



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
March 9, 2016, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on March 9, 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 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We will go. Let's move
2 on.

3 (Overlapping)

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Not real. Yeah, like
5 (inaudible).

6 MS. FLORES: Is it fair?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, no, I'm good.

8 (Overlapping)

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, I'm not. I'm not.
10 I'm just tired (inaudible). I'm just very tired.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. (Inaudible).

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No. I know it myself.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So we will proceed to
15 school district for performance targets which I think where
16 we had a study group on as I recall.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Inaudible) memory
19 (inaudible).

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're good. You all
21 keep that in your memory.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That was clear back on
23 Friday, wasn't it?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was just on --
25 feels like a really long time.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm better. I'm better
2 today. So let's proceed with that. Who are you -- who's
3 gonna run this?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll start it and then
5 Mary (phonetic) and Joyce is here for whatever assessment
6 questions come up.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Joyce getting caffeinated,
8 that's unfair.

9 MS. RANKIN: (Inaudible) I should put that
10 away.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not that you want
12 something?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, no. I'm fine.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So what our
15 goals are for today? Thank you again all of you for your
16 time on Friday. It was so helpful to be able to go deep
17 with you on. I know that for a Friday afternoon that was
18 really hard to do but we really appreciated that. We were
19 able to take your feedback and really think about it over
20 the weekend and the last few days. So for today, we just I
21 go on -- again go over your role in the process for target
22 setting. Talk a little bit about two methods for setting
23 targets. One that we talked about Friday, one that was
24 shared on Friday as a possible method and so we kind of
25 play that out a little bit further this weekend. And then



1 what we wanna really do is think about, if you all feel
2 comfortable enough with the method to be able to say, not
3 to vote on it today.

4 I think -- I think we can pull if you want
5 to wait on voting and improving targets. But if you feel
6 comfortable enough that we would run those spring
7 informational reports for districts, send them out, collect
8 feedback and then once we have the feedback, decide. I
9 think what we just don't want to do is, if you're not sure
10 enough on that method is go down that path and give
11 districts that information and say this is what we've done,
12 knowing that you all have significant concerns. So I think
13 if you have significant concerns we'd rather wait, talk
14 through some different options. And even if that holds up
15 this spring reports a little bit, we wanna just make sure
16 you're comfortable enough before we put that out there.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It was a nickel version of
18 that approach?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The two approaches?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The one, the preferred
21 approach.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The preferred one? So
23 there's -- there's two. There's one -- do you mind if we
24 go through a few slides first and I get to that --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure. No (inaudible) I'm
2 sorry.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that okay? Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it's no problem at
6 all. So those are our goals for today. Again this is the
7 statutory requirement that we shared on Friday about your
8 role as a Board. You can see the bold, the state board
9 shall set, reaffirm, or revise as appropriate, ambitious
10 yet attainable, statewide targets for the measures used to
11 determine the levels of attainment of the performance
12 indicators for the coming academic year. So the -- we went
13 back and let the performance indicators really are defined
14 as those main ca -- categories and the frameworks of
15 achievement and growth and Postsecondary and Workforce
16 Readiness.

17 The measures within those indicators are
18 where we have the English Language Arts Achievement data,
19 the Math Achievement data, the Science Achievement data,
20 the English Language Arts growth data. Those are those
21 specific measures. So that's -- that's that kind of
22 interpretation of the -- of the line your responsibility.
23 So just wanted to highlight the -- that the targets have
24 the goal of raising the level of academic performance that
25 really actually aligns well with what's in every Student



1 Succeeds Act and that have targets going forward. And then
2 also, state law says the extent possible ensure that
3 targets meet federal requirements too. So, we've got a
4 nice way and I think it actually -- I don't think we're
5 sacrificing anything state wise by aligning with federal
6 targets.

7 We pulled in the federal requirement
8 language right here just so you know in terms of what --
9 were that was expectations are. Again, it's a long term
10 goals with interim progress targets along the way. This
11 what that's asking for. And again, when we're talking
12 about the specific targets what we're looking for with
13 those measures of the performance indicators are those
14 specific areas in that red circle around and you know, in
15 the past it was reading and writing. And the way English
16 Language Arts, Math and Science for achievement, English
17 Language Arts, Math and English Language Proficiency for
18 growth and then our PWR measures too. We're not talking
19 today about the targets to determine the overall ratings.
20 Those we'll talk about once we get through this step and
21 we'll -- we'll get to that next step about thinking about
22 how we want to set the -- the cut points for the overall
23 ratings and we may want to do some different methodology
24 for that.



1 We talked on Friday a little bit about using
2 criteria and reference to really say what the school is
3 struggling in achievement and in growth and in PWR and in
4 gaps. Then maybe those schools that are identified that
5 way should be turned around. But that would be more
6 criteria and reference. So what we could talk about doing
7 it that way or we can talk about doing it by percent of
8 points or by the percent of schools we want to identify.
9 There's a lot of options, but we'll get to that in the
10 future. So really again, this is just another way to see
11 where we need those specific targets set by.

12 So I can now make achievement for English
13 Language Arts, Math and Science growth Postsecondary and
14 Workforce Readiness. So how we can determine the targets,
15 we went into a lot of detail on Friday. There's -- these
16 two are the ones that are bolded that we want to talk about
17 a little bit further today. The first one is using the
18 school distribution in determining performance categories
19 from that. So with norm there -- a normative measure, we
20 norm the schools in the state which set those cut points at
21 the 15th percentile, the 50th percentile, the 85th
22 percentile. And use those cut points of the -- from the
23 school, for districts as well. Remember we heard of lot of
24 feedback in the field that they wanted those targets to be
25 the same, so they didn't get mixed messages. Just we have



1 heard from some people that don't like that. A few people
2 from larger districts. But overwhelmingly, when we went
3 out around the state when (inaudible) and I spent the fall
4 in districts and we've done surveys, people wanted a single
5 set of targets.

6 And then the other possibility is using --
7 is the idea that came up on Friday thinking about instead
8 of doing a target for each content area, you do -- you'd
9 add them all up and then to make your determination later.
10 I think we dug in this weekend and really read the law with
11 that those pieces. When the law says it has to be targets
12 on the measures themselves not the performance indicators,
13 I think that suggests that we need to have specific targets
14 for English -- English Language Arts Achievement, Math
15 Achievement and those pieces. So that was our
16 understanding the law, we -- but we'll walk through and
17 talk about that option any way. So Mary is going to talk
18 through that option a little bit about the school
19 distributions just as a refresher from Friday.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My handouts is not the
21 same as the one I'm seeing up there. And I'm trying to
22 figure out how that happen. Did we get an older version?
23 I'm not (inaudible). Were you looking at the
24 accountability talk one?

25 (Overlapping)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. (Inaudible)
2 two things which has the option A. (Inaudible) That's
3 right. This is we got (inaudible). No this are -- this is
4 what our emails used last night. (Inaudible) We'll I've
5 provided them too (inaudible) This is it. That should be
6 it, yes. Okay. Thank you. Here. Yes. And (inaudible) ,
7 you want my paper copy? Here it is. Let me try if I can
8 do this. Okay. (Inaudible). It's on the board docs.
9 (Inaudible) Yeah, its the old one (inaudible). Tell me
10 the number again, we're on 17?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are on nine. All
12 right -- is this site. Oh, sorry, sorry. And that
13 actually and we are 17.01.

14 (Overlapping)

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the one from
16 Friday.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Shows (inaudible) your
18 name.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, okay. Okay.

20 (Overlapping)

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, sorry. My
22 apology.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Don't worry. Oh, I'm
24 sorry.

25 (Overlapping)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Yeah, yeah oh
2 no, it's okay. Okay. Thank you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Sorry.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry. (Inaudible)

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Mary is gonna walk
6 through that option A, the School Norming up using the
7 school distribution for the target.

8 MS. MARY: So as we have discussed on
9 Friday, this is the Normative Methodology for using the
10 school distribution to assign ratings for the performance
11 categories. So you know, we've gotten feedback from
12 stakeholders in our technical advisory panel and that it
13 would be appreciated to have a norm based system and sort
14 of follow that we have previously done. We have four
15 rating categories of -- does not meet expectations,
16 approaching expectations, meets expectations and exceeds
17 expectations. And they're set -- so the approaching
18 expectations as the 50th percentile meeting state
19 expectations, is state average 50th percentile and then
20 exceeds expectations is at the 85th percentile. And just
21 so you know, those approaching and exceeds expectations are
22 approximately one standard deviation above them below the
23 average.

24 So there is, you know, a little bit of sort
25 of statistical justification for -- for having chosen



1 those. And we have looked at baseline in targets but
2 because of the transition to (inaudible) at least for the
3 first few years we'll want to look at how the percentile
4 expectations change and sort of review those targets every
5 single year. With the intention of eventually sort of
6 setting aside a baseline that we can make progress against
7 in future years.

8 So just to review sort of the -- where these
9 targets were actually be set on the PARCC data, you can see
10 that we have the -- the skills score targets for English
11 Language Arts, Mathematics and Science. And we do split
12 those up by elementary, middle school and high school
13 levels, just to sort of get a finer level of detail with
14 those. And then option A, sort of what would that look
15 like if we had built it into a performance framework, can
16 we apologize this is kind of a very rough, not so pretty
17 look at that. But what we -- you would see was that you'd
18 see the four achievement English Language Arts.

19 We would report the mean scale score, the
20 percentile ranking associated with that scale score and
21 then the rating that the district, or school would received
22 based upon that mean scale score and the percentile
23 ranking. And -- and you can see here that we have you
24 know, each of the content areas has their own you know,
25 ratings reported. And then for growth, we also would be



1 reporting the median growth percentile and then the rating
2 associated for each of those categories. And then we had
3 gone through and looked at what the impact data would be
4 using this 15, 50, 85 methodology on the school and
5 district results. And see, you can see that for the
6 majority of the schools applying these ratings we do get
7 very close to that sort of ideal distribution at the end of
8 15 percent does not meet, 35 percent approaching, 35
9 percent meets, 15 percent exceeds.

10 So we really do get a good distribution of
11 scores but the district results are not quite as ideal.
12 There is a smaller proportion of districts that will be
13 receiving -- receiving exceeds ratings since we're using
14 the school distribution. But that does not need
15 approaching in it's categories are pretty consistent. So
16 that -- that is kind of one of those unfortunate trade offs
17 that we found that every normative methodology has
18 something that's not quite ideal about it but in listening
19 to the -- the stakeholders and their -- their desire for a
20 single set of targets, the school distribution was sort of
21 the best compromise that we could come to.

22 And so then the -- the pros for option A is
23 that it directs attention to areas of performance that are
24 exceptional or concerning and this will -- should help
25 schools and districts inform their private planning



1 processes. It -- it helps people interpret the results.
2 Having sort of that easily identifiable red, you know,
3 yellow, green, blue, makes it easy for people to just be
4 able to look quickly glance at their reports and get an
5 idea of how their schools are performing.

6 And it's also consistent with what we have
7 done in the previous years of performance frameworks. And
8 it meets the states statutory requirements for setting
9 targets at the individual measure level. And -- and also
10 aligns with what we've seen in the Every Student Succeeds
11 Act and sort of setting those targets and expectations and
12 having them increase over time. So then the cons is that,
13 you know by categorizing that performances into four levels
14 we are using some of the more detailed data that underlies,
15 you know that the school and districts and sort of could be
16 used to describe their performance. And then as I said
17 before, districts are not as likely to earn an exceeds or
18 to a lesser extent it does not meeting -- meet rating as
19 the schools are just because they tend to be larger and
20 cluster towards the middle.

21 And then one more, so for some ideas for
22 mitigation of some of those negative effects. We do have
23 to request toward consideration process which allows
24 schools and districts to submit additional data. If the
25 school in district performance framework rating does not



1 really reflect their actual level of performance, you know
2 they can come and make a case to the CDE and to the State
3 Board that they should potentially have their rating
4 revised. And -- the specific percentile ranks are
5 considered in this review, so if there was a situation
6 where you were only at the 83rd percentile and didn't quite
7 make the 85th percentile, that would be taken into
8 consideration.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Commissioner?

10 MR. ASP: Sure. What -- give me an examples
11 from additional data that a district might? And how many -
12 - how many did we have choose this process last year of
13 reconsideration?

14 MS. MARY: So in general, we have a K-3 few
15 results on local assessments that have been submitted
16 because that's not something that the state assessment
17 covers. We also have had some districts with sort of 11th
18 and 12th grade information potentially and some other PWR,
19 Post Secondary Success Measures that they've presented. I
20 do not know offhand how many requests do we reconsiders.
21 We (inaudible).

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We -- I feel like it
23 was down here (inaudible) there is like 35 or 40 schools
24 that we had. We didn't do it this past fall because we had



1 the accountability hold by that far previously. I think we
2 had 35 to 40 schools and 12 districts, I think.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: About half of the
5 school -- at least half, if not a little bit more than half
6 of the schools were approved. I think almost all of the
7 districts were approved for their requests. So we've got a
8 whole guidance document about what we consider, and how we
9 consider it data, all these pieces.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you all have any
11 other questions about that option and thinking through that
12 going forward or --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, (inaudible) Ms.
14 Scheffel.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: What would you say to on
16 those that might say a norm reference approach to this
17 ensures that a certain number of schools are in the bottom
18 10 percent or whatever?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: And what would you what would
21 we say to school -- I mean it's like a zero sum game,
22 right? Where you -- you gonna move the mean up and as you
23 move it up, there's always gonna be somebody in the lowest
24 10 percent, lowest quartile?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So with that --



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: What would we say that?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's why we base-
3 lined with the previous targets in 2010. We kept those
4 targets the same so five years. It must be set on that
5 norm and then it -- they didn't change over five years.
6 And the difference that we have now is when those targets
7 were set, we were well into a state assessment and had that
8 in a more consistent data. So I think that's one thing.
9 And then the other is -- those are targets for individual
10 achievement. It's not for the overall distribution of you
11 know, turnaround and priority improvement and I think
12 that's something that's where we'll have to have the next
13 stage in this conversation of how you all want to do that
14 and how you want to decide what percent or what the cutoff
15 is for turnaround versus priority improvement versus
16 improvement. And that -- that's a question where it really
17 comes into identifying schools always at you know, do you
18 want it in a way that every year you're gonna re-norm and
19 always have 5 percent in the bottom and you really wanna
20 wait for schools to show and kind of had a turn around,
21 which is what we've done.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Can I follow up? Can
23 I have a follow up?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: When you look at the history
2 of this initiative in terms of setting targets, if I'm
3 right, the context is we want parents to know, we want to
4 have transparency for the public, how well our school is
5 doing. When they click on school view, they want to know
6 static outcomes, dynamic outcomes based on growth, so they
7 can make good decisions for their -- for their kids. As we
8 set these targets, what has happened: how we've been doing
9 this for like over 10 years? Setting targets at schools,
10 would either meet them or not in some way.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So for the state system
12 --

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- it's been five years
15 that we've been doing that. With (inaudible) we started
16 that back in what, 2003? In the fall of 2003. And I think
17 you see a variety (inaudible). What?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: 13 years.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. It's a long
20 time.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: What's been the impact of
22 setting these targets? When the goal I think is to
23 incentivize schools to reach --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- for the target or exceeded
2 it. Our goal is to give great information to parents as we
3 think about resetting them. What's the context for that
4 work? What -- what -- what are we achieving by doing this?
5 Do you have any window on that; I mean have the targets
6 helped? Have more people achieve them as we combine norm
7 and criterion reference because I think that's what we've
8 done in the past --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- right? We haven't done
11 either one --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- solely.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: So does -- does it work? Are
16 we getting something done as far as --

17 MS. MARY: I think that we have seen you
18 know, schools making progress. And particularly sort --
19 sort of the schools that have been identified at turnaround
20 at priority improvements. Some of the things that they
21 have done, we have seen improvement in their meeting
22 targets or they're going from sort of it does not meet
23 rating to an approaching rating. I don't think that the
24 performance frameworks inherently of themselves change the
25 system. I think they're sort of the signaling device that



1 we are supposed to then use for sort of improvement
2 planning and for a -- for a whole additional layer of
3 process is on top of that.

4 And I think for the moment the reason that
5 we're trying to reset them or reset the targets right now
6 is because of that transition assessments. And so this is
7 our opportunity with you know, the new PARCC assessments to
8 decide if we do want to continue with sort of the system, a
9 criterion referenced or normative reference system or the
10 kind of this combination of these two things that we have
11 previously created. And if we want to continue with that
12 or if we want to make changes at this time.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is there any data that's
14 longitudinal that would show for one of a better term false
15 positives and false negatives. And the idea is that we set
16 it -- set a threshold. We want people to meet or exceed
17 it, and then we hope it relates to something in the future.
18 Kids or schools that don't achieve these thresholds. Bad
19 things happen. Their kids don't go to college, they don't
20 graduate high school, things happen. And yet I hear a lot
21 of false positives and false -- more false negatives you
22 know, in the system that I -- I -- I don't think that's the
23 exact right term but I mean in terms of the public's
24 perception it's like, what if the data doesn't really
25 translate into stuff we care about. Be able to go to



1 college, be successful. You know, that's more on a student
2 level but, you know. Do you have any data like that that
3 would shed light on this work? What if it doesn't have on
4 district's and students that go there?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that's - that's
6 a being policy question that is important to answer. When
7 we're in a system that's really saying that our state
8 assessment is the indicator of school quality and where we
9 want kids to go. I think it's a good policy question that
10 answer, it's something we can dig in --

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's very time consuming and
12 very expensive to begin with --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: I guess my question is what
15 impact; does it have a holistic (inaudible)? Thanks.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: So what we don't know is
18 what kids have learned, right? We know what kids have
19 learned relative to one another. But we don't know that
20 the top 15 percent of students actually meet our standards
21 academically. We don't know that as -- as Deborah pointed
22 out, we don't know what the bottom 10 or 15 percent those
23 kids don't meet standards or do. I mean the fact that
24 we're norming everything means that we're looking for an
25 easy way to figure this out. But we're not telling our



1 voters whether our kids are meeting standards or not
2 meeting standards. We only know how they're doing relative
3 to one another. Am I wrong, Joyce?

4 MS. RANKIN: I think you've got both of
5 them. Do you want to take it. I'll take the first part
6 and then I'll pass it off to you. So in terms of what do
7 we know about individual students and their achievement of
8 the standards that does come through our individual student
9 level reporting and that's not norm based, that is
10 criterion based. That does allow you as a parent to know
11 whether or not your child is meeting the standards based on
12 that assessment on that day.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: But as a taxpayer?

14 MS. RANKIN: So then as we're thinking about
15 some of these targets that are going to --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think -- I think
17 as a taxpayer, you do get because we're not just gonna
18 report the percentile rank, right? We're just not going to
19 -- we're not going to say that the 85th percentile. We're
20 gonna show -- and what we've been proposing is to look at
21 the means scale score, which is a little different than
22 looking at percent proficient advanced. It tells a little
23 bit of a different -- different story. But the means scale
24 score can indicate to you where an average students are in
25 a school. So right now the exceeds rating where that 85th



1 percentile came in is at for English Language Arts is -- is
2 around 755. So 750 we know is the cut on all the
3 assessments for being at benchmark, being at that level
4 four or five students meeting those standards expectations.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: On a criteria basis?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On a criterion basis,
7 yes. So it's just taking those scale scores that are based
8 on the criterion based test and norming the results to say
9 this is good enough. Because I think I mean -- what you
10 could also do and Joyce and I were talking about this. If
11 you could put 750 as your meets cut point, right? That's
12 what we want. The mean scale score to be that all kids,
13 like on average the schools at level four or five and
14 higher. That would be a criterion reference you could do.
15 If you did that, most of our schools are gonna be below
16 means. So they're gonna be getting approaching or does not
17 meet ratings. But that's something we could do, but that
18 would be using a criterion approach and that would tell you
19 a little bit more based on where kids actually with -- were
20 with standards that would lead to diff- to different
21 outcomes for what we're seeing.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: I know and that's what
23 scares everybody which is why we don't have the courage to
24 do this. Nevertheless, if there's some way to either
25 supplement, I mean we get the reality check from



1 (inaudible) that says, "Yeah. You're not where you think
2 you are." And I don't know that we wanna keep doing that.
3 I think we wanna be also be able to our taxpayers based on
4 a norm system where we compare the kids to each other.
5 This is where we are --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: -- but comparing that to a
8 criteria,

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: -- we still have ways to --
11 I mean there -- there ought to be some

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Absolutely.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- kind of communication
14 that is more meaningful than just norming despite the fact
15 that we all grew up with norming. And we had so --called
16 understand it, I don't know what we do but we -- we're
17 closer than that certainly than we are on criterion
18 reference.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I -- I think we can
20 help provide that context by making sure that those mean
21 scale scores and what they translate to in terms of their
22 understanding of the standards and mastery of the standards
23 is right there on the frameworks too. So you could see,
24 you might have learned and exceeds rating at a -- at the
25 you know, and be at the scale score of 755. But that means



1 on average your kids are just meeting that benchmark,
2 doesn't really are exceeding, it doesn't -- so we can put
3 those two pieces of information together. I think it's
4 really -- it's a really important conversation for you all
5 to think about.

6 Do you want to send a message and you can go
7 either which person comes to both, do you want to send a
8 message that our schools are struggling and -- and does not
9 meet an approaching because they're not yet -- we're not
10 yet to that level of our kids at four and five on average
11 on kids at four and five. Or do you wanna kind of norming
12 out and then work your way up and ratchet those targets up
13 over time so we get there. So there's different -- there's
14 different options for it. That's what I wanted to talk to
15 you all about what you wanted.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

17 DR. SCHEFFEL: So I guess, I need to be
18 able to understand deeply how the norm reference and
19 criterion reference models are both implicit in these
20 proposals, because I think they're both in there. And I --
21 I think that we're used to norm referenced tests being used
22 if for informational purposes, not for high stakes
23 purposes. We will use norm references for high stakes,
24 there's a bit of a disconnect because you're forcing people
25 into those lower (inaudible). That's a problematic, it's



1 like a no win situation which is why we're infusing
2 criterion reference inside.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: And we know who we're put --
4 who we're putting down there too.

5 DR. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. So I -- I think that
6 this discussion is a good initial discussion. I have like
7 a lot of questions to figure out what's in these numbers
8 and how we're combining norm and criterion reference to
9 create these charts. So, thank you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think I would just
11 say that that, and you correct me if I'm wrong, the best --
12 the mean scale scores that's really criterion based because
13 that's coming from the state assessment. That's based on
14 the -- based on the standards, right? And then our
15 judgment of the -- how we apply our rating to it and then
16 supply --

17 MS. MARY: How we apply to a rating to the
18 school's mean scale score.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 MS. MARY: So it's the individual student
21 assessment results are criterion referenced. We've roll
22 that up to the school in district level and then that is
23 what we set this sort of a norm to distribution on. So we
24 identify the schools or the districts that are below the
25 state average or above the state average. And then that's



1 where individual ELA content areas. And then we roll all
2 of these different performance measures together to give a
3 final rating, a final score that describes all the schools
4 in the state and then that is usually where we put sort of
5 the criterion referenced. Or that's our suggestion is to
6 put sort of a criterion referenced at that top level to
7 decide which schools are identified as turnaround, which
8 schools are identified as priority improvement and all
9 those pieces. Because at the individual performance
10 measure level, doing criteria reference would just be an
11 enormous amount of time and energy and effort and a lot of
12 resources to do. And -- and so generally the -- the place
13 you get the best bang for your buck for sort of doing the
14 criterion reference piece is at that final end rating
15 level.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: So this would be helpful. I
17 mean I'm sure you hear from schools and districts as I do.
18 The ones that do well in the system, feel good about it,
19 the ones that don't do well complain about fairness issues.
20 It would be helpful as we think about how we wanna set
21 these is let's look at some examples in the schools that
22 have had the most criticism of the system and why do they
23 criticize it in terms of fairness. Are they saying that
24 there's no standard air of measure as far as where the
25 bright line is drawn and they could have in a small



1 district with small in. Three students might make the
2 difference in what bucket they end up in. Is that one
3 criticism and how does this approach either address that or
4 not address it. I think we need examples for the districts
5 that have had the most problems with the current system,
6 because I think this is kind of like what we've been doing
7 (inaudible).

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, actually I think we
9 need examples for the districts that say their high flyers
10 and in fact on a criterion basis may or may not be.

11 MS. MARY: Okay.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Because we don't -- we don't
13 know the top -- I mean for a long time the top 15 percent
14 weren't really necessarily that high performing had they
15 been given a different assessment, right? The assessment
16 sort of determined where they were gonna be. And in fact
17 they were -- there was a lot of room for growth that wasn't
18 -- that wasn't going on.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

20 DR. FLORES: And I'd like to bring this
21 discussion into the level of those kids that are hard to
22 serve and that do not do well. I know that in Denver
23 Public Schools for instance, we have these hard to serve
24 schools that have 37 -- 42 students in a classroom. And
25 I'm talking -- I'm not talking about high school, I'm



1 talking about elementary school. How -- how is it possible
2 that we don't know why a classroom like that is not
3 performing? I mean we know that -- look at Jefferson.
4 Jefferson County says 22; am I correct 22 students were in
5 elementary school? I -- I think it's 22. I -- I've --
6 I've been looking and this is something that I have taken
7 you know, I'm with a group of people that looked at Denver
8 Public Schools and looked at poor kids and looked at why
9 they're not achieving.

10 And when we look deep into and went into
11 classrooms, we saw these numbers. I know that I and
12 another person met with Board Members. We asked these
13 questions. Well it's -- and then there's the excuses.
14 Well, it's just hard -- it's just hard you know, we just
15 don't have the money. We just don't -- da, da, da, da, da,
16 da. But we know that if we have lower pupil teacher
17 ratios, those kids are gonna do better and we want those
18 kids to do better. And -- and -- and here we are talking
19 about -- I know, but I have to bring it down to kind of a
20 level that we know why kids are doing well or not doing
21 well. And also, I have I -- I think we need to -- to look
22 and have showcase. Like for instance, this superintendent
23 that was here today, one of the conditions should be, your
24 school is doing well, let it -- let us showcase why your



1 district is doing well, how is your district -- what other
2 districts are like your district and what is different?

3 I think we need to start kind of thinking
4 that way of solving the problems for -- for these students
5 that really do need the help. I mean I know I -- I go on
6 about giving awards to these school districts and these
7 schools that are doing well and showcasing those schools,
8 but we also need to showcase schools that are -- have
9 conditions, are serving hard at students and -- and how did
10 they get to approaching and then how did they get to meets?
11 And I think we -- we do need to profile. And we do need to
12 show those because you know, it just -- it's very
13 concerning and I come from a district that has a large
14 population of free and reduced lunch kids and we know -- we
15 know what works.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I think you're implicitly
18 asking what's in the number, right? And we know that these
19 assessments load so heavily on language, listening,
20 speaking, reading and writing. And these tests are all
21 given in English. And so, if kids struggle with language,
22 their scores are not going to look great. And the density
23 of the questions certainly in the PARCC tests makes it very
24 difficult for kids who struggle with language to get good
25 scores here. So I think your question implicitly is; how



1 do we interpret these numbers? Well, what are the factors
2 that predict those numbers and language is a huge
3 predictor? So I think it's a great point.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we wanna keep
5 moving, if that's okay with you all.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll talk about this
8 other option. We just wanted to kind of think it through a
9 little bit more after the conversation on Friday. So I
10 think the idea really was that each content (inaudible)
11 indicator would just be measured by their raw percentile
12 rank. You wouldn't roll it up to a bucket of does not meet
13 me, approaching meets or exceeds. And then you could kind
14 of sum up those percentile ranks at the end and look at it
15 that way. As we dug into what States Statute said, I think
16 we really -- we all really do need to set targets at those
17 individual levels and we can't -- not do -- not set those
18 targets there.

19 But we just wanted to -- meet a little few
20 pictures on what it could look like and thought through the
21 pros and cons anyway. So it would be like this, instead of
22 having a rating for the individuals, you wouldn't -- you'd
23 wait and you'd have some kind of weighted average of the
24 percentile sum and you'd give a rating there, be at meets
25 or whatever. So the pros of doing that, you've get more of



1 that detailed in one's data included in. And it would
2 still inform in improvement planning because you'd have the
3 data there. But we thought that there definitely were some
4 cons to it. In terms of we know unfortunately, it's really
5 hard for people to kinda understand get wrap their heads
6 around data, it's not always an intuitive thing for people.
7 So this really would require digging in and knowing what
8 percentile ranks mean and understanding that.

9 Additionally, it may hide specific counting
10 areas because if you're looking at that overall sum, if
11 you're really doing great with English Language Art and
12 struggling in Math but then it comes on average at means
13 you won't necessarily see that unless you really dig in.
14 May provide less actionable information, it's a change from
15 current practice. You might be able to work it through
16 with every Student Succeeds Act, but we're not sure and we
17 also thought it wasn't totally align with state law. We
18 thought through some mitigation pieces to it. We could
19 color code the percentiles to try and give some kind of
20 indication people -- I know there so -- some people out
21 there that can't see color, but for those that can they
22 really -- that color coding is a really helpful signal.

23 So we can do that -- we can do a lot of
24 training to help people understand the data to a deeper
25 level and we could prioritize that use of resource



1 (inaudible) with -- with providing support to the field.
2 So where we are with next steps and you all let us know how
3 you feel. But before we put out any targets in a spring
4 report and informational reports to districts, we'd like to
5 know that you all feel that that's enough down a path that
6 you feel comfortable with and we wanna collect feedback on.
7 But if you're not sure enough about that path we wanna wait
8 and make sure we get there because we don't wanna give data
9 to districts and say, "Well, the state board isn't really
10 sure, but we're gonna give it to you anyway and it may all
11 change." It may change anyway based on the feedback, I
12 think we -- clearly we're gonna be flexible for that but we
13 wanna make sure you all are comfortable enough before going
14 forward.

15 So if you all wanna still like dig into
16 other options and bring examples first, whatever it is
17 you'd like just let us know that. But once we get that
18 kind of level of comfort from you, then we can make those
19 informational reports, get those out to the field and
20 collect feedback on them. That's our plan for spring,
21 early summer so that we can make any last refinements
22 before the frameworks go out next fall. And we'll make
23 sure we share all the feedback we get from the field with
24 you. But then we'll also need to vote on targets before
25 the August meeting so that we can actually get those



1 frameworks out as required by statute and meet in time and
2 then we'll revisit them like we talked about Friday. When
3 we have another year of testing data, we will revisit those
4 targets and see how similar or different they are if we go
5 the distribution -- with the -- with the norm distribution.
6 So we'll go look and see if those are things that we wanna
7 hold or things we are to adjust after the second year of
8 assessment.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So this is March --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: -- and you want us to make
13 some decision by June?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you're not gonna
15 meet in July, or you don't wanna hold a special meeting.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: We are not going to meet in
17 July. We can possibly wait it, right?

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So it was like (inaudible)
19 off the table.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: It may just be my
22 limitation, but I would love some examples.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: And examples of -- of very
25 different kinds of districts, numbers, input factors, as



1 has been mentioned by several members. And what does it
2 end up looking like? Because I don't -- I don't process it
3 well and like so I can see. But if -- If we've learned
4 anything, I think we've learned that these decisions that
5 we make have a very different impact, depending on --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: -- the nature of the school
8 district or school, the size of the school district and a
9 whole lot of other factors. And if you guys can -- I mean
10 go ahead --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can see profiles.
12 Yes, absolutely.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- and look at real
14 districts but don't present us with --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Absolutely, we're
16 going to do some profiles --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: -- present us with a set of
18 assumptions and then what it would look like. Because I
19 think that will -- that would sure help me --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: -- figure out what's -- and
22 then, I don't know I still want to be able to think about
23 how I explain to taxpayers the way we've put this together.
24 The way this is like quasi criterion-referenced process and
25 I wanna be able to say that there always gonna be these



1 districts on the bottom, even if -- even if all kids are
2 successful. There gonna be this -- and I'm -- I'm very --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If we get all our kids
4 successful, we don't need to have a turnaround. If we
5 could get everybody there, unfortunately we're just a long
6 way from there --

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Well our growth model has
8 always -- was norm and so there had to be half the
9 districts below, half the districts above.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The -- the student
11 results in the growth model or norm, but the schools are
12 not norm but the districts aren't norm. You could -- in
13 theory have every single school in district in the state at
14 50, out of mean growth -- mean growth percentile at 50. It
15 doesn't happen because we see different results in
16 different schools, but -- but the Math could work that way,
17 it's not set.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Then you -- then we
19 need to be able to explain that --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Because that's not the
22 perception out there.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. We (inaudible)
24 have that.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: The perception out there is
2 that we have this rigged.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 MS. FLORES: And --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: What?

6 MS. FLORES: And if color -- if color --

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, if you use norm. If
8 you use -- if you're norm, you're theoretically rigging it
9 for the tail on the left, right?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Either tail. Right.
11 Yeah. Both tails.

12 MS. FLORES: And if you --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: And on the right, you don't
14 actually know that the kids are --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We know be --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: -- performing well?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We know better now
18 because we have a test that are measures the --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Right, right.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I think so.

22 MS. FLORES: And in the colors, I mean you
23 have distinct colors. And it could -- I'm just thinking
24 that it could help if you had hues of color, you know, like
25 hues of yellow, hues of --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Purple. I want purple
2 -- (inaudible).

3 MS. FLORES: Exactly. You could have hues.
4 And people would understand that. So that you know, it's
5 not so cut and dry. I just really (inaudible) seriously 84
6 and 85, and then you just had that cut right there? It's -
7 -

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's everything from
9 mellow yellow to (inaudible). Okay. All right, it's good.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) colors.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mellow yellow. Thank you
12 (inaudible).

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So would you all like
14 us to come back in, where we at? We're in March now, in
15 April with some example some kind of different profiles
16 using the school distribution method and maybe do you wanna
17 see something else? Do you wanna see like if we use
18 criteria and use the --

19 MS. FLORES: Yeah, you sure.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- the PARCC, like if
21 we use the PARCC (inaudible) scores for like the level five
22 for exceeds, whatever that mean scale would be and four for
23 meets and I don't know, we'll figure out how to do that --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't want you to knock
25 yourselves out to the point where it's irrelevant.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. I'm just
2 wondering if you wanna see more than one -- one way of
3 doing it for these examples.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: If you could I'd love it,
5 because I'm a little worried.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: About what would be -- what
8 would be the response --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: -- to what we're doing.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: And we are -- we do believe
13 in a competency-based system, that by definition has to be
14 about identifying those competencies and being somewhat
15 criteria in reference. And I recognize that we're gonna --
16 it's -- it's a push. But to the extent that we can be
17 pushing, to the extent that if we're one of the magnificent
18 seven we can be pushing, that has merit even though we know
19 that we'll have to bring our parents and our population
20 along with us to this other way of looking at things.
21 Because there'll always be people that I know who will want
22 to know the norm, the to -- the norm distribution.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's correct.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Both pieces of
25 information are very valuable. And I just also wanna --



1 there's two other pieces of our 200 policy points that
2 we're gonna have to talk about that are gonna have a --
3 have an impact on all of this as well. Thinking about the
4 weighting of how much achievement versus growth versus
5 Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness is weighed in the
6 frameworks, that's gonna be -- that's gonna have an impact
7 because the -- the concerns about the norm reference really
8 have to do with the achievement, that's where you see the
9 biggest impact. So depending on how much you are way
10 achievement, depend -- you know, that will impact the
11 overall ratings or how we are --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- there. So that's a
14 big piece of it. And then that overall rating, how we
15 determine, who is turned around overall, that's gonna be
16 another big --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: What's our feedback from the
18 districts in terms of how much we've been emphasizing gross
19 -- growth versus achievement level?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I get -- I get most
21 people like growth. But I also get growth should be the
22 only thing that is counted and we shouldn't look at
23 achievement at all. And I also get, we should only look at
24 achievement and growth doesn't mean anything because all my



1 kids are proficient so it doesn't matter that they're --
2 they're not growing at all. So we hear everything --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh! Boy, I have a hard time
4 with that guy. Just because you are proficient it doesn't
5 mean that your kids shouldn't be turning (inaudible).

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, but we hear that -
7 -

8 MS. SCHROEDER: We hear that?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We hear that from
10 people that if we're proficient, then you should just leave
11 us alone.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: I can guess where that comes
13 from too. Been there.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, no. It might
15 (inaudible).

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: And from a policy perspective
18 since we've been doing this for 13 years, it would be
19 helpful to know how much money it cost to set these -- set
20 things up and the database that's created as a consequence
21 and managing the system and giving feedback and collecting
22 documents. It's very expensive I would imagine. And what
23 if we got out of it from doing it for 13 years, I mean
24 conceptually, we've generated data. Has it resulted in
25 districts doing more or I don't know, I imagine parents



1 know more perhaps, if they go into school view I don't know
2 what the hit rates are in that website --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can get you that.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- but that would be
5 interesting to know.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Either comments or
7 questions. So do you have what you need to proceed or do
8 you need more definitive answers from the Board?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: If you feel okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I feel okay. I feel
11 like we've got some ideas. Maybe we'll run them by you,
12 Dr. Schroeder before the next meeting. Make sure we're on
13 the right track and we can bring back some examples first.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So I guess you think you
15 have what you need.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think so, do you
17 (inaudible) if --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're gonna get to a point
19 where the board's going to have to make a decision and live
20 with it.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So it's probably what?
23 Not later than May but more likely April, next meeting?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- if we wanna be
25 able to get spring reports out. Then next meeting we need



1 to have a sense from you all that yes, go this way and get
2 those reports out doing it this way.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The spring reports will be
4 based on what, what tests?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's based on -- it's
6 just based on 2015 so it's not -- not comprehensive. All
7 that data, but we just wanna give them like a sense --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 2015 PARCC tests?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, 2015 PARCC. And
10 see Math, Science, not Social Studies, English Language
11 Proficiency and Access, ACT, dropout, grad rate.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So you're gonna -- you're
13 gonna marry all that data --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll put it all
15 together.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And then you'll come in
17 and give a district to us and our school report for each --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For each school and
19 district. We know that it's hard to really give feedback
20 on how the frameworks look or work until you see your own
21 data in there. Once they see their own data then you've
22 got a whole another kind of level of feedback.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's why we
25 thought it was really important to give them something, we



1 know it's older data just to get the sense. And were not
2 planning on giving them any kinda overall rating because
3 were not there with you all yet, we just wanna --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: I'm basically asking all of us,
6 is it possible to have another cheap session like we did
7 before? Right before the -- as we did you know, last
8 Friday.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I would say let's get some
10 examples, to see what our level of comfort is. And then
11 you might be -- you might be right, it might be best to dig
12 a little deeper into how was this created?

13 MS. FLORES: Right.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: What was the important,
15 right -- right yeah, right now I'm -- until I kind of see
16 what this is gonna look like, I'm -- I'm a little vague on
17 what my questions are. I wanna be able to know what are my
18 questions at this point.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Would you all
20 rather do that looking at those examples and more of a
21 study session, a few days-- a little bit before the board
22 meeting. And if you're flexible with us on deadlines for
23 materials, we can -- we could squish that in.

24 MS. FLORES: Yeah, I guess I -- that's what
25 I'm asking.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And do that we could
2 kind of --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Some of us here may be gone
4 the week before --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Oh, I'm gonna be
6 gone the week before.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm gonna be there?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can't do that for you
9 either, that's why I'm offering that.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, that's gonna put a lot
11 of pressure on you --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- because (inaudible)
14 stuff. I think the timing might be we could --

15 MS. MARY: We could maybe make it as a study
16 session during what -- depending on how many items we'll
17 receive during the April board meeting like knock out, like
18 work out. You all will be recessing on Thursday at 11 --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: For lunch.

20 MS. MARY: -- for (inaudible). So maybe
21 that Thursday morning we could dedicate two hours or so
22 this item. And treat it as a study session during the
23 board meeting.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a good idea.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, let's see what we
2 can do. We'll do our best. Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: You might have already said
4 this, but what is the current weight of growth versus
5 achievement? Is it -- is that a hard metric surface?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. So at the
7 elementary and middle level, it's 75 percent, that's growth
8 and growth gaps the way it's in. The way growth has been
9 in the frameworks, it's had that adequate growth component
10 in it. So that has some relationship to achievement so
11 it's not pure growth in districts, a lot of people would
12 say it's not pure growth. So the way we're thinking going
13 forward is that -- that especially because this first year
14 we don't wanna do adequate growth quite yet until we have a
15 little bit more consistency with this (inaudible).

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Did you say 75 percent?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 75 percent for
18 elementary and middle. For high school it's 50, right?

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: 35 --

20 MR. DURHAM: So that's gonna be based on --
21 so you're gonna -- you're gonna tell a public district A --

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: 50.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- which performs in the
24 bottom quartile but -- but had a significant improvement,
25 is a better placed to send your child in District B which



1 is in the 5th percentile but had little improvement, is
2 that what you just told me?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It depends on how the
4 numbers work out, but it could be that -- we have decided
5 it's a priority --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Count me as a no vote on
7 that, okay?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So well that's where
9 you all need to revisit that and think about laws.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 75 percent?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: It wasn't just growth, it
12 was growth plus (inaudible) which is a whole different
13 conversation.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So its growth is 75 percent
15 middle elementary and 50 high school?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And Statute says growth
19 and Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness have to be the
20 weight -- weigh the most. It doesn't say how much, but
21 those two have to have the most weight.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Who says that?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: State statute says that
24 -- that was written in (inaudible).



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So they have to have the
2 most?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The most weight.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So it could be, its scale
5 head back far below 75?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

7 MS. MARY: I think you just wanna make
8 mention that besides emphasizing that's growth and
9 Postsecondary?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

11 MS. MARY: So your Postsecondary measures
12 are not growth measures, right? Your Postsecondary
13 measures are going to be like your ACT scores and --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Dropout.

15 MS. MARY: Dropout in graduation rate?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the matriculation
17 (inaudible) for it.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: So when we talk again, could
20 you break out the algorithm in detail? What feeds into
21 these distinctions, labels and numbers? So I --what are
22 the weightings? So when you say it's growth plus more than
23 growth, if you could be very detailed that would be
24 helpful. Because again it's like what's in the category,



1 what comprises it and what are the weightings? That
2 algorithm is crucial to understand.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you like us to go
4 through how it's been in the past or what the proposal is
5 for going forward?

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: How its been in the past --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because then we could look at
9 how that's affected. Whereas districts stand and then we
10 can think about it, I think more helpfully.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Any further
12 discussion? Any questions?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you all come up with
14 questions that after this and would like information,
15 please just reach out to us. It will help us if you come
16 to us sooner than later.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Very good. Thank you all
18 very much.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 (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