

Chat Box: Sept. 16, 2020 COVID-19 Policy Implications Stakeholder Group

Impact of COVID on Learning

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

What an upset!

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 01:38 PM

Clarifying question: is it possible that in the future, an executive order could nullify whatever recommendations we make?

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 01:47 PM

Our regional student achievement council is most concerned about the timing of our recommendations and state decisions as they are already in early planning for WIDA Access, and fear that extended deliberation may result in late-to-need decisions without sufficient time to adjust to, or implement the recommendations.

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 01:55 PM

Would love to know where to go on Read Act. It's proving super difficult to do in remote environment.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 01:55 PM

Ditto Jen

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:02 PM

will all comments be released

not just those related to accountability and accreditation

From Me to Everyone: 02:03 PM

Yes, we will release the themes, but also all of the individual comments

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:03 PM

I have a question on the inclusion of reimagining accountability included in process of last slide. Seems to be in conflict with the grounding at start of meeting on legislative intent

From Me to Everyone: 02:04 PM

Yes, we will need to balance that comment within the scope of the group. Some of that conversation may need to be put on the "parking lot and talk about it later" list.

From Joyce Z to Everyone: 02:23 PM

You all may already have this but here is a link to vendor-provided information on READ Act fall 2020 (remote) administration support:

<https://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/readinterimassessments>

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 02:24 PM

Maybe ask districts to offer what their local assessments (NWEA, Star, iStation, etc.) are telling them about learning loss over the time of the closure and summer. More loss? Less loss? Similar loss?

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 02:24 PM

Some students did not receive new learning opportunity, focused to review previously taught content, some exposure to performance based activities

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:25 PM

What Johan points out is important

From Kym' iphone 10 to Everyone: 02:25 PM

agreed Jason

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 02:26 PM

Most districts have produced return plans that talk about lessons learned from the spring and changes being made based on that.

What districts/schools submitted to CDE for waivers in spring also could be source of info.

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 02:27 PM

given what we know about digital divide, lack of access to devices and internet, how many students didn't receive engagement in spring? Christina's point on districts capturing engagement in spring is important especially if we don't understand how districts and schools did it differently

From Carol Eaton - Jeffco to Everyone: 02:29 PM

The McKinsey paper shared by CDE predicts exacerbated achievement gaps by 15 to 20 percent, which will be a significant impact on the assessment and accountability outcomes, as well as Ed Effectiveness, which seems to emphasize growth over status results. Perhaps districts/boces can assess the reality of that prediction in the next month or so and then this committee can take it into account as we make recommendations?

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 02:29 PM

Gathering information that would be robust and useful seems ambitious. The interesting question is how can we assess students to measure the learning loss? We seem very ill equipped to do this.

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 02:30 PM

I think that it is important to have actual numbers on teacher mobility, teacher retention, etc.

From Kym' iphone 10 to Everyone: 02:33 PM

aasa has a really extensive website with data, research and sharing of practice with a national lens

From Me to Everyone: 02:36 PM

You bet

Educator Effectiveness/Evaluations

From Katy Anthes to Everyone: 02:53 PM

Christina-- I know it is a tough one-- I think you need to work with your legal council on that.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 02:55 PM

thank you Katy. I don't think it's an issue just for my legal council, it's that we are opening up 181 districts to potential lawsuits

by leaving the statute as it stands

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 02:57 PM

And, didn't CDE already essentially say to districts that Professional Practice is focus within evals conducted this year, as so few data sets for MSLs exist? I'm still not understanding problem we are trying to solve.

From Katy Anthes to Everyone: 02:58 PM

I understand Christina--- the challenge is the timing of all this. The statute can't change until the Legislature makes a decision. So, in the meantime, I think different district's will have to talk with their legal council and leaders to determine how they want to handle. Since districts use MSLs differently (some don't use state data much at all)

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 03:03 PM

YES, Christina!

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 03:37 PM

In the future could we know which members are in each break out group

From Rhonda Haniford to Everyone: 03:38 PM

Christina - Yes, most definitely. The groups are on slide 40 of the presentation, but we jumped that slide I think when we went into breakouts. We'll make sure we review it first next time.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 03:39 PM

awesome! thank you

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 03:39 PM

I cannot hear anything?

From Joyce Z to Everyone: 03:40 PM

Johan did you accidently turn down your speakers?

From Katy Anthes to Everyone: 03:41 PM

I think it might be your computer Johan? We can hear?

Its pretty big on my screen

I can see it

From Sue Gill to Everyone: 03:45 PM

Group 4 would support the option for districts to do MSL/Os this year.

From Kym' iphone 10 to Everyone: 03:47 PM

agree Amy

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 03:58 PM

And D wouldn't be needed if MSL portion removed

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 03:58 PM

I agree with not including C and D

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 03:59 PM

Exactly right Johan

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:00 PM

It's hard to find the time to be a psychometrician now that I have to be an epidemiologist.

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 04:00 PM

Ha Paul!

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:01 PM

bahahaha

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:06 PM

I think this entire discussion is why some people used the word "reimagine" in reference to these systems.

Well said Stephanie

From BretMiles to Everyone: 04:07 PM

Good reminder to point out the difference between a valid and reliable assessment, and when we decide to use an assessment for another purpose, which could call into question validity and reliability

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:08 PM

That's helpful. And the language around not required, but allowed addresses this. Am I misunderstanding that?

From BretMiles to Everyone: 04:08 PM

Yes, Kym. Well said

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 04:12 PM

I'm comfortable removing E for consensus decision today, but remembering that we may add it later as we discuss things like flexibility

We can't change legislation until January

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:13 PM

5.03 (D) School districts and BOCES must clearly communicate to all teachers the tools that will be used to measure their performance of the Teacher Quality Standards and Measures of Student Learning prior to their use, and how these will be weighted and aggregated to determine final Performance Evaluation Ratings. School districts and BOCES must clearly articulate to each educator the personnel category into which they are assigned, and how the growth of the students they teach will be measured for the purpose of informing their Performance Evaluation Rating. School districts and BOCES that elect to adopt their own locally developed quality standards for evaluating teachers must clearly communicate how those local standards align with the state's Teacher Quality Standards. School districts and BOCES must clearly communicate to teachers the consequences of each category of Performance Evaluation Rating, including how each teacher's assigned rating contributes to the loss or gain of nonprobationary

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:13 PM

Is there consensus across the state that CMAS is a valid and reliable measure of student learning and growth or teacher performance?

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:14 PM

thank you amie

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:14 PM

I am okay with this

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:15 PM

I am happy to talk with anyone about validity and reliability

From Mary Bivens to Me: (Privately) 04:20 PM

can you add me to the google you were working in please?

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:21 PM

Apologies all, I have to hop off at 4:20 for another commitment. I appreciate the dialogue and discussion and look forward to our future meetings/discussions.

Assessment

From Amie Baca-Oehlert to Everyone: 04:21 PM

Apologies all, I have to hop off at 4:20 for another commitment. I appreciate the dialogue and discussion and look forward to our future meetings/discussions.

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:24 PM

I am here

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:31 PM

but even math and ELA are not required by federal at all the grades we test

From Kym' iphone 10 to Everyone: 04:31 PM

sorry but I have a need to meet with my district nurse this afternoon... covid calls. 😊 thanks for the great conversation.

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 04:37 PM

Given the Fed position/intent not to waive assessments, is there discussion about how that will drive opt-out? I would not be surprised to see dramatic, catastrophic opt-out levels. Just in the Pikes Peak region we are "missing" 4K students already. Wait until we require them to attend for an unvalued assessment. We need to wave that red flag...

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:38 PM

yes

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 04:38 PM

Missing 4K students? That's concerning regardless of assessments

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:39 PM

I have a district in my BOCES that has not administered a CMAS test to even one student in 4 years now.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:39 PM

is it all opt outs?

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 04:39 PM

Might the reason those kids are not showing up be because the options available do not work for them or their families?

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:40 PM

Yes, 100% opt-out.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:41 PM

no, psat/nmsqt determines scholarships for college

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 04:41 PM

Yes Jen, it's a huge concern because we know where the movement is happening, and that Kinder are holding out in droves, but we DON'T know where the others went. We think they're staying home and waiting for a return to normalcy/perceived safety/maskless learning

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 04:41 PM

Luke, the community has decided that they don't value the results of the state assessments. They are part of what is called the Student Centered Accountability Project (SCAP).

From Peter Hilts to Everyone: 04:42 PM

Luke, that's probably exactly correct, it's just hard to prove without arguing from absence of info

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 04:42 PM

Jason: I was referencing the 4k number from this fall Peter referenced, not opt outs.

From Johan van Nieuwenhuizen to Everyone: 04:42 PM

I want to recommend that we start with recommendation 1:SAT essay and keep this as an option for the students that need it and want to take the

essay.

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:44 PM

I don't think we've put enough on the table to eliminate. Federal law does not require us to test CMAS at all the grades we test

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 04:45 PM

Opts out are a consideration for what we do with accountability, not a consideration for whether or not we do assessments

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:48 PM

we also need to consider how different groups of students opt out (e.g., opt out rates are higher for white affluent students)

From Jen Walmer to Everyone: 04:50 PM

Totally agree Christina!

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:54 PM

I also want to caution CDE in its belief that students will come in for testing. We have tens of thousands of families and students-- disproportionately of students of color -- who have chosen 100% virtual due to their health and safety concerns and other reasons.

tens of thousands

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 04:54 PM

Jen H. - so much this!!!

From Stephanie Perez-Carrillo to Everyone: 04:58 PM

I agree with Johan's point.

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:58 PM

We consider the essay to be an opportunity and we try to have all students take it

From Jen Holladay (she/ella) to Everyone: 04:58 PM

Agree on keeping student access to essay option if they want it

From Paul Freeman to Everyone: 04:58 PM

Yes

From Chris Gibbons (he/his/him) to Everyone: 04:59 PM

Also yes

From Christina Ethier to Everyone: 05:00 PM

I suggest that we make the recommendation to eliminate Social Studies

From Jason Westfall to Everyone: 05:00 PM

2nd!

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 05:00 PM

I agree with eliminating social studies

From Da'Lisa Hatcher to Everyone: 05:00 PM

Eliminate Social Studies

From Cheri Wrench - CASB to Everyone: 05:00 PM

I agree eliminate Soc St

From Luke Ragland to Everyone: 05:03 PM

Good point Paul. I agree with you generally, but I think the current test just doesn't have the value to justify

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

Agree on 20-21 pause on social studies assessment. Have to transition to district COVID meeting.
Thanks, all, for the conversation today.

From Katy Anthes to Everyone: 05:07 PM

Sorry everyone-- this is fascinating. But I have to jump to another meeting.

From Michelle Murphy to Everyone: 05:09 PM

I need to drop off, hope we will spend more time on validity and reliability in subsequent meetings