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Depending on how you  
2 set your framework, yeah. And it's that balance between  
3 the feds (inaudible) and I think it's actually a good  
4 faith, you know, it's really hard to define ambitious yet  
5 attainable, right? We wanna have ambitious goals, and we  
6 want goals that are realistic, and that we can attain over  
7 time. And that's really hard. And with the (inaudible) in  
8 our state it's really hard.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But just know like  
10 before this, you know, future target setting thing, we do  
11 have a little bit of time, you know, before ESSA has to be  
12 in fully in place. So we -- we can look again at the  
13 targets next year once we have a new year date, and -- and  
14 we can think about (inaudible) before setting those  
15 expectations.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's just a real  
17 key point. We have time for the ESSA integration. We  
18 think (inaudible) plan on due -- be due sometime next  
19 winter or spring so that '17 '18 year will be the -- will  
20 be the data is first used with that the fall of '18 those  
21 performance frameworks is when we need first to have the  
22 ESSA fully integrated in there. So we've got time, we've  
23 got (inaudible) to think through what's right for our  
24 state.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And ma'am we also do  
2 get into quite a bit of detail, and in the PowerPoint about  
3 the individual achievement, and growth metric. So starting  
4 first, and actually the NPWR. So starting first with the  
5 achievement metrics. Just sort of an overview. So we're  
6 proposing to use mean scale score on the (inaudible),  
7 Science and Social Studies, and English, Science sorry --  
8 Science only, and English Language arts, and Math  
9 assessments. And then, we'll be setting the targets by  
10 grades span sort of elementary schools looked are lumps  
11 together middle schools, and high schools, and then I'm  
12 thinking that we can use the 15th, 50th, and 85th  
13 percentile ranks. And then (inaudible) was putting the  
14 (inaudible) outside board schools.

15 We generally exclude the alternative  
16 education campuses because they have a very different  
17 population of students attending them. And it tends to  
18 skew the results, it can potentially skew the results for  
19 the entire state in a way that's not really meaningful.  
20 And then we also removed Districts, and schools that have  
21 less than 16 records just because that's too small for us  
22 to report, and they tend to show a lot more about  
23 (inaudible) system. And so -- so it's -- it's -- of the --  
24 the schools that sort of meet all of these criteria, we  
25 have historically used the percent of students score



1 (inaudible) exam on (inaudible) so the percentage students  
2 scoring at a particular benchmark. But we are now  
3 proposing to shift to the mean scale score as our -- our  
4 metrics for two reasons.

5           One is that the mean scale score allows us  
6 to focus on the achievement for all students not just sort  
7 of bubble kids that are near the benchmark cut points. And  
8 then also because data can be more accurately recorded with  
9 the mean scale score compared to a percent proficient  
10 metric, and ensures greater data privacy. So the big thing  
11 for, at least me, is with data privacy concerns because  
12 even when we are requiring a minimum end of 16 using the  
13 percentage benchmark, we have potential to -- identify  
14 students personally identifiable information because if a  
15 school has zero percent of students at benchmark, or 100  
16 percent of students at benchmark, by definition, we know  
17 the academic achievements of all -- of their -- of every  
18 single child in that school, and that's -- is PII.

19           So we're having to reconsider how we look at  
20 achievement, and -- and status scores. And so we have  
21 situations where also -- where only a -- a small number of  
22 students fall into proficiency category, and then we have  
23 to go through these rather arduous masking, and suppression  
24 algorithms to make sure that we're not disclosing PII. And  
25 so what we've done previously, not previously for this



1 year, for the first time, we would have sort of a range.  
2 We recorded greater than 50 percent of students that  
3 benchmark, if I can't tell you exactly 52, or 54. And the  
4 problem with having a target, and that you can't actually  
5 report is, better we write on here --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- it becomes difficult  
8 to report whether, or not the school was greater than, or  
9 less than the target when you can't actually tell them what  
10 their actual target value was, and what their actual mean  
11 scale score was. So with mean scale score, as long as they  
12 meet the minimum end criteria, and there's no conclusive  
13 way to determine an individual student's skills score, or  
14 performance levels, so that gets us around some of these  
15 data privacy concerns, and some of the -- the difficulties  
16 caused by reporting an intended target.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know this Math, is  
18 just what you wanna be doing at our (inaudible).

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) I'm really  
20 starting to understand this.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't -- I don't have  
22 a clear number in my head. How many Districts do we have  
23 that are under 16 classrooms? How many Districts?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there's only a  
25 handful of Districts, I would say that are under 16. But



1 one of the problems that we actually have is -- is, it's  
2 actually 16 students in elementary taking the assessments,  
3 or having valid scores on the assessment, I should say. So  
4 a lot of times even we do have quite a lot of districts  
5 that are, you know, a couple hundred, and they have  
6 situations where sometimes they fall below this, and in  
7 sometimes they have data that's reported or not. It's one  
8 of the reasons that for the performance frameworks, we've  
9 generally done the three-year aggregations. To try to give  
10 those small Districts more time to accumulate enough  
11 student records to -- to be reported. But since we're with  
12 the new tests, and having to start over again, we're kind  
13 of back at square one that we don't actually have  
14 additional years, and we're going to have more situations  
15 where schools and Districts don't meet the minimum N.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- so currently, we  
17 have the data on the performance of those really small  
18 grade levels District sites. What do we do with them now?  
19 How do we -- how do you talk to them now? On an -- on an  
20 annual basis, you know, and through your thing -- your  
21 stand reporting. How -- how do we address needs that keep  
22 popping up, no matter the size of the school, or District?  
23 I guess, you know, it's kind of rhetorical but I -- I would  
24 like to know how -- how are they interacted? (Inaudible).  
25 Because if -- if there's consistent, and even if it's



1 (inaudible), either way, and especially the under-  
2 performing, and this can go on for a few years. So we  
3 really have the right policy, and the rule is to have  
4 enough information to impact.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it will be a  
6 challenge for us this first year when we just have one, you  
7 know, or two years of data. We'll have to think about the  
8 15 data from a one, or two year framework with the 15 data,  
9 and the 16 data, or just choose 16 in the first year. But  
10 it is a challenge, and that's where we also have the  
11 request to reconsider profits, and we really try, and  
12 target that for such small systems so they can (inaudible)  
13 dated evidence. When we work with them on improvement  
14 planning, and try to help them understand their  
15 performance, they -- you know, sometimes we get frustrated  
16 because understandably so. But we don't have these  
17 aggregate numbers, we can't do it the way you're telling  
18 all these other schools to do it. And at that point it  
19 really becomes, here's some guidance out there for them,  
20 becomes really knowing your students. And not writing down  
21 about individual students, and what kids can do because we  
22 don't want that in the public document. But for them  
23 really, they have the ability to be able to look  
24 individually at kids that -- and so much of why we look at  
25 aggregate data, and larger systems is because it's a quick



1 way to get a big picture understanding. But then you  
2 really do want to get to individual kids, and know what  
3 individual kids could mean. It doesn't so fit well into a  
4 system built like this so -- so it's trying to figure out  
5 those names --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We had another big  
7 conversation but I'd be interested to know sometime  
8 (inaudible) I don't have those tiny Districts. But how --  
9 how at what rate are those who are under-performing, at  
10 what rate are they asking for help? Are they reaching out  
11 for the resources available? Are they -- is there some  
12 other kind of operation points where (inaudible) types  
13 resources. But I guess it's -- the two-way communication  
14 thing, do they know about taking advantage of --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some are, and some  
16 aren't, that's all I can tell you. Like, we reach out to  
17 them, and some want to engage, and some don't want to. But  
18 that's the same thing the larger Districts do. Some want  
19 to do it, engage more, and some don't, as much. That was -  
20 - that's a good question like it's curious.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So then, additional  
22 considerations that we have particularly for this year is  
23 participation. So participant rates -- participation rates  
24 from 2014-15 mean that not all students are included in the  
25 distributions that were used for setting our months target.





1 And the participation rates, and the demographic --  
2 demographic of the students who did participate in the  
3 elementary, and middle school level suggest that we do have  
4 pretty representative data for the state as a whole. But  
5 participation rates at the high school were lower, and we  
6 are not entirely sure that we actually have a  
7 representative sample so this is kind of another reason  
8 that we will want to revisit these targets in future years  
9 depending on -- on how the data shakes our minutes, the  
10 next round of testing.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we are trying for  
12 the -- the spring to -- to release informational reports to  
13 the field, that is a sort of a preview of what they should  
14 be expecting to get next fall when there is at least  
15 currently an expectation that we will be publishing new  
16 performance framework sort of 2.0. And so to try to get  
17 that -- these new spring preview reports we have gone  
18 through the data from the new assessments. And using this  
19 idea of the 15, 50, 85, you know, set targets for  
20 elementary middle, and high school, you know, and we've  
21 shown them here. So if the Board is eventually going to --  
22 I should say the Board will eventually show the world will  
23 eventually have to approve some set of targets. And it's  
24 like I said, our first attempt at setting forth actual  
25 values for those.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is what 15, 50, 85  
2 would look like on a normal distribution norming on the  
3 school. There is some intel then on that but it's just a  
4 way to look at where we are. I think it's probably helpful  
5 for you, you know because you don't live, and breathe the -  
6 - the old cars of the park the way we do. But 750 is the -  
7 - the benchmark skills going on (inaudible) if I get this  
8 wrong. So you can see just with --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What in the world is  
10 happening? (Inaudible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- with -- with on  
12 here, if you looked at -- if you wanted a mean scale score  
13 that where all kids are on the mean end at that percent  
14 four, five percentage benchmark, that's about four English  
15 language arts. It's in between the meets, and exceeds that  
16 close to the exceed cut point. And that exceeds a little  
17 bit above that, where everybody got glorified. So it's  
18 just trying to get back to that you weren't, like you if  
19 you wanted to think proficiently percentages, would that be  
20 fine then? So quite a confusion, I'm sorry.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, so --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If I understand the raw  
23 score, consistency (inaudible) Midland High.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So this is  
25 actually very different from teacups, the teacup was



1 vertically scaled which meant that sort of the expectations  
2 for a fourth grader could be, you know, 350 explications  
3 for a fifth grader could be 500 for a sixth grader could be  
4 back 550. And so we -- we did see sort of these  
5 incrementally increasing targets on teacup. But the way  
6 that they created park is that every single grade is 650 to  
7 850, and all the same targets are set at the same places,  
8 and so they've been standardized to be consistent in that  
9 way.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's really helpful.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So yeah.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is. It has so much  
14 of interpretation, and allows us to use this kind of metric  
15 because it has meaning across (inaudible).

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now we can say that 750  
17 is mean at Benchmark across all of our grades, and that has  
18 --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that taught me about  
20 teachers who set the eighth grade in my --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) weird  
22 conversation that I don't think ever --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think there were a  
24 lot of conversations back, back in the standard setting  
25 days, and with this Emax target that's (inaudible) also a



1 lot of conversations. But in the end, where the teachers,  
2 educators indicated, this is what it means to have mastered  
3 the standards of this grade level. That was defined at  
4 7:15. So the number was assigned based on the  
5 recommendations of the teacher. So again, it is very easy  
6 to have conversations across the state of Colorado now as  
7 it was indicated some 50 grades three to nine for ELA math,  
8 that's the target. For individual students (inaudible).

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then the 15th if we  
10 behave in 80 percentile, there're also very consistent  
11 because of the way the school Districts spell out, is  
12 pretty consistent. So that -- that is -- I'm hoping that  
13 will add some value for the next round. And so there are  
14 some challenges in using norms, and -- and the biggest one  
15 is that the comparison group determines where a particular  
16 guy you ranks. So therefore the decision on who is  
17 included, or excluded from that comparison group is  
18 extremely important.

19 And so the norm-referenced targets sort of  
20 vary greatly, depending on whether we look at schools as a  
21 comparison group, or Districts of the comparison group.  
22 And just describe more information they need. But we have  
23 182 districts that range in size from three students to  
24 90,000 students. And we have 1,851 schools that range in  
25 size from one to 4,000 students. So there are a lot fewer



1 Districts, and they are a lot more diverse in terms of how  
2 their sized. So in general, what we are -- what we've seen  
3 when we look at the results for this is that you know, the  
4 Districts tend to sort of be a little more clumpy that, new  
5 districts are on the top, and the school distribution is on  
6 the bottom.

7                   So the Districts tend to sort of as I -- it  
8 clusters more closely towards the mean, and then the school  
9 distribution is a little more spread out. And you know, we  
10 also see that school distribution just because there are  
11 more schools, sort of, less the more differentiation than  
12 the District distribution. And so this is still a thingy  
13 discussion, cause previously we had set the framework  
14 target independently for schools, and Districts. So we had  
15 one set of targets for schools, one set of targets for  
16 Districts. And feedback from stakeholders was that this  
17 was confusing.

18                   So you know a small system could have one  
19 set of ratings based upon the district results, and then  
20 for identical results, they'd have a different set of  
21 ratings from the school results. And so we've been trying  
22 to figure out a way to solve this issue. And then, one of  
23 the -- the option is to use either the school, or the  
24 District distribution, and just apply the same set of cuts  
25 for everything. And so for the presentations that we've



1 done today, just prove simplicity is not completely  
2 inundating you with results data. We use the school  
3 results, or the school distribution for all of our  
4 comparisons.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But this is just for  
6 all that (inaudible) kind of talk about a different known  
7 methods, and options, and you all have. So one is the  
8 school distribution that works, and you do -- do a bit of  
9 school -- school data that is really even, got that nice  
10 15, 50, 85, but you don't do that for Districts, kind of  
11 the Districts are mostly caught in the middle, right?  
12 (Inaudible).

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we actually went  
14 through, and applied, you know, the -- these cuts, these  
15 targets when we proposed what would be distribution of  
16 ratings for does not need approaching civics needs, look  
17 like preaching to elementary, middle, and high school. And  
18 then we book out by sort of what do the schools look like,  
19 and what do the District ratings look like. And so you can  
20 see that the school ratings as Elisa said, to be closely  
21 match the 15, 50, 80 target. But the District  
22 distributions are kind of distracted particularly at the  
23 exceeds rating. And -- and that is just one of those  
24 things that we're going to have to decide what we want to  
25 do. In terms of which -- which comparison to apply because



1 pretty much every option we had, has some drawbacks, and  
2 some negative unintended consequences.

3                   So we'll just need to decide what we really  
4 wanna value in our state. And -- and I have all the data  
5 in case anybody wants more data. We did run everything  
6 using the District distributions as well so -- so but they  
7 wind up looking, you know, 15, 50, 85 the Districts are  
8 very tight. And then if you collect the district  
9 distribution to schools, then you get a little -- a little  
10 bit wonky. You wind up with a whole lot of school spirit  
11 that does not even exceeds, sort of extremes. So kind of  
12 like the districts pull everything in the middle, schools  
13 kind of push everything to the extremes. And so -- and it  
14 is, I -- I will also say that the -- the -- the difference  
15 between the school district distribution is the most  
16 pronounced for achievements. We're getting -- moving into  
17 the growth of -- (inaudible).

18                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just talk. So you can  
19 use the school distribution, and the District distribution,  
20 that it makes like -- you could do what we used to do with  
21 separate school on District distribution. We had that with  
22 the surveys, we've been out in the field, we've had  
23 accountability work group. Everybody wants this target for  
24 lines is what we heard really loud, and clearly.  
25 (Inaudible) And then you get the weird results. The other



1 thing we could do, and we haven't run impact yet, is you  
2 could -- you could take the school distribution, and the  
3 District dis -- distribution, and you could cut the  
4 difference, and you could make a target somewhere between  
5 the school, and the District lines. Starts getting even  
6 more arbitrary, I didn't get that position, wanna do norm.  
7 So if you wanna do something different than norm then you'd  
8 have other options but for norm district kinda got four  
9 different options we got through. But they're -- none of  
10 them are except these -- these -- there's gonna be a  
11 concern. (Inaudible). One degree, or another. Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've spent a lot of  
13 time trying to brainstorm if there was a best option. And  
14 in the end, we really have not been able to come up with  
15 anything. Luckily --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How do you explain all  
17 this?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that  
19 (inaudible) is how it's been, or how addressing concerns,  
20 the easier it is to explain these people already have a --  
21 a grounding of what we've done for the last five years, or  
22 some people did -- (inaudible).

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know why I did.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. And that's  
25 definitely something we've got to figure out the balance.





1 I -- I got an earful from some -- I didn't get. I got  
2 concerns shared today that we at CDE shouldn't go with a  
3 simplistic EV to explain methodology. It's not the best  
4 technology. So we're trying to balance that technical  
5 exactness, and then communicate it, and making it clear,  
6 and understandable and fair because so much of it is about  
7 fairness too. Yeah.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's very sticky. I  
9 agree with your decision.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I think that --  
11 yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the next section we  
13 gonna talk about is the growth target. And so this year  
14 the match set that were -- am looking at doing for this  
15 performance framework is the median growth percentile, or  
16 medium student growth percentile. And -- and until we have  
17 more consecutive years of seeing Ash Park, we sort of  
18 suggest holding out on doing adequate growth metrics,  
19 because we don't really know what growth from park to park  
20 looks like yet. So we need to wait a little while. And we  
21 also ha -- have some time to consider how we would  
22 potentially want -- if, and how we would potentially wanna  
23 include that in the frameworks. And there has been pretty  
24 widespread stakeholder input, encouraging us to remove  
25 adequate growth from the growth indicator -- as a whole and



1 -- and the calculations that were being d -- that we're  
2 doing. So -- oh yes, please.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think -- would happen  
4 with added to growth, added to growth defined statute, and  
5 the way it's defined statute is that, they're really  
6 ambitious, and not so attainable targets for students who  
7 in many ways who calculate ma -- and that impartial  
8 proficient. To those -- soon as that runs, that impartial  
9 goal to get them to proficient within three years or by  
10 10th grade. And the target, the kind of growth needed to  
11 get there especially when unsatisfied kids are at  
12 unsatisfactory levels was extremely ambitious, and we  
13 didn't see it happening very often. Students that were  
14 already proficient in advance, the target is to find them  
15 statutes to remain proficient for the next three years.  
16 That was -- the extremely attainable target, and not very  
17 ambitious.

18 So based on the kind of student, the student  
19 performance that you had, or student achievement in your  
20 school, some schools had really high adequate growth that  
21 was nearing what they were already finding out about  
22 achievement. And it's so the conversation, was if we're  
23 talking about growth like growth, be pure growth, and not  
24 be tied to what kind of kids you have, but really be about  
25 growth. And then have achievement be that other indicator



1 of whether they -- where they are and not -- I think the  
2 adequate could do that. And I think some -- some more  
3 nuanced ways of measuring growth to say, "it's enough", and  
4 maybe make it more developmental along the way of getting  
5 kids on the stage will be really useful.

6                   And that is useful for improvement planning  
7 purposes, but for accountability, the way this kind of  
8 statutes, make it hard right now. For it to be a fair, and  
9 meaningful target, and a target that really encourages  
10 progression over time. We have been able to set the  
11 targets with the English language proficiency growth, and  
12 that really is about developmental, getting from one level  
13 of English proficiency to the next -- to the next. And  
14 that, that reflects that students revealing a little bit of  
15 ambition built in, and that's stuff a lot more fair, and a  
16 lot more meaningful. So --

17                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. The students get  
18 a lot more support with those targets. So whatever we wind  
19 up doing with -- in the park, and PTA, I think we're gonna  
20 take it. Anyone who wants take look, and dig a little  
21 deeper.

22                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just, thank you. What  
23 are those conversations? All the -- anything related to  
24 growth, achievements, static versus the moving (inaudible).  
25 We do have -- I -- I think I'm wrong. We have a focus on



1 those conversations around now. It was (inaudible) How are  
2 those conversations going? I guess even now, with the non-  
3 tested contents entitled to have, of just pre-examined  
4 schools, that their goals. What's -- what's going to --  
5 where's the (inaudible) like, I know something. That you  
6 can -- you can -- let's wonder -- gather through this --  
7 how this growth, and goal setting discussed with the  
8 subgroups? That we have to show they reformed on all of  
9 them including the dep's -- the part of -- that's gonna be  
10 part of a federal requirement.

11 Changing for example, trying to get a brief  
12 (inaudible) of growth on the -- in that large group of kids  
13 is much different than it -- than in bringing on growth,  
14 when you're at the low growth performing end. But even  
15 that is complicated because within all the other  
16 sufferings, there are four range of kids, as well. I'm  
17 just -- I'm just looking forward to the next couple years  
18 of everything that we're looking at changing to really get  
19 some new ways of thinking about those kinds of  
20 conversations. And then -- and still having a -- a process  
21 of our system inconsistent so we can (inaudible) integrity  
22 as well. I'm just thinking that it would -- we got a lot  
23 of work to do.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have a lot of work  
25 to do.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On one hand, it's  
2 really exciting what could happen (inaudible). On the  
3 other had, (inaudible)

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All those details  
6 (inaudible).

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So many details. And  
8 so it turns out that for growth. Previously, we had a  
9 single set of growth targets that were applied to all  
10 content areas in (inaudible) and -- and in looking at that  
11 park data it have, thus far, for this year, we found  
12 something similar that we probably could set a single set  
13 of cut that's consistent, which makes it much easier. So  
14 we're looking at median growth percentiles of 30, 50, and  
15 65 as, sort of, producing that 15, 50, 85 percentile rank  
16 distribution. So that's why --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) before.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. It -- it was --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We got it close. Okay.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we have different  
22 targets of whether or not could mean adequate growth, or  
23 not adequate growth, and all that Math.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But the intention or --  
25 or initially has been, sort of, too empirically still get



1 to -- at that time, it was actually 15, 50, 90, but we've  
2 heard recommendations to make it symmetrical so it's 50,  
3 50, 85. But it's the same idea, that it's a single set of  
4 growth targets applied to all the content areas, and all of  
5 the grades. And so that's just, kind of, explanation that  
6 we have, you know, about that.

7                   And then to the next slide, you can see that  
8 when you look at the impact data for the growth targets for  
9 schools, and Districts using -- this is -- so onset of  
10 targets, but they're very consistent, and very similar, and  
11 very close to, sort of, that, you know, the top 15 percent  
12 that exceeds, 35 percent meets, 35 percent approaching,  
13 bottom 15 percent, and that's not meet. And there is no --  
14 some slight variation. They're not all perfect, and  
15 tending to have something to do with that. There --  
16 there's some (inaudible) or things tend to cluster, that  
17 make it so that we can't have a perfect distribution. But  
18 in general, the results for English Language Arts, and Math  
19 now are pretty consistent.

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How should it grow?

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh! We didn't have  
22 this conversation yet?

23                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this year, we're  
25 doing something really fun in Colorado. Okay. So -- so we



1 have been calculating growth from the old TCAP results onto  
2 the new PARCC assessment.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just to understand what  
4 it looks like (inaudible). We have to know, right? She  
5 has to know.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I don't know what  
7 I'm gonna do with it yet, or what it at all, we're gonna do  
8 with it yet. I'm actually still in the process for them,  
9 still working with dealing in the Center for Assessment to,  
10 sort of, get all this finalized. But I wanted to include  
11 it, and we -- we get some idea of what we were looking at  
12 in this presentation. But we've taken, sort of, like, the  
13 2013, and the 2014 TCAP results, and look at the how  
14 students, you know, get in on PARCC in 2015. And for that  
15 most part, things are looking pretty good, actually, very  
16 good. It's -- It's --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good being consistent?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good being consistent.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, what we'll do, is  
20 take that (inaudible) of little bit deeper good in  
21 technical advisory panel for longitudinal growth, share it  
22 with them, get their recommendation on. If, and how it  
23 should be used, and put out within here.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a scale for  
25 (inaudible) target between these two tests?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you doing anything  
3 on (inaudible).

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we -- but it -- with  
5 ACT, we have not generally run growth on that assessment.  
6 So we haven't done that previously. But we could do  
7 something where we are looking instead of the percentile  
8 ranks, where school, and Districts fell on the old ACT, and  
9 as we transition to the new SAT. Because generally, what I  
10 have found is that even though the scales have changed,  
11 even a part, sort of, honestly, it is still a bell curve,  
12 and the -- sort of, you know, high flyers and low liers,  
13 still tends to follow the same bell curve on the new  
14 assessment. So we can do something like that.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And it's account the  
16 individual students?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Yeah, looks at  
18 individual students.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I said, you know, I  
20 have three other kids did the ACT, you can do the -- scale  
21 on the SAT too? Just say you'll (inaudible) just say yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just for re-  
23 clarification, I think what you were asking about is  
24 something slightly different, which is really is there a  
25 way for us to come up with a table that will have -- if you





1 score this sudden ACT test, this is what you could've  
2 expect to score in the SAT test, and vice versa. The  
3 answer is that is, "Yes." Those tables should be available  
4 in June.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what you're talking  
6 about is here. This is -- is similar thing that you're  
7 talking about comparing PARCC and -- ain't that what's  
8 this?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. It's a little  
10 bit different in that. It's looking at the same kid on a  
11 different. So if you had a kid that took the third grade  
12 TCAP, the fourth grade TCAP, and then the fifth grade  
13 PARCC, you would look at the history from those three --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And -- and they're --  
15 they -- they're similar --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- as a group.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- yeah. And then, as  
19 looking at the growth that they made, and just taking all  
20 that history, and ma -- doing the growth percentiles.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It should be.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. And then -- and  
23 we're seeing consistently enough, but -- yeah, yeah.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So it -- this --  
25 I apologize for not clarifying earlier, because we also



1 have created a set of reports that are -- percentile  
2 comparison report that looking at -- at the cohort of fifth  
3 graders who took TCAP, the cohort of fifth graders, who  
4 took PARCC, you know, for school, how did those results  
5 compare? And that is different from this -- these growth  
6 results that we're looking at here where you're tracking a  
7 single cohort of students from grades four, five, and then  
8 six into PARCC. So we have looked at the assessments both  
9 ways. And if we were to do ACT to SAT, it would be sort of  
10 in -- in that first percentile comparison measure. But  
11 there is also a possibility we've been talking about with,  
12 once we have PSAT to do PSAT to SAT, and we could you  
13 growth for that. And -- and you know, there's a lot of  
14 options that will be potentially available to us.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so I think  
17 everybody can to move on to the post secondary, and  
18 Workforce Readiness target. So the PWR measures tend to be  
19 and less consistent, and a little -- there -- there each  
20 one has to sort of be taken, and considered on it's own.  
21 And there have been changes in time in the calculation  
22 guidance, and sort of the reported results that we've seen  
23 from the field. So we thought that now as we're changing  
24 targets for all of the other metrics, this is the big time  
25 to revisit the PWR targets as well. We do recommend that



1 we retain the targets for the Colorado ACT for one more  
2 year because we are planning on transitioning the -- to the  
3 SAT. So I don't spend a lot of time, and resources, sort  
4 of renorming that this year. But we are recommending that  
5 we re-look at the targets for drop-out rate, and graduation  
6 rates. And then we will need to set new targets for the  
7 new measures of matriculation rate, and then PSAT, and SAT  
8 in the future when we have those results.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Matriculation, that  
10 means college?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So matriculation rate  
12 is a composite of two-year college enrollment, four-year  
13 college enrollment, and then CDE program enrollment. And  
14 then we're --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In Colorado only?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In Colorado. And it  
17 actually includes National Clearinghouse results.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we are getting  
19 those?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we're working with  
21 the Department of Higher Education to get that  
22 matriculation rate, and -- and yes, it does have the  
23 student clearinghouse results. So it doesn't include every  
24 single college in United States but it's -- it's a much  
25 better representation than just the Colorado School.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And do the districts  
2 plug this data? And then record it? Or we do it?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll do it for them.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do the districts have  
5 the opportunity to look at their -- look at the -- results,  
6 or you get district by district verified?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think -- I don't -- I  
8 mean maybe you could tell a district. So you gave them but  
9 you get data from higher add on the enrollment numbers with  
10 the appropriate (inaudible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Give a summary data a  
12 year later.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. A year later.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So districts could  
15 actually -- actually track their students --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, and so --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- more I -- I noticed  
18 in some --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And some districts  
20 right now have their own contracts with National  
21 Clearinghouse. You get it but it's costly. But I know  
22 that there are some districts that do that we are trying to  
23 see first the contracts would allow us to share. That'll  
24 means we need to figure out the data sharing agreement so  
25 the district so to get the summary data that's not



1 performance remarks from us, and then we have to figure out  
2 what individual data they can get.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So can I (inaudible)  
5 explain to one of those categories yet?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It does not currently.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Except if a student  
8 finishes. Like the one thing that we're trying to make  
9 sure is that the student graduates high school, and then  
10 associates degree that they will get credit because they  
11 make a switch to the workforce. The school should get  
12 credit their matriculation rate that they already did that  
13 for their student during high school that they didn't need  
14 to go onto to your college. They barely completed that.  
15 But it's not -- but if they just take in a certain number  
16 of concurrent moment classes, we don't currently have that  
17 in the framework is something we're looking into. The  
18 concerns we've heard is not everybody has equal access in  
19 the state. And so if you put some measure on that kids  
20 don't have equal access to. So we're looking at ways how  
21 can we regard that, and recognize that. We have a menu of  
22 options for district (inaudible) in different areas to  
23 focus.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) rates,  
25 districts get those, right?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) right now.

3 And --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) five years.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so I think

6 (inaudible).

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think mediation

8 is just for Colorado. (Inaudible)

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible)

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have no information

12 on that.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm just -- It is a

14 pre-matriculation rate (inaudible)?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was decided by the

16 legislature last spring. So it is presented the first time

17 in (inaudible).

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One last question.

19 Completion, do you report installment four-year

20 (inaudible)?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have some slide back

22 to -- to discuss that, and more detail because it's an

23 excellent question. And in addition but before you're

24 right. And then also the completion rate which can include

25 GED. So we've had a lot of conversations with our



1 stakeholders about that in the past year. So but first  
2 we're going to talk about ACT real fast I'm just saying  
3 what is keeping the previous target to -- and we'll update  
4 that once we have SAT data.

5                   And then so then next -- just sort of  
6 looking at the trends that we've seen in Colorado since the  
7 targets for graduation rate, and dropout rate were set in  
8 2009, and 2010. You can see that there has been a very  
9 steady noticeable increase over time in graduation rate,  
10 and sort of a significant drop in dropout rate. And so we  
11 are looking to potentially reset those targets so that we  
12 can make sure that we actually have you know ambitious yet  
13 attainable expectations for school, and district  
14 improvement because, I would say that, as time has gone on,  
15 everybody has become you know meets or exceeds and that  
16 they're not quite as meaningful as they were initially set  
17 them. So we're looking at -- at that regarding those.

18                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) graduation,  
19 drop rates are severe, national trends. Received national  
20 trends, below national trends.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Graduated some more.  
22 Graduates are increasing nationally over time. I don't  
23 know about drop out rate though.

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We presume that one  
25 would --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are related.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The earliest drop out  
5 in Colorado starts with seventh graders. We look at  
6 seventh through 12th as an annual dropout rate. So dropout  
7 it's not like 100 percent are either graduate, or dropout.  
8 And I think they are similar.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so for dropout,  
10 there was also a change in the way Colorado calculated the  
11 reported dropout rate. And that having in 12-13, okay.  
12 (Inaudible). So another reason that's out with that new  
13 definition, we probably want to look at every morning. So  
14 when we are proposing so you've got 50-50, and 80 per 50 --  
15 50 -- 80 percentile comes again, and -- and I just like to  
16 make the choice. So we can see that with dropout rate in  
17 particular, there is -- it's very huge. Like the vast  
18 majority of schools, and districts have very low graduation  
19 rates, and they're sort of like the -- dropout rates,  
20 sorry. And then there's some sort of a trailered training  
21 technical a school that smaller number of schools districts  
22 that have higher dropout rates.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But you see that big  
24 spike right that there at 0 percent, that huge almost 20  
25 percent of schools, right?





1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Zero percent of  
3 students dropping out. Yeah. That's changed over time.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's national data  
5 of drop out the that is -- is about six to seven years then  
6 back. A terrible drop in number of those school that are  
7 not using graduates in, you know --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so nationally, the  
9 trend is looking good.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. And -- and there  
12 with 20 percent of our schools having got a single dropout  
13 in the last year, that is actually really impressive.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And how big are those  
15 schools?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're actually do  
17 great. I had the same question. I actually went, and  
18 looked, and well, yes, a lot of them are small. There are  
19 some that -- there are quite a few that have hundreds of  
20 students. I think the largest one had 644 students, and  
21 not a single student dropped out. And or was recorded as a  
22 drop out of the last year, because I had the same question.  
23 I wanted to know. Yeah, I was quite impressed, actually.  
24 I was like, "Wow." And then so graduation rate. So what



1 we've traditionally presented for the current per --  
2 performance framework has been the best of graduation rate.  
3                   So we would look at a school's four, five,  
4 six, and seven year rate, and then give them whichever one  
5 get them the best results. So if we re-norm the -- the  
6 target sort of with current data, we would have recommended  
7 decline sort of 50, 50, 80 percentile targets. We have had  
8 a lot of conversations about completion rate versus  
9 graduation rates. And looking at the co -- the  
10 consequences of switching that, so the answer -- at this  
11 point, my recommendation is, that adding completer rate, or  
12 changing the completer rate, does not actually benefit the  
13 majority of traditional schools. It's very important for  
14 alternate education campuses, and they already are allowed  
15 to use completer rate, but for traditional schools, and  
16 they don't get a lot of bang for their buck. And with the  
17 lowered expectations for the GED that are coming up, I have  
18 concerns about thinking that -- that completer rate, and  
19 graduation rate are truly comparable. So I would recommend  
20 that we continue using just graduation rate.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We haven't gotten a  
22 female tactic to come to a feedback from accountability  
23 record where us look at using a completer rate instead.  
24 Back when the qualifications for the GED were raised, and  
25 now that they've decided to go back, and lower those down



1 again, there some concerns. Historically the U.S.  
2 Government has not looked at completer rate as a liable  
3 measure, they want the graduation rate. But who knows what  
4 will happen in the future. That is graduation rate is  
5 still definitely something we can negotiate both that lower  
6 GED expectations now. I think that was a concern for us,  
7 about going from completer instead of grad. And we've got  
8 some really solid chance, grad rates have really been  
9 increasing over time. When we implement grad -- grind  
10 guidelines, we'll definitely wanna look at the distribution  
11 again, and think about because it may change things. Yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know -- I have  
13 no idea what percentages of kids who graduate early. And  
14 this is where the (inaudible) and the changing. You know,  
15 we always want to make sure when assessments can be given,  
16 when ready. There are kids who have graduated before their  
17 four year call course. Are they counted or do they  
18 completely get --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there is a three  
20 year graduation rate that GED collects. And -- and we've  
21 got -- at the moment we're not counting that for  
22 Performance Frameworks. So these three -- the students who  
23 graduate in three years, are included in the four year  
24 graduation cohort. Because they're sort of define it as  
25 (inaudible). Exactly. But there's not currently like you



1 don't get a bonus for graduating students within three  
2 years. Generally, there hasn't been a large enough number  
3 of students within in any given school, or districts, to  
4 really make it worthwhile looking at a three year completer  
5 rate. It's not that we've seen it at the these of system  
6 level.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's why we -- we --  
8 are we patch is normally but we have top 10 at the bottom.  
9 But I'm thinking if a school of school in the district  
10 conversation is at (inaudible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Request for a  
12 reconsideration.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In a small district  
14 maybe, particularly that large -- early graduates  
15 (inaudible) that years accountability. Somewhere someday,  
16 it might be -- it might be just impulse in the overall  
17 achievement in that -- in the graduation rate. Probably  
18 not very often --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But I'm sure there's an  
20 occasion where it would.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Taking a whole real  
22 picture as much as your mother would.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Yeah. So the  
24 thing that we have been sort of looking at more is like a  
25 result of the four year graduation rate. And -- and this



1 sort of, is more in alignment with sort of federal statutes  
2 some of the expectations for on -- on time graduating. And  
3 so we've also run the data to see what -- what it would  
4 look like if we set certainly 15, 50, and 85, you know cuts  
5 based upon just before your graduation target. And then,  
6 the next slide sort give the impact data. You know, when  
7 applying these targets for -- for schools, and districts.  
8 Actually I -- I apologize. This is the side of a target.  
9 The next one is the impact data.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And -- I'm just like  
11 completely like the kids target who dropped out previously  
12 it's been one percent, with the drops to zero percent, just  
13 because that's what we've seen, so many schools with a zero  
14 percent drop out rate now.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And in the same way  
16 that if you look at the best of graduation rate previously,  
17 the expectation for meetings they need the expectations are  
18 the 80 percent. Based from a new distribution of that 93.9  
19 percent. So there's been a pretty significant shift. If  
20 you look at the four year graduation rates, the targets  
21 would be 67 percent, 85 percent, to 95 percent, which is  
22 closer to what we previously had. And in line with what  
23 I'm sure we'll get to talk about one of these days. But  
24 just sort of knowing that you have being clear that in a



1 normative system as the system has improved. Our targets  
2 will continue to go up, and --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Unless you take your  
4 id. You know who you wanna be. Right? If you are already  
5 95, and you felt that was good enough you could leave it  
6 there. But if you wanted to differentiate. You know, then  
7 you wanna move it up. I got a lot of talk about students.  
8 And just the matriculation, we don't have all the data  
9 quite put together yet. We just finalized the data sharing  
10 agreement with Department of (inaudible), and all of that.  
11 But once we do it the proposal is to look at the 50/50 cut  
12 score of that rate. We've gotta dig in to really  
13 understand what those numbers look like.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. And so now, you  
15 can see the -- the impact data. And so based upon what  
16 we're seeing here. Like again, since we set these at the  
17 15th, 50, or even 85 we can see that it's pretty  
18 consistent. There are in situations like that which I  
19 talked about for graduation drop out rates. Where we have  
20 a significant number of students who are at zero percent  
21 drop out. And so they kind of cluster in that exceed  
22 category, but there's really no way to differentiate  
23 between like, below the goals you can go, there's no way to  
24 parse that out more. But you know, this information, is  
25 meaningful for -- for our ability from the framework



1 perspective, to sort of identify schools that are  
2 systematically low performing schools, that are  
3 systematically like high performing across indicators. So  
4 that we can, and eventually decide what their performance  
5 framework rating overall should be. And so I think that's  
6 everything we had about that. I'm sorry, matriculation  
7 rate. We've already talked about it. So this is just sort  
8 of saying you know laying out that we discussed previously  
9 about the enrollment for your college enrollment. And that  
10 we're working on getting the data.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We wanna just have a  
12 little time to hear about some other methods. Talking  
13 about picture, referencing mainly, and maybe talk briefly  
14 about the previous target if that would be helpful to get  
15 the whole level, and cheapest option. Is that okay? You  
16 still hanging in there alright?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ultimately that -- and  
20 I mean that mode of transition time but also we got the  
21 conversation. We talking about offers you make. At some  
22 point we've gotta put things that are in existence.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It depends on your  
24 purposes. Right? Like how you -- you're trying, and what



1 you trying to do. And what you trying to do well. But  
2 yeah (inaudible).

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think the only  
4 reason why I'm really here, is because I just wanted a  
5 break. So I'm gonna be talking about that criterion  
6 reference approach, but I think it's really important to  
7 keep in mind that, even now we're talking about criteria,  
8 in the background, you're still kind of operating in clean-  
9 type normative framework. And that's important because of  
10 the example that is in your hand-out, the prep-school  
11 primer. Search it quite nicely which is not due to prep-  
12 school are target that requires students to bring them all  
13 in three minutes to be classified as proficient. Right?  
14 In teenage.

15 So there's an existence truth concept that  
16 that's really key here. That is, with all you have --  
17 you've got to see this. It has to be observable, has to be  
18 believable in order for you to set that cut at their  
19 profession. Same thing I came here to analog in the field  
20 B, right? With 100 percent as a target for 2014, that's  
21 long gone. It's something that wasn't attainable. Yet  
22 that's something that was set. And it became -- there's a  
23 lot of backlash as a result of that. And so ultimately  
24 these cut scores are based using criteria that's informed  
25 by what people can do. So that's sort of the norm the





1 framework has come to mind. But the thing that is  
2 important to distinguish is that once you fix say standard  
3 to the distribution, and yours -- you're no longer making  
4 comparisons, right? Explicit comparisons about how  
5 students perform against other students. Or how schools  
6 perform to other schools. We are kind of moving away from  
7 that standard based approach.

8                   For the advantages, I think the key point is  
9 that it involves quite a lot of stakeholders. That is,  
10 counsel expert specifically. Those who are deeply  
11 knowledgeable, about educators, and uploading framework,  
12 for other types of folks that come around the table. And  
13 help inform what should the standards be, relative to what  
14 they believe are values or expectations that should be  
15 defining each of those cuts. So those cuts have meaning.

16                   And I think these leads to the second point,  
17 which is, it leads to a more transparent way. At least in  
18 terms of being able to communicate what that criteria means  
19 relative to the standards. It's not just a score that  
20 compares, but it's also a way in which you're saying, these  
21 are descriptors, these are success criteria, these are  
22 expectations that we have in each of these different level.  
23 And that's what -- that's the meaning behind each, and  
24 every single one of those targets, or those performance  
25 levels. And so it becomes more user friendly. Also seal a



1 broad set of users, or stakeholders, or constituents, who  
2 can better understand what it means to be at that  
3 performance level. I think, everyone around the table can  
4 probably -- is very familiar with all these challenges.

5           So I think the first point, is probably the  
6 biggest one, is that the criteria are developed for all of  
7 these, is based on human judgment. Even though these is  
8 informed by experts, and people who are deeply knowledge --  
9 knowledgeable about the content. You know these things can  
10 certainly be filtered by personal agendas, biases.  
11 Certainly by some political agendas as well. And so this  
12 can certainly influence where the targets are set, and how  
13 criteria are defined. There were quite a few standard  
14 setting methods, and target setting methods that could be  
15 used. And depending on which set of methods to use, you  
16 can have different results.

17           So I think that it's important to say here  
18 is that you're not worried to just one thing method. In  
19 fact, people do use I'll say different types of approaches,  
20 and compare them. But I'll get to the fourth point. It  
21 becomes really viscous, intensive, and very costly just to  
22 even do one round. So the -- the third is really  
23 important. Because when you're always getting people  
24 together in a room, It's kind of herding cats. You're  
25 trying -- we need to make sure that the office itself is



1 greatly organized. And that's not an easy thing to do.  
2 And it has to be facilitated by person who's deeply  
3 knowledgeable about the various methods. Why? Because  
4 that person has to train every single parent around the  
5 room, so that they can deeply engage them, and meaningfully  
6 participate in the standard setting up in that controls  
7 them.

8                   So this fourth point is important. It's not  
9 trivial at all, because when you think about it, say we  
10 have 12 raters, or 12 panels in a room. And say it takes  
11 about two days for us to set a performance target on say  
12 just one indicator. So think about how that could increase  
13 exponentially, when you think about all the different  
14 indicators that are in the framework. And then you have to  
15 think about all the materials that need to be gathered, as  
16 well as all the stuff that need to be there, in order to  
17 attend every single standard setting session. So hyper  
18 causes, even though there are certain I would say  
19 advantages. It is very resource intensive, and costly.  
20 Just to give a very high level -- just general process of  
21 how this approach works. The first piece is critical  
22 because there's a lot of time spent at the forefront just  
23 training.

24                   Getting (inaudible) to understand, what's  
25 the meaning behind his work, and how -- what is the



1 process? And how do you engage in this meaningfully? And  
2 so sometimes what you'll do is, you'll have dry runs so  
3 that people understand, "Oh okay. This is what you mean  
4 when you say, I'm a borderline student, and you're asking  
5 me for the probability of that student being successful."  
6 Being able to really engage in that, take some practice.  
7 And so this first piece is really important. Second piece,  
8 incredibly important. And this is this idea of being true  
9 that anyone can define the criteria for each of those  
10 performance levels, and the descriptors.

11                   And so these are typically vetted, and  
12 finalized before you get into the setting process. So you  
13 have to be clear about what you're shooting before you  
14 actually define where the code should be. And then the  
15 third piece is then you go into the judgment grading  
16 process, and you engage in the standard setting process,  
17 and then fourth is important because it's not a one shot  
18 deal. It's iterative. And so we certainly come together  
19 as a group, where we take a look at the results, and there  
20 are some adjustments that are made to the target.

21                   Fifth one is equally important, it's about  
22 all the communication, and how you communicate the  
23 information about the target how they are set, and the  
24 performance expectations to stakeholders. We're not  
25 getting into the methods today. I think the handler



1 actually did a nice job. We are just talking about the  
2 different types of methods that are out there. Mainly from  
3 -- for assessment, but there are certainly ways in which  
4 this can be done for accountability ratings as well. But  
5 again, this idea of there are clear disadvantages, and  
6 advantages for any method that you choose. And of course,  
7 all others are -- I would say encumbered, or also not  
8 necessarily covered, but it involves human judgment.

9                   So there is no single correct target. I  
10 think that's a really key point here. Because the targets  
11 are constructed. So they're not just found but, they  
12 actually -- they come together, people come together to  
13 actually construct meaning at the other criteria, and they  
14 construct meaning about the target that's been set.  
15 Setting the bar higher, or lowering expectations. This is  
16 actually a really important point, because you're saying  
17 "Where do we set the cut? And do we give the benefit of  
18 the doubt? Or do we set a more stringent criteria?" I  
19 think that reflects some value.

20                   So to give a concrete example, when I was  
21 working with Hawaii, one of the big things that we were  
22 looking at is educator evaluation system. And how do you  
23 set the cuts for some of the targets that have been set?  
24 And so I think the overwhelming feedback that we got from  
25 the field, as well as from even the board is that we have



1 to give the benefit of the doubt to educators. For this  
2 reason, we actually got in a margin of error. We didn't  
3 consider the top part, we just consider the lower part of  
4 confidence interval. So we gave the benefit of the doubt  
5 to educators.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm gonna walk to --  
7 oh, yeah. I'm gonna walk through two just really simple  
8 examples, so it kind of brings this to life, a little bit  
9 more with respect to say accountability, and I'm gonna  
10 start with the second point actually, because I think it's  
11 a little bit more concrete. So for Colorado, for ACT, this  
12 is something I look to mention -- mention at the very  
13 beginning. The approaching target was set at 17. So CDE  
14 actually didn't do this job, but ACT did, and they looked  
15 at the scores that were most likely with kinds of scores  
16 that you would need to enter most Colorado community  
17 colleges, and that was 17.

18 The same exercise was done for setting the  
19 target at 22 because that was considered to be more a score  
20 associate that was doing enrollment in more selective for  
21 your institutions. So that, that just gives you a sense.  
22 Now, going back to the first point, this is the process  
23 that I'll -- I'll actually be involved with. For the first  
24 time in Nevada, they're gonna be convening a group of  
25 stakeholders this summer, and we're gonna be looking at the



1 overall star ratings. So just to be clear, I know you're  
2 being asked to look at the sub-indicator, and indicator  
3 level. They're not interested in that, they're more  
4 interested in the overall ratings, and giving definition to  
5 that because that's where they thought that it's really  
6 critical for stakeholders to understand what makes it five-  
7 star rating school, and how's that different from say a  
8 four-star rating school. But they do want to do this  
9 relative to say CCR expectations. So that's the thing  
10 that's gonna be interesting for how they're gonna do this.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: College, and career  
12 ready.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, I'm sorry, or PWR,  
14 that's right, yeah. Sorry about that. So I think this  
15 second piece, I have a link, which I think will be nice to  
16 take a look in. This is, we're gonna have a little  
17 difference, so did Utah. Yeah, well, hang on, just so you  
18 know, and what they did was they look at, this is called a  
19 profile approach because what you do is you look at the  
20 entire profile at states schools. We look at well, what do  
21 higher performance schools in general kind of look like?  
22 What are the key characteristics, and features of those  
23 schools? We do the same kind of exercise for schools  
24 located at different performance levels, and so when you



1 open this up. (Inaudible) And if you could slow down  
2 please. Yeah.

3                   So what you will see, so it's just click  
4 down to warning schools, and what you do see is look,  
5 there's a descriptor there that tells you if you're a  
6 warning school, that's how you kind of look like. Right?  
7 You see that performance criteria that's pegged to it, and  
8 then what you also see is that the -- the -- the state as a  
9 whole look across sub-indicators, and said, "In general,  
10 this is how you would likely perform on this different set  
11 of indicators." So if you click on to say, focus schools,  
12 it's slightly different.

13                   So look at the performance criteria right  
14 under the title. So it's that substandard achievement  
15 reading in math, unacceptable achievement gap. It's a  
16 little, or no academic progress in improving student  
17 achievement or increasing graduation rate. And then you  
18 see also, well, there are some criteria that they're  
19 looking at, additional criteria in terms of how are those  
20 schools likely perform based on the substandard indicators  
21 there. So that just kind of gives I think a little bit of  
22 light to what I'm saying when they, when they are looking  
23 at the profile of schools and try to figure out what are  
24 the key features we wanna draw out of it. And then New  
25 Jersey, Mercer county, they went through similar process of





1 looking at profiles of teachers in order to determine what  
2 makes sense for defining the criteria, and what make sense  
3 for defining the steps. Okay.

4 I think just to sum, well, just to close  
5 this piece, should give you a sense of, you know, I think  
6 you have a sense that this is quite a heavy month  
7 especially to undertaking in terms of defining criteria.  
8 So one thing to consider is, you know, for all 22 sub-  
9 indicators, that might be a tough layer especially when you  
10 think about the time frame associated with having to set  
11 these indicators by say, default. One thing that could be  
12 certainly considered, and is using this type of approach  
13 for setting the final plan type rating.

14 So instead of when you're looking at  
15 accreditation with improvement plan, going back to  
16 something that was raised earlier, then you have a clear  
17 picture perhaps of a performance profile associated with  
18 that so it gives rise to meaning. That is there's more  
19 meaning behind what that plan type means to schools, to  
20 stakeholders, et cetera. Okay? And that pretty much wrap  
21 the big criteria bit.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know. This last one  
23 is really quick and then we can do a conversation,  
24 discussion, or in a few hour done. We had heard from a  
25 few, from district, and logistic holders about the idea of



1 using a previous target, quick keeping, specifically  
2 keeping that achievement targets where we had set things  
3 done, CSAP, TCAP. And the -- the -- that suggestion came  
4 from a rationale of saying, well, we're, we're saying to  
5 students, and their families that our expectations have  
6 increased. Right? And so kids that took TCAP in the past  
7 now are taking the math part. They're not seeing that  
8 same, necessarily seeing that same level of proficiency  
9 that they had in the past because their e -- our  
10 expectations have raised.

11                   So the idea would be to align those  
12 performance shifts with what we're messaging in the  
13 performance framework. If we re-norm, we're gonna re-norm  
14 and only again have 15 percent that are really struggling  
15 and then another 35, and another 35, and 15 at the top. If  
16 you kept it the same, the majority of schools in districts  
17 would be at, does not even approaching, but that maybe  
18 aligns with the messaging of, they knew that we have new  
19 higher expectations.

20                   So it's an idea, I think it's an idea that  
21 we have concerned about in terms of a sense of fairness and  
22 differentiating school on district performance. But I --  
23 it's a very solid idea in terms of saying being aligned  
24 with that message that we have higher expectations now. So  
25 we just wanted to share that with you since it was



1 something that we had heard, and wanted to make sure you  
2 all heard that as well. Challenges to that, I think one of  
3 the other challenges for us to that is that our previous  
4 targets were stand -- set on a normal distribution, they  
5 weren't set by criterion reference. We didn't say it had  
6 some meaning tied to something else.

7                   And so because it was we believe pleased  
8 that by a norm, that how does that norm carry over to a new  
9 assessment? So that's one of those challenges there. And  
10 again, it would mostly describe our schools, and districts  
11 did not meeting our approaching state expectations in terms  
12 of achievement, and that wouldn't allow that same level of  
13 differentiation that we may, that's helpful to have at  
14 least when we're trying to figure out who to learn from,  
15 and where to celebrate things, and where we really wanna  
16 focus and prioritize support.

17                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm guessing the  
18 districts didn't want us to say the same, we are not the  
19 ones who are going to be changing.

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wouldn't say that. I  
21 think it was more of a policy conceptual idea that came,  
22 where it came from. It came from one district, but I've  
23 also heard it from a few other people. Then it's just  
24 floating out there. I think we were just trying to put out  
25 all the possible idea that we had.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, we were clear to  
2 communicate what it is that we do, and how different from  
3 what we have at court.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, yeah.  
5 Absolutely.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So next steps, we would  
8 love any questions or follow up. I think we've got, we've  
9 got requests from good ideas that going in, and looking a  
10 little bit deeper. We'll go- wanna do some more additional  
11 data analysis as data becomes available go fund  
12 articulation rate, and then PSAT, sometime this summer SATs  
13 a year. We'll need the board to approve targets for the  
14 fall 2016 release. So when we put those out, we're aiming  
15 for September, usually this got in August in normal years  
16 which is just, with still new data coming in, and  
17 adjusting, where -- where just send me September for those.

18 We would like to have some indication from  
19 you all in the sense because we're putting a spring reports  
20 out for the district just for them to get a sense, and  
21 understand it would be helpful I think for them to know  
22 where those targets would be. So we can do that this  
23 spring, at least for some of them, that would be great, it  
24 means we have more tough times in research, and evaluate,  
25 we do have time till the fall. Till September, I should



1 say to do that here before September because we need time  
2 to go out then. And then again, as we continue doing the  
3 next year we really wanna look at the targets, we wanna  
4 look, and see what 50th percentile is in '16, do the  
5 comparative to a '15. Same with the 85th, and 15th and  
6 really, see how things have changed over time and we'll  
7 bring that to you. So any thoughts or questions or things  
8 you all would like us to do or send some time line from you  
9 would be helpful.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What you're asking for  
11 on Wednesday is?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we were gonna ask  
13 you to vote on Wednesday, and then we dug in, and dug in,  
14 and dug in, and so there might be some questions, and  
15 concerns here then we thought maybe when things get a  
16 little soon, and that we should wait till April. But I  
17 think there's some either ideas that we should spend some  
18 time investigating. We can talk more on Wednesday, we can  
19 take it off the agenda for Wednesday. We want to get a  
20 sense from you all about how are you feeling about this,  
21 and then make it efficient.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What you ask us to vote  
23 on specifically is the norming?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Norming the 2016  
2 results.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Norming, I think within  
4 norm -- the 2015 results (inaudible) goes for the before  
5 '16. And I think that's where we landed, you know, all of  
6 the pros, and cons I think where we landed like Mary said  
7 is on doing norm reference, and using the school  
8 distribution. It's not perfect. I think it's probably the  
9 best solution for going forward but I think we should look  
10 at from other options too. And maybe that's what we look  
11 at that, we get this information in the meantime both, the  
12 way that leads, and then there's the big promising there.  
13 We could go deeper into that or if we think we just want to  
14 go norms, we could go with norms, and do that in April. We  
15 just want to make sense from you of what's up, right?

16 What you want more information on. It -- I  
17 mean, it's detailed, and it's important in terms of the  
18 messaging, and where we want schools, and districts to pay  
19 attention. When they're doing their UIP, they really do go  
20 look, and see where there's red, and orange for digging,  
21 and paying more attention. Also for blue, I always tell  
22 them go look at where your blues, and greens to see where  
23 you are succeeding because you can learn a lot from where  
24 you're doing well. So it gives them that kind of sense for  
25 planning. It's important we pay attention to that. But



1 again, these don't -- in, and of themselves determine that  
2 final distribution the final rating of schools, and that's  
3 another conversation that we're all good to have together.  
4 Maybe not on a Friday afternoon.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All this lying  
6 assumptions on the decision that we have to make by next  
7 summer. So is this, sorry it was released in (inaudible)  
8 as a reflection of where are we now.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: '15-'16 school year.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It includes this  
11 springs?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It will be this springs  
13 with -- yeah.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what's, what's on  
15 the calendar, it's (inaudible) is in the fall of 2017, and  
16 spring.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So are our decisions,  
18 are you decisions in summer 2017?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We will include that  
21 data.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: From years?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it will include  
24 that.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In time for spring  
2 2017.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct, and it's  
4 funny. So I will talk about this on Wednesday, and when  
5 you got a timeline for you, all. But the -- we have 30, no  
6 29, one school closed, 29 schools that have already entered  
7 here five hours. So (inaudible) directing action the whole  
8 by June 30th, 2017 we would suggest that you would want to  
9 look at these new ratings even though they've already  
10 entered year five if they come off, they move to improve my  
11 performance in a longer priority to turnaround. You need  
12 to take an action because they've already, they've already  
13 come up.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's -- what I need  
15 to be sure though --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

17 MS. MCMILLAN: -- is -- is what's coming up  
18 in the next year, going to be? (Inaudible)

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

20 MS. MCMILLAN: That's the case.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, will make --

22 MS. MCMILLAN: That case just one --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's something  
24 we'll talk because we're going to recommend it. I think it  
25 makes sense to wait until those ratings are final before





1 you start changing district, and when I can afford on their  
2 own because there's a few that have said we want to go  
3 where we want to present our plan. I think having them do  
4 that before November makes sense. But we think after if we  
5 start in November, December timeline we think it will be  
6 tight, and that's what we're gonna talk with you all about  
7 that we can get them all through by June 2017. I have a  
8 lot of work to do, and I need a raise.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What if we go on about  
10 even having something like (inaudible)?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Like Page said article  
12 and the comments indicate here. At Stanford who really has  
13 looked at me, and has found --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: State could just keep  
15 you. Well of course we all know to choose. And they have  
16 been pending along with those same schools. We know that  
17 Texas is doing better now, and we could even look according  
18 to him we could even look at doctors in states that are  
19 more like us. And then one thing to investigate what  
20 they're doing, and why their kids you doing better. They  
21 are English for pushing kids and let's say Texas is doing  
22 better than ours here. Well answers to me to get better  
23 scores and get them. For me to do with this kids that we  
24 are in Colorado.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And like understanding  
2 performance.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When something bad you  
4 know because you just got to say it's down, down.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No -- no I'm talking  
6 about. The idea that we have the and that everything has  
7 and --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Learn about our system.  
9 So it's more about learning about our system and policies  
10 and best practices --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That we can use in  
12 Colorado district by district. I think that's right. We  
13 might. We might be able to if we if we use. It we use the  
14 coast to as opposed to the other. Sure.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And just to give you a  
16 simple way. So -- seem like a good idea.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not (inaudible)  
18 You can't keep talking.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And why not? I mean  
20 Massachusetts did. Massachusetts did their test. Their  
21 own test, according to their own test. Yes, based on NAPE.  
22 And I believe that that's why they are where they are.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you're suggesting  
24 that we change our test, so that it looks like it mean  
25 nothing? That -- is that what you're saying?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well I mean, that's  
2 what their chair, that's what the Feds want. The Feds --  
3 that's a criterion bestowed to everybody.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's okay. So when I  
7 talk about aligning their systems to NAPE, and most cases  
8 what they have done is one of two thing. One is they had  
9 taken their fourth and eighth grade tests, and they've  
10 embedded some NAPE questions into that, and then they use  
11 that information. Or they utilize the NAPE performance as  
12 one of those external factors to consider during standard  
13 setting. Similar to, you know, what we've done with some  
14 of our other standards. NAPE does not exist in Grade  
15 three, five, six, seven or nine. Historically, it is  
16 sampled across states so very few Districts get District  
17 level results. School level results are even harder,  
18 individual student level results are even harder. Now  
19 again, I think it makes sense to say that we could learn as  
20 a State.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right. Right  
22 that's right.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, look this other  
24 State with a similar population is doing something  
25 differently and as a State.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is what we're  
3 going to do. But in terms of District utility or school  
4 utility, that would be much more difficult. (Inaudible).

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. But as a whole,  
6 we do want to help those kids that are -- that are not  
7 succeeding. I mean those (inaudible).

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which is more due to  
9 experience the (inaudible).

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I just finish? May  
11 I just finish? It is important that we learn about kids  
12 who are not doing well.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And, and we need to  
15 work with that population, so that that they will do  
16 better. It's not fair to just look at kids who are  
17 performing and doing well and giving awards to those kids.  
18 And, and just think, "Oh well, we'll always have that, that  
19 population with us. Let's not worry about them." And I  
20 think we need to, to look as the system as to what other  
21 States are doing so that we keep -- are able have data,  
22 have information and do something about those populations  
23 that need the help. We do need to do that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good job.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What did Florida do in  
2 terms of getting more feedback from the -- they -- do you  
3 remember? (Inaudible).

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would actually need  
5 to go, and look specifically. I know that Florida has some  
6 what we referred to as to the Districts and those are  
7 districts who participate enough to actually get District  
8 level results. And again, I will need to look more  
9 carefully. This is what it ultimately that we have got.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A lot of times, but we  
11 need to know what it would cost, even if it's just the  
12 fourth, and eighth grade. What's involved in getting more  
13 data than, than usual. Once every two year sample. And  
14 Florida, and Texas are two States that are doing better at  
15 Math. And we got population.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we got to, I don't  
17 know at what point -- part, but it might be field test and  
18 I think it was just (inaudible). And he spoke to us about  
19 a little bit about how you had looked at how there were  
20 among the result was not only me that was in that room.  
21 It's another (inaudible). It's brought a balanced change-  
22 did you look at that a little bit? But anyway, just to see  
23 where the -- where the park measure and our results fit in  
24 with other -- I mean those (inaudible) that our results'



1 saying. (Inaudible) right? And maybe some national  
2 (inaudible) but.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Before we only fail to  
4 break up. Let me ask. You all asked a specific question  
5 and so I'm getting ready to leave. Do we want this on the  
6 agenda and are we ready to make a decision in this upcoming  
7 March meet.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How about yes on the  
9 agenda, but maybe not in Baltimore.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Today, Joyce?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a couple of  
12 questions that I wouldn't mind answered if (inaudible).

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Great.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Number one, is this all  
15 required? All of -- all of this, is it required Federally,  
16 State-wide. I just wanna know what, what the requirements  
17 are for this. And the second thing I'd like to know is, if  
18 this is not we're gonna vote on, I would like to see this.  
19 And I'm not sure if this is the format. So now all the  
20 Superintendents in my District, and I would like their  
21 input as if they're a stakeholder to be sent back. And I -  
22 - I want that divided into my congressional, just -- just  
23 because it's very real, and I wanna see what their thoughts  
24 are. If I sent this to them I would hope they would have  
25 some semblance of understanding, but if not, it might have



1 to be paired down a little differently. But they are the  
2 ones who are gonna have to explain that to parents and this  
3 is not- we're not too early to start with that one.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I sent the notice of  
5 this meeting and the bullets, the PowerPoints of our  
6 accountability context. So there's one for each District,  
7 and probably most of yours, it's probably at the  
8 superintendent already through some of our stakeholder  
9 groups too. We can do some more. I think what will be  
10 most helpful for those schools, and Districts to be able to  
11 respond maybe to see their data and that's which is what  
12 we're trying to do this spring. But that makes it hard  
13 timing, so maybe we'll think through if there's some  
14 options for it. You all say, "Let's look at it this way."  
15 I don't know -- I don't know what to think about it.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Provisional approval or  
17 something?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, provisional or  
19 like we get a nod from you to do it and then we send them  
20 their data like that and get feedback. Cause that's what  
21 we've been trying to do with the Spring Report, so that  
22 they could see their data in there. We'll collect feedback  
23 over the summer and see if we need to change anything  
24 before the official falls for it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd really like buying  
2 in like that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Specifically to their  
5 District. To give, less time, because it comes out and we  
6 vote on it and then they say what's this all about?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Absolutely --  
8 absolutely. And we were -- we didn't -- I'm trying to  
9 think how much. We've mostly just talked when we- Elliott,  
10 and I went around the State in the fall and talked to all  
11 the Superintendent groups about some of the  
12 recommendations. What we heard loud and clear then, talked  
13 to them about was having a single set of targets for school  
14 and District, and that's what they really wanted. But  
15 again, we started seeing and what the impact is and that's  
16 the other thing. So that's why we wanna get new data. And  
17 if we can get an indication from you all of go this path,  
18 and give them the data without passing them. I think we  
19 could get some good feedback. So thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jane do you answer  
21 that?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, along that  
23 communication, do, do you have some Districts that are  
24 really what they do has been making things criteria in





1 pieces. And you know I would -- I'm gonna ask Ms. Minister  
2 if you all had input into this conversation?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My work is split in the  
4 -- on the (inaudible) group that I'm working on, I kinda  
5 built like a 2.0.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, I just --  
7 maybe the answer to that. So thank you. And I -- but  
8 that's my quick one. All I need is a yes or no from Joyce  
9 that we can talk about NAPE in relation to how it could be  
10 -- calibrates in a com -- in a comfortable way we can  
11 (inaudible) information based on decision making on by  
12 looking at. We're not talking about what test we'll be  
13 talking about school.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So whenever we have had  
15 a conversation about setting CAT scores we have reference  
16 to make, and how NAPE compares to our suggestive CAT score.  
17 Yes, we have done that.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So do you have enough  
19 guidance, and anybody on the phone?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Anyone?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, so you've put it  
24 in the Agenda at least for an information item?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. All right?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I agree.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. All right. Does  
4 that -- does that give you the, the guidance that you need?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It does. Thank you all  
6 so much for your time this Friday afternoon.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We appreciate  
9 (inaudible). I will -- we appreciate you all getting and  
10 find out just the time to do it, if I never -- another act,  
11 then talk later.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good idea.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) group week  
15 (inaudible) signing off.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Bye. (Inaudible).

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

18 (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