

## COVID-19 Policy Implications Stakeholder Group – Chat Box Notes – September 30, 2020

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 12:57 PM

I'm going to try and leave my video on, but sometimes internet is an issue....if it struggles, I will turn off video.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 01:11 PM

Yes, thank you.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 01:24 PM

I like the idea of public comment (written and in person)

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 01:24 PM

Our district, and many across North America as well as some state associations has used a public input forum called Thought Exchange, which is a phenomenal tool for gathering and rating public comments. Thought Exchange has made their platform free during the Pandemic for issues just like this.

From Katy Anthes to Everyone: 01:25 PM

Hmmm, cool. Thanks for sharing that Peter. We should look into that.

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 01:25 PM

I think we need to make sure this is accessible for regular people and can truly represent public views. I think feedback form or focus groups could be structured to ensure representative samples. Equal access for parents and community members key

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 01:25 PM

Agree with Luke.

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 01:26 PM

Can we reach out to ensure traditionally underrepresented groups can provide feedback?

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 01:26 PM

A public opinion survey would be ideal not sure if there are resources available for that

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 01:27 PM

I wonder if questions administered would be differentiated? There's an assumption about what people may or may not understand about these three buckets.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 01:28 PM

If we use any kind of technology platform, perhaps we could use and translate a short video to explain the topics...face time for Katy!

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 01:31 PM

I support the idea of a public feedback form

From Me to Everyone: 01:31 PM

To clarify, please keep working with the people that you are representing to inform your participation on this group. Do not feel like you need to wait on this input process.

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 01:33 PM

Whatever we do, we need to be prepared to weight the responses and opinions to reflect broader public.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 01:33 PM

Agree with Michelle that the forum needs to be open-ended because these topics are so energized that even the framing of survey questions would be a topic of support/cynicism

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 01:56 PM

Is it possible some of this could change as the year goes on?

I am referring to the in person administration and remote administration

From Heather Chikoore to Everyone: 01:58 PM

Good question Amie. We'll ask Joyce about timing of a decision re: remote administration.

From Prateek Dutta to Everyone: 01:58 PM

Joyce, can you elaborate on what CollegeBoard has stated so far on the topic of remote assessment? You mentioned they have "indicated" that remote administration is not possible. Can you elaborate?

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:00 PM

By allowing remote administration, you are decreasing test security and will likely need to decommission items. Have we accounted for the cost of new item development after 2021?

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 02:01 PM

Is there a potential of "saving" money when we do not engage in state assessments? What are our contractual obligation with Pearson and Collegeboard?

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:02 PM

yes, I was wondering the same Johan

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:12 PM

yes! there is a lot about leaning contexts that we would need to know.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 02:13 PM

Joyce, our area superintendents are convinced that ANY state assessment will trigger massive opt-outs. How would a 20%, 40% etc. opt-out rate impact this whole discussion?

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:15 PM

great question pete

sorry peter

what would be the federal consequence be if opt out was 20% or more?

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 02:15 PM

Hard to separate sanctions from accountability, when we're being asked to think of assessments today separate from those systems

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 02:18 PM

really? so interesting. I wonder why

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 02:18 PM

Or: "Margie's school and district supported her in meeting CMAS expectations"

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 02:20 PM

What would be the process or supports given to superintendents, principals, teachers, students and parents in gaining an understanding of all of this? Some of us are not members of Mensa.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 02:21 PM

How do you factor in students in districts that are in-person who have opted for remote learning? There are significant numbers in many/most districts.

Also, how do we account for students who are sent home due to exposure for some portion of year, particularly during test administration.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 02:23 PM

The only use, it seems, would be to help us understand unfinished learning/learning loss? And, given that we don't typically get data back until August, it's not particularly actionable.

Schools are doing administration of READ Act assessments with remote learners right now. What expectations has CDE set around those?

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 02:23 PM

Yes, Michelle, I have the same question. How would the results take into account and ensure those utilizing the results are interrupting them with the knowledge of the student circumstance for this year- in person to remote to in person to hybrid, etc.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 02:23 PM

The Pikes Peak Area Superintendents' Association (PPASA) and the Pikes Peak Regional School Achievement Council (PPRSAC) both met this week to discuss the CSAC recommendations and topics. There was overwhelming and energetic consensus that state administered (CMAS) and state-required assessments (Literacy screeners, Access) are counterproductive and should be cancelled or at least optional this year. The one exception to that consensus is the SAT. Our concerns are less about technical validity, and more about the public credibility of the assessment in the eyes of students, parents, and staff (almost certainly leading to high opt-out levels) as well as the opportunity cost of lost instructional time to administer a low-value assessment regimen. We are also unanimous that we cannot guarantee fair and equal administration across in-person/online/hybrid/tech-rich/tech-poor populations.

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 02:24 PM

Section 5 of peer review requirements says 100% of student must participate/be able to participate. If the test is not available remotely, how can that requirement be met?

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 02:25 PM

Also, how would broadband access be taken into consideration? We still have so many students without access

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 02:25 PM

Good point Cheri-

From BretMiles to Everyone: 02:27 PM

If the assumption is that we cannot give the assessment for all of the uses that we have typically given the tests, it becomes a question of return on investment. This is a significant investment of instructional time in a year when we need to optimize instructional time. So, if the test can't be used for its many intended uses, is it worth the time to administer the test?

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 02:27 PM

The feedback I have received from teachers very closely mirrors what Peter H wrote above.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:28 PM

At this point, ACEE estimates that districts across the state have spent \$250K on prep for tests that may or may not happen. This is all money that could have been spent on instruction and student support.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 02:29 PM

Bret, I would say time AND money. We need to consider the return on investment at a time when we are experiencing massive fiscal hits

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 02:30 PM

I am very reluctant to make any technical recommendations in this conversation, I don't feel that the stakeholder group is the appropriate group to make a recommendation regarding what is and isn't technically sound. That feels like a conversation for the TAP.

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 02:30 PM

can we please go back to the notes slide?

From BretMiles to Everyone: 02:30 PM

Yes, Amy. Money matters tool I'm still drawn back to Peter's comments. His superintendent group is not alone in the concern that there is no we can guarantee fair and equal administration across in-person/online/hybrid/tech-rich/tech-poor populations.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 02:31 PM

Peter's comments say it all!

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 02:32 PM

I agree with you Bret and Amie.

Connectivity is a HUGE issue for our students in the SW and yet I have 20% of our students who have opted for fully online.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 02:34 PM

It seems like we are identifying many reasons to not administer these assessments. Are any members willing to offer reasons TO administer them?

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 02:34 PM

I would add that local health requirements for in-person testing sites for PSAT/SAT also could create differences in testing condition

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 02:34 PM

I took a temperature check with principals and they all agree that we need another data point to triangulate data. We are paying for interim assessments as part of a balance assessment system and cannot afford to pay for another test. The state assessment helps us to accomplish that. We do know that most students will show a decrease in academic achievement as a result of COVID and everything that caused a challenge. It is important to know by how much. Please allow for flexibility (optional) participation

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 02:34 PM

Agreed Chris.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 02:34 PM

Agree with Chris

On overemphasis on technical

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 02:35 PM

agree w Chris as well

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 02:37 PM

Formative assessments are already giving teachers that much needed and timely data.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 02:37 PM

I will have to log back in

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 02:39 PM

Formative assessments should play a larger role in all discussions of student learning. Our over reliance on state summative assessments for so many high stakes decisions and ratings is not best practice.

Break at 2:42

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 02:50 PM

To clarify my concerns around over emphasis of the technical, we have been given a lot of information around a myriad of important technical concerns that are critical for all the reasons pointed out by committee members. My interest is in ensuring we have time to discuss why we would proceed with the assessments in light of all these concerns. I am not certain that is the sentiment Chris was expressing :)

From Da'Lisa Hatcher to Everyone: 02:55 PM

Hello! Thank you! 😊

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 02:59 PM

Can we discuss how COVID has impacted/will impacted the historical uses we just went through? Seems important before we talk about specific tests

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:06 PM

We had 86% show up

Similar for SAT last week

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 03:08 PM

Agree with Carol

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 03:08 PM

86% for PSAT-SAT does not seem to predict equivalent participation in CMAS. In our region, we have over 4K students opt out of ANY attendance. I feel like this discussion is glossing over the first question "Should we administer?"

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 03:08 PM

Clarifying question: ensuring all CO students have the opportunity to take PSAT (or SAT) for free is dependent on this decision, or not?

From Christina Wirth-Hawkins to Everyone: 03:12 PM

Jen - Yes. These recommendations relate to whether or not CO students should have a state sponsored opportunity to take the PSAT or SAT in spring 2021.

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 03:15 PM

Agreeing to administer any assessment like the PSAT without having parameters on purpose and use and the validity of inferences about results seems challenging.

From Prateek Dutta to Everyone: 03:15 PM

My question is similar to Luke's. So I will hold off for now, thank you Heather

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 03:17 PM

Perhaps we could have a conversation about can we agree on administering the PSAT at least at the individual student level — optional for students to take as they did this fall?  
And then talk about other levels of purpose and use that might be agreed upon?

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 03:17 PM

Denver Coliseum

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 03:18 PM

Agree Carol.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 03:21 PM

I support students having opportunity to take a free PSAT

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 03:23 PM

If we do make it optional how do we ensure kids aren't left out? Those who aren't able to attend in person?

I do agree with Carol's recommendation and want to reiterate the equity concern.

Is there a valid assessment that kids can take remotely?

From Da'Lisa Hatcher to Everyone: 03:23 PM

I agree with the concern of equity.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 03:23 PM

i would also offer that remote learnings tend to be more students of color

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:24 PM

The advantage is that we get information about some - perhaps very many of our students.

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 03:24 PM

I agree with concern of equity

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 03:24 PM

So sorry if I jumped in front of Amy P. I thought you were calling on me. I apologize.

From Amy Pitlik to Everyone: 03:26 PM

You had your hand up first, Amie! No jumping. :)

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:26 PM

Effectively it's always optional, so the word is redundant

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:27 PM

With Opt-Out, all of the tests we are discussing are "Optional" right now.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 03:28 PM

So just to clarify, does offer equal required?

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 03:28 PM

Clarification: PSAT is valid against national data set, so local optouts less relevant, correct?

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 03:31 PM

Appreciate the clarification.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 03:32 PM

I would like to add an amendment that it say, "...only if it can be done in a manner that meets local health mandates" or something that acknowledges that administration can only happen if it complies with local health guidelines.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 03:33 PM

Amend to include schools having access to data as well, for educational planning purposes.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 03:33 PM

yes

exactly Jen

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 03:35 PM

How does this address concerns about students with disabilities who can not come to school for the test?

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 03:35 PM

@Michelle, we are doing accommodations now for the October test, so it can be done



From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 03:35 PM

No, I think that we need more clarity on what we mean with data provided to schools and districts

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 03:37 PM

Agreed with Luke. I think we need more discussion about aggregating data and the right level of public visibility.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 03:42 PM

Concerns about aggregated public use is, for us, about HOW it will be used and by whom. Understanding learning loss, maybe. High-stakes accountability: no.

Amie -- are some of your concerns about possibility districts would use for evaluative purposes/local accountability purposes, not for educational planning and improvement?

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 03:42 PM

Can we ask for consensus on offering the test and separate out consensus on providing data?

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 03:42 PM

We can't dismiss the role of formative assessment in that very concern

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 03:43 PM

I'd suggest we make a chart for each assessment, and whether they should be administered, aggregated, reported for X, reported for y.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 03:43 PM

The concern regarding inequities and resource allocation.

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:43 PM

I don't see how a district that wanted to slice and dice the data could be prevented from doing that.

From BretMiles to Everyone: 03:44 PM

What resources are being deployed based on this information? If we are making a decision based on getting resources to students based on disaggregation of these tests, we should clarify what resources we are talking about.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:44 PM

I feel like we need to be careful when we make statements that assume that ALL communities place the same value on these assessments.

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 03:45 PM

Like Prateek, I have significant concerns over equity and losing the sense of urgency over the gaps we see in CO.....that said, I agree with the points that Johan and Jason have made that some of our stakeholders do not place value on the assessment

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:46 PM

Exactly Bret. And will those resources be soaked up by the Front Range, leaving little for the rural areas?

BREAK 3:52

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 03:51 PM

Prototyped a decision matrix bc that's how we're thinking in my region

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 03:52 PM

thank you peter

this is what i was getting at

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 03:54 PM

Can you re-drop the link to the flow chart into the chat?

From Me to Everyone: 03:54 PM

I downloaded your photo, Peter. We've got it. Thanks

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 03:55 PM

I can't download from the chat either

From Me to Everyone: 03:56 PM

We can send it out with our follow up communication. I'll see if I can get it to one of the presenters so they can at least share their computer so everyone can see it now.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 03:57 PM

PSAT and SAT have meaning for students outside of Colorado, so appreciate addressing CMAS separately

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 03:59 PM

Yes

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 03:59 PM

Yes

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 03:59 PM

state assessments or just PSAT and SAT right now?

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 03:59 PM

If we choose right at the top of the chart, does the rest matter?

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 03:59 PM

I heard just PSAT/SAT and was voting based on that.

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:01 PM

If parents become aware that aggregated data has been provided to the school would they be right to ask to see it?

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:01 PM

I can't get my public interested in the data

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:01 PM

@Jason -- we are all public orgs, can it be withheld?

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:02 PM

If your N size is small because you have 45 students PK-12 you sure can, and must.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 04:04 PM

Does the phrase "non-accountability" mean "data that will not be used for accountability purposes" will nevertheless be released to schools....

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:05 PM

"will not be used for accountability or evaluative purposes"

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:06 PM

It is important for all concerned that the results are not for accountability but for individual student and school use.

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:06 PM

G11 science CMAS is the wrong test at the wrong time. It has too little value at the best of times and this is not the best of times.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 04:10 PM

O-lert (like alert but with an O). :)

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:11 PM

thx!

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 04:14 PM

If you are referring to me, Stephanie, I am not reluctant to share with schools and districts. I just expressed the additional consideration that is captured in the first bullet. I am happy to further explain why I think that is important if that is what you were asking.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 04:15 PM

Sorry to land in grammar, but the problem is using the hyphenated phrase “non-accountability” as a modifier for results, when it needs its own specific articulation.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:15 PM

I was just asking for clarification. And I agree with that bullet point. Thanks.

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:17 PM

We are spending a lot of time to talk about results of assessments when we are not sure if we should have assessments in the first place?

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 04:17 PM

Is that aggregated results by schools and districts or just individual scores?

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 04:18 PM

Getting away from the passive voice... CDE will release state assessment data to individual students and aggregated data to districts and schools for instructional uses not related to the state accountability system.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 04:18 PM

Good question, Carol

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:18 PM

We are still talking about PSAT/SAT not all state assessments?

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 04:18 PM

That is my question as well Jen.... that wasn't the language I just heard from Heather....

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 04:19 PM

Are we intentionally losing the language around compliance with state/local health requirements?

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:20 PM

Suggested recommendation: If we offer any state assessments in Spring of 2021 then results should be released to students, parents, schools and districts for local use only.

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 04:21 PM

agree with Michelle

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:21 PM

agree with Johan

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:24 PM

Why not be transparent?

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:24 PM

I agree with Prateek and Paul. With the right guidance, the information should be transparent.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:25 PM

because you also have additional data privacy considerations

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 04:27 PM

perhaps we create conditions under which data could be aggregated

and if those scenarios are not met, then data cannot be aggregated

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 04:30 PM

How are we coming to agreement on these edits?

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:30 PM

Even schools and districts would appreciate CDE providing to us aggregated (and student-group disaggregated) data for schools and districts, along with student-level data, to support our improvement planning

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 04:33 PM

Completely agree with Carol.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:33 PM

Are those technical advisory group issues? or this group? decided aggregation parameters

From Kym LeBlanc-Esparza to Everyone: 04:33 PM

Thank you for articulating that Carol, I agree with your thinking

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:33 PM

I agree with Carol

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:34 PM

Let's get to the end game. Can we agree on the maximum and if not work backwards.

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 04:34 PM

The TAP has recommended that we consider validity of inferences about results at individual student, school district and state/high stakes levels

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:36 PM

Yes

I'm on the all side of that debate

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:36 PM

What are the fears people have in the data being public?

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 04:36 PM

Agree with Joyce

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:36 PM

I would support asking the TAP about the aggregate parameters.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:36 PM

i don'

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 04:38 PM

just an example

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:41 PM

Good point Stephanie and Amy- I also agree.

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:41 PM

Yes, I would agree that point Heather.

From BretMiles to Everyone: 04:43 PM

I realize that this comment doesn't help the current conversation and moves us backwards, but we have been talking for two hours about how test results will be used, and earlier in the meeting we added to our notes that we don't know how to deal with 2.3 Test Administration and 2.4 Monitoring Test Administration in anything other than a regular school for all model. If we are making COVID impact recommendations, we still need to understand if we can even do this at all before we talk about how we would use the results. Perhaps these comments can just be saved to impact our next meeting agenda, idk.

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:44 PM

We are operating under current data release rules. Why do we have to change them?

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:45 PM

I think the non-accountability language is absent now in the language

From elizabethcasillas to Everyone: 04:49 PM

I agree with Peter

From Joyce Z to Everyone: 04:52 PM

CoAlt must accompany any general assessment that is given.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:56 PM

thank you for the levity paul

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 04:59 PM

it sounds like there needs to be work between meetings or we won't be able to move forward in the 2 meetings we have left...

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 05:00 PM

I agree Carol

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 05:01 PM

Or we need to add a couple shorter meetings with appropriate public notice

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 05:02 PM

jen that's may be more productive

sorry, shorter meetings

i wonder if more small group would be helpful

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 05:02 PM

TAP is willing to help as well between meetings

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 05:02 PM

yes, ACEE is also willing to help

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 05:03 PM

I would like to hear from more experts around administration challenges and use of data

From Amie Baca-Oehlert, CEA, she/her to Everyone: 05:03 PM

Agree a couple more shorter meetings may need to get added

From Carol Eaton Jeffco to Everyone: 05:03 PM

thanks for the facilitation and the prep!

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 05:03 PM

Thank you, colleagues