

BEFORE THE
PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
WORK SESSION

November 16, 2017

9:22 A.M.

Jerry Apodaca Education Building -- Mabry Hall
300 Don Gaspar
Santa Fe, New Mexico

REPORTED BY: Mary Abernathy Seal, RDR, CRR, CCR 69
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
201 Third Street, NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

(9113L) MAS

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 matter -- but I think we might want to check with 2 them before we finalize it, so they can come at a 3 time when we're actually maybe close to meeting. I 4 was just thinking that I -- 5 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Come for? 6 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, are you 7 coming back for these things, or is this the last 8 time you're actually here? 9 MS. BOAST: Let's see. The definite plan 10 is that I'm here today. Tim will be coming in 11 December, assuming that that coalition meeting -- 12 that it works to take -- that's my colleague, Tim 13 Field. 14 Then we have left it open for the spring, 15 really, whether -- because as much as possible we 16 can do in terms of feedback -- we can do webinars, 17 we can do calls, we can assist you in the best 18 manner in terms of engaging with schools and 19 collecting feedback for you. And then if another 20 point -- so there could be a point to help if 21 there's a trip out to -- really, we'll leave that up 22 to you in terms of what you'd like to do. 23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: As long as 24 you're accessible, because we'll look at the 25 schedule for next year. Do I know what I'm doing</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 not anticipating from the schools, I think we've got 2 clear sailing with being able to move the timeline 3 in terms of approving it. And then maybe if we hit 4 some bumps in the road with the data or whatever, 5 then we might need either calls or a visit at that 6 point in time, because we've already started the 7 process. 8 MS. BOAST: Yes, and that is a typical 9 additional point that often we will come back in 10 person to meetings at the point of approval if there 11 are issues. But if we can do that by phone, by 12 conference -- so again, we're flexible there. 13 Any other comments on timeline or 14 questions? 15 Okay, so goals for today. This is fairly 16 ambitious, but we're going to review the trial run 17 results, but then we ultimately would like to leave 18 with you in possession of a draft set of indicators 19 and a draft plan for rolling up. This is not a 20 final approved. It is not final. But it's a draft 21 to share with schools. We would expect that when 22 we've gone through this process with other 23 authorizers, we would expect there will be some more 24 revisions and tweaks, so hopefully that takes a 25 little pressure off feeling we're finalizing the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 next April? No, actually, I don't. But I know from 2 August on. So I was just thinking that before we 3 finalize something, we might coordinate with you, 4 but it sounds like you're a lot more flexible. 5 MS. BOAST: We're flexible. 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And we're fairly 7 inflexible. 8 MS. BOAST: That will work together well. 9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That's why I 10 mentioned it. 11 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And actually, Lyria 12 and I spoke a little bit about this last night 13 because in my perfect world, I would like the 14 approval to be done before April/May, because I 15 think it would be challenging to negotiate with the 16 renewal schools and the other schools that we have 17 backed up when we haven't approved the performance 18 framework. I think it presents just challenges, you 19 know, that I would like to avoid. So if we could 20 get it in place so that, you know, we don't have 21 schools saying, "I didn't really know that's what 22 you were going to do," and you know, I think it 23 would just be a little smoother if -- and I'm hoping 24 that we're closer than further away in agreeing to 25 this, so that barring incredible pushback, which I'm</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 final version. But we want you to feel that you're 2 close to a version that you're comfortable with 3 sharing with schools. Because again, if that can be 4 the focus of that December meeting, it will really 5 help to meet the timeline that you have for 6 revisions. 7 So there will be I think two points that 8 we need to make sure there's consensus. One is on 9 the measures themselves that are included in the 10 framework; and then that process for rolling them up 11 into an overall rating. So those are two sort of 12 different pieces that have different considerations 13 and probably different conversations that need to be 14 had. 15 All right. So we'll dig into the results. 16 From the conversations both in June and in August, 17 the directions that we were given were to look at 18 indicators that would form the framework that 19 included state accountability A through F 20 disaggregated grades; then the addition of a 21 subgroup performance indicator. And we're looking 22 at both proficiency and growth as possibilities 23 there; and then the other important category in your 24 current framework, which is the school specific 25 goals.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 So those are the three categories that we 2 looked at in the trial run, and so we'll go through 3 them separately with a focus on the subgroup and the 4 optional school-specific because -- again, I think 5 you're familiar with the A-through-F disaggregated 6 component. I'm happy to talk more, but I think 7 that's the part you all are most familiar with, so 8 it's new in that you're looking at it in a 9 disaggregated way, but the system itself is not new. 10 We'll start with the subgroup performance, 11 turning over to page 4 and 5 and 7. And so just to 12 review, again, you know why this was considered as 13 an addition to the framework. A couple important 14 points. First, in the statute there is the 15 requirement for disaggregation of statement 16 assessment results, and while it's available on the 17 report card informational part, actually having it 18 in your framework has you meeting statute 19 requirements that are fairly important. 20 The most important thing, though, and what 21 really came up in what we heard from you all, is 22 that you feel the need -- or the subgroup 23 performance indicators give you a better ability to 24 dig into the performance of a school, especially if 25 they're serving large groups of kids in subgroups</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 provided by PED, but there are a couple of important 2 data notes that I need to give here, and anybody who 3 really wants to dig into the weeds, I'm happy to 4 talk to you during break if you have really specific 5 questions, or now. But subgroup proficiency -- we 6 were looking at school results that covered all 7 assessments and all grades. So this includes -- and 8 these are the data files that were provided to us, 9 so it does include K through 12. Whatever is 10 available, we used the results there. 11 And the subgroups that we looked at were 12 initially -- we set out to look at the free and 13 reduced lunch, so economically disadvantaged 14 students, English language learners, and students 15 with disabilities. As it turned out, you'll see as 16 we go through, there were too many results 17 suppressed for the ELL and the SPED for us to be 18 able to feel comfortable with the results and the 19 categories. So you're going to see the results for 20 free and reduced lunch, but we are going to follow 21 up to try to get unsuppressed data because 22 ultimately if this is added to your framework, you 23 do want all available subgroups. 24 For subgroup growth, we were able to look 25 at all of the subgroups who had sufficient students.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 that are traditionally lower-performing. So giving 2 you the ability to say, well, the school is getting 3 a D or an F in a certain component, but do we really 4 think that is a good reflection of what's actually 5 happening in the school? 6 And that's very important to many of the 7 Commissioners in terms of what you shared were 8 priorities. It also will hopefully strengthen your 9 review process during renewal. Because often those 10 are some of the stickiest issues, right, like you 11 know, because schools will often, you know, have 12 valid complaints that accountability ratings aren't 13 truly reflecting who they're serving and how they're 14 doing with those students. So we're trying to shed 15 some more light here for you. 16 So we took a look at both proficiency and 17 at growth. You know, I think there was more 18 interest in the growth and what that can tell you, 19 because that's really trying to tell you how much 20 students are learning at that school. But we did 21 look at proficiency because that can give you some 22 good insights as well into school performance. So 23 we're going to present it all and see sort of what 24 additional information this gives you. 25 Before we dive in, both of these were</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 There are some schools that just don't have enough 2 students, so you're not going to see those. The 3 subgroup growth, you're going to see quite a lot of 4 detail today, because the results that we received 5 from PED were disaggregated results of that Q1/Q3 6 growth. So I think you're familiar with seeing the 7 growth of the bottom students in the bottom quartile 8 compared to the top three quartiles. So what you're 9 going to see today is both of those results then 10 disaggregated to those three subgroups. 11 We did not -- another thing that could 12 possibly be a discussion point are additional 13 subgroups. So race, ethnicity, migrant is sometimes 14 something that can be reported. When we looked at 15 the results for the charter schools, I think there 16 were only four schools that had results for 17 African-American students, and a majority had 18 Hispanic. That will be a discussion ultimately if 19 you do decide to add the subgroup measures. You'll 20 want the main FRL, ELL, and SPED, but for schools 21 that have enough students in other groups, do you 22 want to include those? So that will definitely be a 23 discussion point. 24 Okay. So any other questions? We're 25 going to now dive into subgroup proficiency. Any</p>

Page 14

1 questions so far? I think I may have actually
 2 already covered all of this.

3 For subgroup proficiency, as I said, we
 4 tried to look at the three main subgroups, only
 5 looked at FRL. And the evaluation that we did was
 6 to look at each charter school and see how students
 7 in each of the three subgroups compared to their
 8 peers across the state. So there are a couple of
 9 things that are important here. We have a graphic
 10 here. This is an example of a school, a charter
 11 school who has enough FRL students for their
 12 performance to be evaluated, and we're looking at
 13 the ELA proficiency rates here for their
 14 economically disadvantaged students. This school
 15 serves grades 6 through 12 and their FRL proficiency
 16 for ELA is 15 percent. So 15 percent of those
 17 students are at or above proficiency.

18 When we look at all other schools in the
 19 state and the performance for grades 6 through 12,
 20 this school falls into the second quartile. And you
 21 can see that at the 75th threshold, 33 percent of
 22 the FRL students are proficient in grades 6 through
 23 12 at the median, you know, so that state average
 24 performance is 22 percent proficiency rate. The
 25 bottom quartile, 13 percent proficiency. So you can

Page 15

1 see this school falls between that 25th and 50th, so
 2 this would be a second-quartile school. Does that
 3 makes sense in terms of -- so you'll see all the
 4 results in terms of quartiles, quartiles statewide.

5 Just a caveat, it's very important to be
 6 looking at making those grade-served distinctions
 7 because proficiency rates are very different, you
 8 know, grade by grade. So we did all those
 9 adjustments behind -- again, if you want more
 10 details about the methodology, I'm happy to talk
 11 through that. But as we're looking through results,
 12 you're basically seeing quartile comparison.

13 Okay. So on page 6 of your handout, we
 14 showed two examples. This is really to highlight
 15 why are we even looking at adding or considering
 16 adding this? So the top graph shows two high
 17 poverty charter schools. One has 99 percent
 18 economically disadvantaged students, the second 95
 19 percent. They both received an F in terms of their
 20 current standing grades. And in the A-through-F,
 21 again, the current standing is the one that looks at
 22 proficiency rates. So they have an F grade for
 23 current standing.

24 Well, you can see that one of the schools,
 25 you know, for their students, economically

Page 16

1 disadvantaged students, it sort of aligns when you
 2 look at those students. They're in the bottom
 3 quartile statewide compared to other students,
 4 economically disadvantaged students. But the top
 5 school actually, when you do that statewide
 6 comparison, they're above the state median. So
 7 their students, you know, are actually faring better
 8 than the majority of students in poverty statewide.

9 This is a pretty important piece of
 10 information for you to know if you are monitoring
 11 performance or making a renewal decision, and I
 12 think this is exactly the kind of information that
 13 you had really prioritized.

14 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Right.
 15 MS. BOAST: And then similarly, the bottom
 16 example are two schools that are not -- you know,
 17 one has a 23 percent FRL enrollment, the other 45
 18 percent. Again, when you dig in, you see very
 19 different stories than just that F current standing
 20 grade. So I'd love to just have your questions or
 21 comments on this, because while all schools are
 22 not -- many of the schools are aligned with their
 23 A-through-F grade, but what we're looking for are
 24 those exceptions and special conditions where you
 25 want to know whether a school has some performance

Page 17

1 aspects that you're not seeing in the A-through-F
 2 grade.

3 Okay. So I am now going to give you the
 4 big -- here come the colored pictures.

5 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: For guys that
 6 could be color-blind.

7 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You're out of luck.
 8 MS. BOAST: And what you have is, you have
 9 the K-8 schools on one side and then high school on
 10 the other side, and you can see that on the second
 11 column. So in the handout, we pulled out some
 12 examples. Here you see all of the schools, okay?
 13 So let me give you a little -- if we start with the
 14 K-8 schools. You have all the A through F
 15 disaggregated grades in this left section. I think
 16 that's what you're used to seeing. Right? That
 17 middle section shows the subgroup growth, and you'll
 18 see because it's split out by the poor students in
 19 the bottom 25 percent and the top 75 percent, you
 20 have a lot of columns there. But basically what you
 21 have are the FRL, ELL, and SPED for ELA and math.
 22 We color-coded it so you can see that quartile.

23 The final set on the right is subgroup
 24 proficiency. You can see that unfortunately right
 25 now we only have the FRL results, but ultimately, if

Page 18

1 you adopt this into your framework, you would be
 2 seeing all three of those subgroups and any
 3 additional.
 4 So I think for this first subgroup
 5 proficiency, what you want to be really comparing is
 6 that the FRL columns over on the right, the far
 7 right, proficiency, compared to your current
 8 standing grade, which is the second colored; right?
 9 And so you'll see as you go down, if you kind of
 10 just -- you'll see that many of these are pretty
 11 aligned. Where you see green, you're seeing green
 12 in both places. Where you're seeing red, you're
 13 seeing red in both places. And what's valuable is
 14 where you're seeing differences.
 15 I should also say, we purposefully did not
 16 put school names here because at this point we
 17 really want you to be looking at the usefulness of
 18 the information.
 19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I don't know
 20 whether these particular ones -- but some schools
 21 are K-12, some are -- so is this the K-8 part of a
 22 K-12 school, or just a K-8 school, for example?
 23 MS. BOAST: That's a really great point.
 24 And I think one that ultimately when we get a
 25 methodology document for you together -- in the

Page 19

1 trial run we followed the designation used in the
 2 A-through-F system, which I believe -- and correct
 3 me if I'm wrong -- if they serve high school grades,
 4 they're evaluated under that high school weighting
 5 system.
 6 MS. POULOS: So all kids are included, no
 7 matter what. The way we're calling a K-8 is if they
 8 do not serve any high school students. The way that
 9 we're calling it a high school is they do serve some
 10 high school students. But no matter what, all of
 11 their students are included in the data. So this
 12 school on high schools, a school that could be K-12
 13 or 6-12.
 14 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: It could be K-12,
 15 6-12, 8-12, 9-12.
 16 MS. POULOS: Right.
 17 MS. BOAST: Any questions, any trends
 18 you're seeing? But I'd also just love to know how
 19 useful you think this would be, you know. Is this
 20 what you thought it would tell you?
 21 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Well, for me, I
 22 think that it's a glimpse into stuff that we haven't
 23 been able to see. And we always wonder about
 24 charter schools that don't have a lot of poor
 25 students do very well, and so they're well-balanced,

Page 20

1 and those are weighted down by poor students who are
 2 having to struggle. And it probably doesn't mean
 3 they're not growing. It just means that they have
 4 that larger number of students in that category.
 5 MS. BOAST: And we want you to be able to
 6 answer that question. Are they or aren't they?
 7 MS. POULOS: I think in some ways it does
 8 disturb this idea that if you have a low percentage
 9 of free and reduced lunch students, you're not going
 10 to be good performing, because if you look at line
 11 number 21 on the K-8, their FRL percentage is low.
 12 It's 23 percent. They're a D; right. And then you
 13 go over and you look at this, and with their FRL
 14 students, they're not serving them well; right? And
 15 I think you can see that because they're actually
 16 doing that, quite frankly, with all their students;
 17 right? Which is why it's blending this way. I
 18 think that's really valuable.
 19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I was
 20 actually -- when I saw this, I was actually kind of
 21 pleased, because -- and I think this was a fear of a
 22 number of the charters when they knew that we were
 23 starting to dig into this, that there was going to
 24 be this massive pack at the bottom and they were
 25 going to somehow be exposed and this isn't going to

Page 21

1 work well. And if that had been the case, they were
 2 exposed for the right reason, but there aren't that
 3 many that are at the bottom. You know, I was
 4 pleased with the number of schools that weren't at
 5 the bottom, and this also -- some of these schools
 6 could be SAM schools. So that's a different
 7 consideration, as well. So there may be even fewer,
 8 quote, unquote, more of a traditional charter
 9 because some of these six down here at the bottom
 10 could be a SAM school. And we had said that we
 11 would look at a SAM school in a somewhat different
 12 fashion, that there will be some formula that will
 13 be created for SAMs. So in all likelihood, it will
 14 be less than what's here. I'm assuming that one or
 15 two of these schools have to be SAM schools.
 16 MS. BOAST: And that's something I can
 17 look at during the break so we can --
 18 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So I was kind of
 19 pleased, because I think you're right, I think this
 20 showed that schools that serve more challenging
 21 students, that are better -- in low income areas,
 22 for whatever reason, they can do it and they do do
 23 it. And school -- and there are some schools that
 24 should be knocking it out of the park because they
 25 don't have the other baggage that comes with many of

1 those students. But maybe they're just looking at
2 it and saying, "Well, you should do better,
3 because -- or we don't have to do this because, oh,
4 you have got, you know -- you have got all this."

5 So just because you have or don't have
6 money doesn't mean you can't...

7 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I find it
8 interesting in the high school if you look at
9 graduation rates, and the schools, if you look at
10 number 41 with an F in graduation rate, but at the
11 performance of the student, my question -- it raises
12 a question for me in those cases and the Ds of
13 students who are performing well, why are students
14 not graduating? What's happened here?

15 MS. POULOS: And you have to understand --
16 and we don't have to go into it now -- but we have
17 to understand that the graduation calculation holds
18 the school accountable for every student who has
19 ever come into their school. So we may be doing
20 great with the kids that stay with us, but there may
21 be a population of kids who don't feel welcome or
22 they have left early.

23 MS. BOAST: They have to drop out.
24 Because if they transfer to another school they go
25 to that school's cohort.

1 growth. So again, you'll be able to look at
2 examples. I'm going to pull out a couple of
3 examples first that we highlight in your printout.
4 Let's see. So this school -- on page 8, on the
5 bottom draft. Again, we're looking -- these are two
6 schools that received Fs on both their Q1 and Q3
7 growth on the A-through-F grade. And again, by the
8 colors, you can see that when you dig in, these are
9 two very different stories; right? The bottom
10 school really does appear to be struggling, because
11 kids are not -- except for Q3, the special education
12 ELA is the only one where they're above the special
13 education median statewide average. But otherwise,
14 you know, these students are not showing strong
15 growth compared to peers statewide, whereas the top
16 school -- actually, it looks as though students are
17 growing, which is what you want to see when you're
18 looking at that proficiency versus growth. You
19 know, they may come in far behind, but how are they
20 learning at the school? So this would be a very
21 different picture and maybe different conclusions
22 you would draw when you're reviewing the school
23 results.

24 So we'll refer back to your multipage
25 matrix, but here you would be looking at the Q1 and

1 MS. POULOS: But we still hold them
2 accountable.

3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: For a percentage
4 of all the students.

5 MS. POULOS: For the time they're there.
6 You have to think, why is that? And it may be that
7 the students are lower-performing, aren't feeling
8 welcome at that school, which could be a problem.

9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Or they're leaving
10 early because they're going off to a college program
11 and therefore they haven't graduated.

12 MS. BOAST: It warrants digging in.

13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Because the only
14 way they wouldn't be counted is if they took a GED
15 early to go to college.

16 MS. POULOS: A GED would be counted as --

17 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: As a dropout.

18 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And if you leave
19 because you have been accepted into this fabulous
20 college program, you're leaving early, you didn't
21 graduate that student.

22 (A discussion was held off the record.)

23 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Worth digging
24 into.

25 MS. BOAST: Let's look at the subgroup

1 Q3 grades compared to that big section. So I'd love
2 to just see, again -- sort of give you a couple of
3 minutes to go through, see what you think, and I
4 also would love feedback on whether the bottom
5 25/top 75 is useful or too much information.
6 Because one thing that we could ask of PED is: Can
7 we have an all students disaggregated growth rate
8 and see whether that's available.

9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think for me, you
10 know, the top is important as well, because I think
11 we end up with some schools saying, "Well, we're
12 already up here, so how do you expect me to grow my
13 students any more because we've already hit this."
14 It doesn't mean you can't stop growing.

15 MS. POULOS: It also demonstrates a severe
16 lack of understanding about how we're measuring
17 growth.

18 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. And so I
19 think it's important for those schools that are at
20 the top level to understand that there's still a job
21 to do; that it's not, okay, you have rung that bell,
22 and now they're on their own, because we can't do
23 any more for them; that there's always growth
24 that -- it may not be -- it certainly is easier to
25 show great growth with the lower students than it is

Page 26

1 most of the time with the upper students.
 2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: If we're
 3 comparing when they're doing the -- when you're
 4 comparing the growth of the schools, you're
 5 comparing my score with Katie's score and we had
 6 exactly the same scores the last two years, and this
 7 year I got lower than she did, so my score is lower.
 8 Right?
 9 MS. BOAST: Well, let's make sure I'm
 10 understanding your question. These growth results
 11 start at the student level and are really asking the
 12 question: Is this student making expected growth or
 13 not? Are they above or below?
 14 MS. POULOS: Let me add, because this is
 15 what she's going for, in comparison to their peers,
 16 their performance peers, which is -- that's how we
 17 determine that expected growth.
 18 MS. BOAST: Right.
 19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So it's harder.
 20 MS. BOAST: Can you repeat your question,
 21 though? I want to make sure that --
 22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Maybe. What I
 23 was saying is, because this is always the question,
 24 because it's hard for me to understand it, too, but
 25 what I understand -- and I'm sure I'll be

Page 27

1 corrected -- is that when I look at the growth in a
 2 school who has high-performing kids, I'm still
 3 looking at their first quartile, highest quartile.
 4 And they may go down, because the people who they're
 5 being compared to, whose scores for the last two
 6 years were exactly the same as theirs, these kids
 7 did better than this child did. And that's why the
 8 scores went down? Is that right?
 9 MS. POULOS: So it's not that the scores
 10 go down. Right. You're right. We group kids by
 11 who had the same scores for the last two years. And
 12 we find only looking at this year's scores what was
 13 the average score for that group, which then tells
 14 us how much each kid should have grown, right, the
 15 average amount. And then if they're above that
 16 amount, they have a positive value-added score. If
 17 they're below that, they have a negative value-added
 18 score, which means they didn't get their expected
 19 growth.
 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So it's not a score
 21 to score exactly. It's the average that should have
 22 been the growth. So it's an expected growth.
 23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And it could
 24 have been a negative number, even.
 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes, right.

Page 28

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And they're
 2 still okay.
 3 MS. BOAST: Some students do have negative
 4 growth, but is it more negative than their peers?
 5 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You did well because
 6 you grew less.
 7 MS. BOAST: Yes. That's unfortunate,
 8 but --
 9 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Lyria, you're
 10 asking us to consider the value of subgroup scores
 11 as compared to the value of a whole group score; is
 12 that what you said?
 13 MS. BOAST: No. Thank you for asking that
 14 question. You have here the subgroup growth for
 15 students in the bottom 25 percent and students in
 16 the top 25 percent. Usually when we're looking at
 17 disaggregated growth it doesn't also have this
 18 division of bottom, top. It's just all students in
 19 the school, all of your special education students,
 20 you know, how is their growth. And because growth
 21 is a peer comparison, you're sort of adding another
 22 level of distinction by saying the students in the
 23 bottom quartile, the students in the top three.
 24 It's almost giving you too much additional
 25 information.

Page 29

1 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So what you're
 2 asking us to consider is if we have the data that's
 3 available for the subgroups that we've talked about,
 4 ELL, special education, free and reduced lunch -- do
 5 we need to have the bottom 25 and the top 25?
 6 MS. BOAST: Yes.
 7 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Because by getting
 8 the information on those specific subgroups that we
 9 have been looking at would eliminate our need for
 10 that extra layer.
 11 MS. BOAST: Yes. In a certain sense,
 12 looking at the bottom quartile is -- you know,
 13 accountability systems will do that to try to
 14 identify the most -- achievement gaps, which is what
 15 you're doing by looking at subgroups in the first
 16 place. So it's almost like you're applying two
 17 filters to it. If it's valuable, though, we
 18 certainly can leave -- I just don't want things to
 19 be so overwhelming. It's different to get 12
 20 columns versus six, and if it's not adding that much
 21 information, then it's just more to process and --
 22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: To me that's a
 23 good thing because what I have been looking for all
 24 along is information on the subgroups. The bottom
 25 25 and the top 25 become less important to me if I

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 can look and see how the economically disadvantaged 2 group is doing in comparison, or the ELL group is 3 doing in comparison, or the special ed. group is 4 doing in comparison. That's what I would like to 5 know. I don't need that other. 6 MS. BOAST: You saw value to it. 7 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I see value in the 8 top 25 percent when we're looking at schools that 9 may be looking to, you know, offer a new location or 10 do things. I think we get most of the information 11 from the other subgroups with the bottom 25 percent. 12 I don't necessarily think we get it with the top 25 13 percent. 14 MS. BOAST: Just to clarify, that's 15 looking at the top 75 percent and disaggregated 16 subgroup. 17 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes. 18 MS. BOAST: Okay. 19 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I agree with what 20 she just said in terms of the subgroups. I think 21 that would be very useful, and I'm also wondering if 22 it can be done or -- just as a heads-up, it has been 23 my concern that some schools have a high turnover of 24 students, and I hear it from parents, and I also 25 hear it from some teachers that feel like they're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 still an important question because we know turnover 2 is a very negative -- 3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Does it count 4 the graduation rate on the other side? 5 MS. POULOS: Only if those students who 6 attend your school were there on a date that we took 7 a snapshot, so we're still enrolled, either on the 8 40th, 80th, or 120th day. Only then would they go 9 into the data and they then they could be taken out 10 of the data if they moved out-of-state and it was 11 registered appropriately when they left, such that 12 that's reflected. 13 So again, we have to kind of realize that 14 a lot of this data actually just doesn't get in 15 there. Those challenging populations end up getting 16 taken out of our data completely. They're not there 17 on our PARCC assessment data, so we never see those 18 students that aren't at the school for a full year, 19 which actually goes to a question that I think we're 20 going to talk about later, because some of our 21 schools -- I have started giving you this data -- 22 see upwards of 70 percent of their kids leave within 23 the school year, meaning 70 percent of the students 24 they're getting money to serve aren't being 25 reflected in any sort of system that you get to see</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 getting evaluated unfairly. When I went to school, 2 30, 40 percent of my classmates would change the 3 first semester, and then they would change again the 4 second semester. We had a high number of immigrant 5 families. They would come and go, come and go. And 6 the very poor have to move. I moved every two 7 years, whenever my dad could not pay the rent. And 8 so how much of that has an impact on a school's 9 performance if a student comes in midstream and is 10 not quite up to par. 11 MS. BOAST: So a couple important things 12 to consider there. One, the results that you are 13 seeing actually only include students who are in the 14 school for a full academic year, but you're not 15 seeing those students. But that still has an impact 16 on the school, the school culture, I mean, even if 17 those kids are not included. And so I think the 18 results would look worse if you included them. But 19 that is an important -- just the fact that there's 20 so much turnover impacts school quality. So I'm 21 going to make a note because I want to dig to see 22 what else we could do. 23 But I think you don't need to be concerned 24 about how that's impacting these results, only 25 because it's only looking at the academic but it's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 how well they work with those kids or what results 2 they get for those kids. And so I think it's worth 3 talking about whether we want to figure out how to 4 make sure we get at least some information about 5 those students and what's being done for those 6 students because it's really a large percentage of 7 the population that we don't know anything about. 8 What question was I answering? 9 MS. BOAST: Graduation. 10 MS. POULOS: The graduation rate. Right. 11 So I don't think that is actually having much of an 12 impact on these because, again, if they're moving 13 quickly in and out, they may not even get captured. 14 But then again, they may get pushed out of the data 15 for other reasons. 16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: The data is 17 overwhelming. This is what schools are having to 18 do, in and out and coming and going, and it's like I 19 can't even imagine the amount of errors that could 20 be occurring. And I don't mean intentional. 21 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Because some kids 22 are gone before even all the paperwork is done and, 23 you know, that's a district that -- the school I 24 taught in, you know, the transient population was 25 just phenomenal. We owned the first Trade Center</p>

1 bomber's children, so they were quickly gone after
2 that.

3 MS. POULOS: Lyria, one of the questions
4 that I think I had from this -- maybe this was
5 answered -- was, if we are breaking -- and I think
6 this was answered but I wasn't clear on it -- if we
7 are breaking out students in the bottom 25 percent
8 and looking at it disaggregated and we're doing that
9 for the top 75 percent, do we keep in our framework
10 the aggregated measures from the letter grade system
11 Q1 and Q3, or do we actually take those out because
12 these schools are then being held accountable for
13 those students again? That's a question that I
14 still have.

15 MS. BOAST: A couple of things, and this
16 is going to be important after lunch when we
17 actually look at the weighting and you all go back
18 to your scratch sheets and get to fill them in
19 again. There are a couple of things that are
20 important, I think, to consider there. One is that
21 if you actually have schools with a low number of
22 students in subgroups -- so maybe you have a low
23 poverty school that doesn't have high percentages of
24 ELL and SPED -- if you don't keep the Q1 and Q3,
25 you're essentially not evaluating their growth.

1 having lower weight on this disaggregated component,
2 but if you don't have it, this is the only place you
3 really capture all students in the school. This is
4 going to be an important consideration for you all
5 in terms of weighting, you know.

6 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: And I heard my
7 colleagues hammering away at the lower percentile
8 over and over and over until I understood that some
9 of the high-performing charter schools were either
10 ignoring their students or getting a higher turnover
11 rate of students in that area. But we have to push
12 them to be accountable for that group also.

13 MS. BOAST: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Because it's much
15 easier dealing with the top performers and helping
16 them succeed even more. But if you ignore the
17 bottom where the real work is, you know, that's a
18 bigger challenge.

19 MS. BOAST: Yes. Okay. So important. It
20 sounds like there's maybe some agreement, but that
21 will be important this afternoon.

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Just to clarify
23 in my mind, when you say they have a high percentage
24 of -- I can get a high percentage of ELL or 80
25 percent or something like that. What is the lowest

1 Okay? Because we're only looking at subgroups here;
2 right? By looking at both, you are giving more
3 weight to the growth of students and subgroups,
4 which may be in line with your mission and what you
5 actually think should be done. But those are things
6 to be considered.

7 And the one other thing that will be
8 important to consider is that we know from -- and I
9 can pull that up; I think I have it -- I'm going to
10 go way down to the bottom. We know when looking at
11 statewide for all schools in the state the results
12 on the A-through-F system, right here, this shows
13 each of the A-through-F components, and you have the
14 values for all schools in the state versus your
15 charter.

16 So let's see. Where is Q1? I can't even
17 quite read that. How far over is it? Oh, the
18 highest. It's the fourth set over is the lowest 25
19 percent of students. It's the ones with the great
20 big red bars. So we know that the way that over 50
21 percent of the schools in the state are getting an F
22 on that Q1 bottom thing. So we talked about that
23 being a little bit of a concern in terms of
24 distinguishing performance between different
25 schools. So that almost would be a reason for

1 amount that we are saying are free and reduced
2 lunches or ELL or special ed.? What is that number
3 or percentage?

4 MS. BOAST: The third column on your chart
5 has the FRL percentage. I would have to come back
6 to you with the ELL and the SPED. But you can see
7 that that first 19 percent -- so you have a school
8 that has 20 percent economically disadvantaged
9 students. And you know, if, say, another 10 percent
10 were added, looking at ELL/SPED, you know, it's
11 conceivable that 60 percent of a school could not
12 fall into either of those three categories, so then
13 you would not be looking at growth for 60 percent of
14 the students if you gave no weight to your
15 A-through-F.

16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Someone has to
17 be in the bottom quartile. They have to be.

18 MS. BOAST: Yes. Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Someone's got to be
20 at the bottom.

21 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Not in this
22 state.

23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Quite honestly,
24 I would expect the special ed. kids to be at the
25 bottom quartile. That's why they are in special ed.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 If they were in the top -- now, there are dually 2 exceptional kids. There are kids on the autistic 3 spectrum who might be higher. Clearly they're 4 exceptional, is what I want to say. But in general, 5 they are the kids who kind of plateau. Doesn't mean 6 they can't grow at all, not saying that. But they 7 plateau. 8 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Their growth is 9 small. 10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And it's small. 11 So that's why they're getting special help. It's 12 kind of like, "Duh." So I kind of understand those. 13 But my point is -- and I have said it to many 14 schools -- I get those. I even understand the ELL 15 kids not being as proficient and making as much 16 growth. But there's other kids in there, like the 17 "normal" -- I don't know if you can put quotes on 18 that -- but you know, they are also in that lowest 19 quartile. And there's something not okay with them 20 not showing the amount of growth that they should. 21 Does that sound right? 22 MS. BOAST: Yes. So you would advocate 23 for continuing to see these stats. 24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes. It's so 25 hard. It's just so hard, you know. And of course,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 think the whole reason you're interested in having a 2 subgroup growth evaluation, because these are the 3 schools that have performance that doesn't quite -- 4 when you dig into subgroups, you're getting 5 additional information. You're learning, you know 6 what? If we actually look at the FRL students, 7 they're doing better or worse than the school as a 8 whole. Right? So this is where sort of the value 9 of these measures are. And you can see there are a 10 fair number of schools that fall into them. The 11 majority are aligned with their all-student grades, 12 but you know, this is where you have some additional 13 value or usefulness from digging into these. 14 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And it stands to 15 reason that the majority would, you know, fall into 16 it, but there's always those exceptions. And yeah, 17 I think we need to see those exceptions to make a 18 better decision. I guess the only problem with it 19 is, we wouldn't have that similar information if we 20 were looking at, okay, well, if we decide to close 21 this school, we won't have that information for the 22 school that they could be going to; so that you 23 could say, "All right, this is a better choice or 24 not a better choice," but at least we would have a 25 little bit more information as to what is being done</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 those are my kids. They're on that bottom quartile. 2 Come on, kids. 3 MS. BOAST: Okay. I want to give you all 4 one more view, and I apologize if this is 5 head-spinning, so you can ignore it and look at the 6 school details. But these two charts on page 9 have 7 been flashed up here. 8 This looks a little overwhelming, but 9 basically what this is trying to show is the 10 relationship between what schools received on their 11 A-through-F quartile grades and then where they fell 12 in this subgroup evaluation. So as with the growth, 13 we would sort of expect a fair amount of alignment. 14 So many schools you can -- so the very top right 15 cell on the top chart says 40 percent. And that 16 means that 40 percent of the schools that received 17 an F on their Q3 math growth grade in our analysis 18 were in the bottom quartile. So there was 19 alignment. 20 And then if you look at how many were in 21 quartile 1 or 2, it goes up to 60 percent. All 22 right? So that's sort of -- but what's interesting 23 is it went down to 40 percent of schools that 24 received an F who were above the state median. 25 So what's circled on these charts is I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 at that school. 2 MS. BOAST: Right. That's all the 3 prepared sort of aggregations and tables that I 4 brought for you all for the subgroup proficiency and 5 growth. So I think what you'll need to decide -- 6 and again, when we get to that overall rating, we'll 7 be talking about which of the measures do you want 8 to include, how do you want to weight them, but you 9 know, there is a decision. Do you want proficiency 10 and growth? You know, do you want to have both of 11 those views? Do you think that they're giving you, 12 you know, two views that are valuable? That's a 13 decision point. And then again, they do want to 14 dive into that Q1/Q3. Those seem to be the two 15 really big decision points that you all have. 16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Growth is always 17 important because hopefully it's always going up and 18 not going down. And proficiency in a sense to me is 19 important. I don't believe that all kids are going 20 to be -- or even just test. I don't even know about 21 test, but test proficient on that one day when 22 they're taking that test. But when you have kids 23 who are at the 98th percentile in proficiency, I 24 can't get real upset about not growing. I 25 understand we're comparing them and doing all that,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 but if you're at the 98th percentile in proficiency, 2 I'm not totally concerned about you. 3 MS. BOAST: So I'm just going to have a 4 devil's advocate point. If you have a school that 5 is in a low poverty area and all of the students 6 that enroll are proficient or advanced, you could be 7 giving that school a pass on really having to 8 provide much of an educational program. 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Because they're just 10 letting them, you know, skate. And that's not -- 11 their job is to grow the students to their 12 potential. So that they should be -- you know, it's 13 less -- well, and I can't even say it's less 14 challenging. Because some of those upper percentile 15 kids can be extraordinarily challenging, you know, 16 so it's just a different challenge, so that it's not 17 right -- to me it's not right for a school to just 18 sit on their laurels and say, "Oh, look, all our 19 kids are proficient, so we're okay." 20 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: My youngest son 21 flunked math in middle school. Flunked math. He 22 was supposed to redo math again in the summer. And 23 so I got called in, and I said, "Well, he's going to 24 have to bite the bullet. So what's his grade? An 25 F? How come I didn't get, as I requested,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 now come up with creative ways to grow these 2 students. Yes. And that can be as challenging as 3 taking a look at the lower quartile, because in many 4 cases, there's significantly more material to how to 5 help the lower quartile than there is for the upper 6 quartile. The challenge becomes more, you know, on 7 an individual basis to go and create the material to 8 work with those students. 9 COMMISSIONER CRONE: A lot of our GED 10 students were that type of student. They reached 16 11 and said, "I'm out of here. I'm going to college." 12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Sometimes 13 they're smarter than we are. 14 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Sometimes it's 15 just -- unfortunately it's not challenging because 16 oftentimes at schools, because you're proficient, 17 you're doing well, I don't have to spend any time 18 with you. And in some cases, it's class size, that 19 I only have so many minutes in a day, and this is 20 what I have to do, so my time is focused on this 21 bank of kids because these kids get it, and it's 22 harder. And we have many schools whose mission is 23 to push those kids. So they have to show that 24 they're doing it. 25 MS. BOAST: Great. Well, it's time for a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 monthly -- weekly reports? Because I know my son. 2 And he's very smart and he is trouble." And I said, 3 "Why don't you just send me a letter and be done 4 with it?" 5 "No, because his test scores on the 6 national test put him at the top 5 percent in the 7 nation. So we have a feather in our cap here at the 8 school, but he flunked math." 9 I said, "Well, what are you going to do?" 10 "Well, we have to flunk him." 11 I said, "No, I don't think so. If he had 12 done terrible in the exam, which is proficiency, he 13 didn't grow a darned point all year long, did not 14 grow, but he knew the stuff." And I said, "Did he 15 flunk all the tests?" 16 "No. He never submitted homework." 17 I said, "Okay. And the reports I asked 18 from the teacher I never got, what do we do with 19 that?" 20 And so the two are really, really 21 important, growth and proficiency. The top Q3, Q1. 22 If we want to make our charter schools not just 23 regular schools, but dynamic schools, then I think 24 we need to see all of that. 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: The challenge is to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 break, and then we'll dig into the school-specific 2 goals. We're a little ahead of time, so shall we 3 take a ten-minute break? 4 (Recess from 10:22 a.m. to 10:32 a.m.) 5 MS. BOAST: Let's talk about optional 6 school-specific goals. This time I want to first 7 say that we looked at this as part of the trial run, 8 but very differently than we looked at subgroup 9 growth data, because for the subgroup performance, 10 growth and proficiency, we had data sets for all 11 schools, all schools in the state, we could really 12 run all these analyses. 13 For the school-specific goals, obviously, 14 there are a lot of challenges that we talked about 15 in the last meeting, so I want to first say what we 16 did do in the trial run because it is different from 17 the others. We reviewed the goals and so I'm now on 18 page 11. We reviewed all the goals that are 19 currently written into contracts. And then for just 20 a sample of them, I think it was ten schools, we 21 actually looked at the submitted data. And the 22 rationale here was more aimed toward -- in past 23 meetings I think there was agreement that as part of 24 the developing accountability plan, you all wanted 25 clear guidelines for schools onsetting those goals</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 and some clarity around how that process would work. 2 So really the trial run, I think it's important to 3 think of it as informing that process of your 4 guidance document and your public guidance to the 5 school that will be part of your published 6 accountability plan used during the renewal or the 7 initial contract negotiation. 8 So I'm not going to have charts and I'm 9 going to have some examples just to illustrate some 10 of the challenges. But unfortunately, I don't have 11 the charts so I can show this percentage of the 12 schools met their goals, these didn't. So it's a 13 little challenging now. 14 So let's talk about those challenges 15 overall, and then this is the bottom of page 11, and 16 then we'll look at a couple of examples. So we sort 17 of saw three large categories, and again we spoke 18 about these in August. But it will be good to look 19 at some examples. The first is the consistency of 20 the target expectations. And I think for any 21 authorizer setting mission-specific goals, this is a 22 common challenge. Ideally, you want the targets 23 that you set for a school's school-specific goals to 24 be roughly equivalent; that for one school to meet 25 its target should be equally difficult or show equal</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 do you want to see all students -- and I think it 2 makes sense, especially when you have such high 3 transients to be able to see those two groups of 4 students. But that's the whole thing that I think 5 it would be good for you to have a set policy. 6 Then the second sort of category of 7 challenges is around the data collection. Because 8 there are many different assessments and many 9 different metrics, and I know there has been a lot 10 of conversation about the difficulty in receiving 11 the data from schools, schools being clear on 12 exactly what and when they're supposed to submit, 13 and then effort required in chasing that down, if 14 it's not. And again, you have your multiple schools 15 all with the different things that they need to 16 submit. 17 So again, I think having some clarity or 18 guidelines about exactly what and when they're due 19 and where the low-hanging fruit, I think, are those 20 many schools who have -- NWEA. I know a lot of them 21 had Discovery; that won't be the option. But you 22 know, if you have 40 schools who all are doing NWEA 23 and then you develop a common set of expectations 24 for administering the assessment and reporting 25 results back, that can really go a long way to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 sort of effort and progress as it does for another 2 school. But you are dealing with different targets, 3 different measures, different data, different -- so 4 that is going to be a challenge inherently. But 5 we're going to talk about some ways that you could 6 standardize, especially, for example, many of your 7 schools are using NWEA MAP. If we can move towards 8 having some common performance benchmarks that you 9 can apply to all schools unless there's a clear 10 rationale not to use that, that's going to be 11 helpful. Because what we've seen is that even 12 across schools using the same assessment or 13 measurement, there are different performance 14 expectations represented in the target, which I 15 think makes sense. They have been made over 16 different time periods; there are reasons for that. 17 But we're trying to move toward having more 18 consistency. 19 Then also Katie had mentioned earlier some 20 of the targets, when they do include assessment 21 data, include all students in the school, and some 22 include only those school academic year. So having 23 some conversation and having a more stated 24 expectation and perhaps a policy from your 25 perspective of what students do you want to see, or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 making this a more streamlined process for schools, 2 for staff, and for you as a Commission to be able to 3 actually receive results that you can use. 4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Is that what 5 David was talking to us about? 6 MS. BOAST: Yes. 7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And pulling out 8 his hair? 9 MS. POULOS: Yes. 10 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And we've had the 11 discussion about, is it possible to have the reports 12 to go directly -- you know, instead of having to go 13 to the school and get filtered in, out, or whatever, 14 can, you know, that data just go directly to CSD so 15 therefore, there is no concern about the school, 16 whether they got it there or not; I didn't know it 17 was this way; it's automatically set up so that it 18 goes -- and that if that -- and I know there was an 19 initial conversation that it required some kind of 20 signoff, which I don't think is an issue. And I 21 don't think most of the schools have a problem with 22 doing it, because it eliminates something that they 23 would have to do, and if there can be a conversation 24 then by the technical staff of CSD with NWEA, so 25 that there's clarity as to this is exactly what --</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 how we need it, you know, but I think there was 2 somewhat of a concern that that could potentially 3 add money to the cost of the testing, because that's 4 a different layer for NWEA, so therefore, there's a 5 cost. 6 I had a number of conversations with 7 authorizers at the NACSA conference and they 8 actually pay for testing, you know, which that's -- 9 but if there was some way -- because I don't know 10 what -- when you're looking at all the schools, I 11 don't know what that total cost would be. So I 12 really don't know whether it's an astronomical 13 amount of money or it's a reasonable amount of money 14 to say, "Well, then why can't it be there?" 15 MS. POULOS: Could that cost be something 16 that comes out of -- 17 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Exactly. If it's 18 not, you know, a million dollars, right, if it's a 19 reasonable sum of money, why can't that come out of 20 the 2 percent budget? 21 MS. POULOS: And the challenge is making 22 it limited; right? So then you have to say, "Well, 23 we're going to do this. We want an assessment 24 company rather than 15 different --" 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. Exactly.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 is already two years above grade level and he makes 2 another two years, which isn't unreasonable to say 3 it, actually, and I'm not sure that those -- I am 4 concerned, and I'm glad he's making that two years 5 but I'm thinking we need to distinguish when we're 6 writing those goals that 15 percent of those who are 7 below the grade level, are below grade, have to make 8 those two years' growth. You understand? Does that 9 make sense, what I'm saying? 10 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I understand. Sad, 11 I understand what you're saying. 12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But I was 13 looking back and I thought, Why did I say that? And 14 I agreed to it. 15 MS. POULOS: We've definitely had some 16 discussions about what data the assessment company 17 actually calculates, which maybe then prevents the 18 schools and us from having to redo -- identify -- 19 you know, like, part of the problem is, when we get 20 data from them, there's no identification of who's 21 FAY, but the goal says FAY. So then we have to 22 trust that they have taken out the right kids. We 23 don't have any way to verify that; right? 24 Then we're calculating something that is 25 not data, that the assessment companies calculate so</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 And we've had that conversation to say there's 2 either going to -- maybe we'll hone it down to, you 3 know, this, because it has to be a reasonable number 4 of assessments, only because we have to be able to 5 get the information from those companies as to what 6 is growth, what is proficiency, so that we know, 7 when we're negotiating, we're negotiating in the 8 same language. 9 So yeah. If NWEA was a similar cost, 10 maybe we could say there's one of two choices you 11 have, and that the -- 12 MS. BOAST: And then you can have a common 13 set of performance targets. 14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Get a deal, say 15 we have 62 schools, we're going to do that. 16 I have a comment kind of on what you were 17 talking about, Patty, is, you know, this, like, made 18 us think, if nothing else. But oftentimes when we 19 were doing the performance frameworks, we'd say, 20 "And you must have 15 percent of your kids show more 21 than one year's growth." 22 Remember, we have done that, not all, but 23 some. And what I'm thinking about is, if Patty is 24 three years behind and she makes one year of growth, 25 you say, "Oh, you made that target growth." But Tim</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 then again, you're relying on people who aren't 2 experts on how to calculate this. Is this the right 3 thing to be calculating, et cetera; right? So I 4 think the conversation we've had about how can this 5 actually be workable is by looking at, again, why 6 were we sending certain data but what is the 7 assessment company calculating? Why do they 8 calculate it, what value does it add? 9 MS. BOAST: And can you use those? 10 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And that's a 11 challenge oftentimes with the conversations with the 12 assessment companies, because you call and you get 13 this answer, and then the schools come in and say, 14 "Yeah, but we got this answer." So that, you know, 15 you don't get the same conversation with these 16 companies, so to try to be consistent is very 17 difficult, because they themselves are not 18 consistent. 19 MS. BOAST: So again, I think the end 20 result here -- and not today or even tomorrow, but 21 hopefully by December or January -- is to have a 22 draft sort of set of recommendations that you all 23 can review, go through, and then get feedback from 24 schools on. 25 So we've already touched on some of the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 things. The last category of challenges was just 2 mentioned slightly. In looking through all of the 3 targets, there actually were -- this wasn't a 4 gigantic number, but maybe 5 percent of targets that 5 actually, even if the proper data were submitted, 6 couldn't be evaluated. And again, I know you have 7 many years of things, so that presents an issue. So 8 again, I think standardizing and having exemplars, 9 samples, guidance, hopefully will eliminate that. 10 So let's look at a couple of actual 11 examples and then talk about, you know, what you're 12 comfortable with in terms of directions towards a 13 draft guidance, because I think what I'd like to 14 come out of today with is sort of direction from you 15 as a Commission in terms of what you're comfortable 16 with and not in the guidance one-page documents or 17 however many pages, so we can come back to you with 18 a draft. 19 So the first thing that I wanted to really 20 show is the example, what you have at the top of 21 page 12, which is a target, an example target, that 22 actually shows up in quite a few of your contracts. 23 And I understand the intention behind it, but I 24 think there's some unintended consequences that are 25 good to look at.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I guess the 2 other part of that one was -- and I remember why we 3 did this, so let me be part of the problem and not 4 the solution. But we talked about either the winter 5 or the spring, but if they make it in winter and 6 then they bomb in spring -- 7 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: They have already 8 met it, the way this is written. 9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Exactly. So I'm 10 not sure that they don't need to make -- that we 11 ought to not have just a time that they do that. 12 And I understand that spring is -- not that we 13 haven't been in the classroom. We know how that is. 14 But at the same time, you're impressing upon the 15 kids, Hey, this is important. You have to do it at 16 the end. Because what if they bomb? 17 MS. POULOS: But I also think -- and we've 18 talked about this -- if you take into consideration 19 all the results, that a kid that met it both times, 20 they get a full credit for it. A kid that met it 21 half the time, they get half-credit for it. So 22 that's another way of saying, like, everything is 23 important, and we want to see consistency and see 24 the kids continuing to move in the right direction. 25 And if they didn't meet it and maybe, you know, you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 So here you can obviously see that a 2 school would meet standard if a percentage of 3 students either meet growth or meet proficiency. So 4 again, that's understandable except in that 5 condition that we talked about earlier: What if all 6 the students already were proficient and a school 7 gets credit for meeting this when they didn't really 8 particularly have the students grow at all? 9 That's a concern for me, for us. So I 10 think you all need to sort of consider that. But 11 one recommendation would be to keep those goals 12 separate. If you want to have those, if you want to 13 be looking at those, if you want to be able to look 14 at proficiency on NWEA and growth on NWEA, keep them 15 separate. The nice thing is that the way NWEA 16 reports those school-level reports, they are 17 separate, so you can have a streamlined efficient 18 approach and if you were able to, you know, have an 19 MOU and receive reports directly from NWEA, it's a 20 low sort of demand in terms of staff capacity to 21 aggregate those. It is right there on the report. 22 What percentage are proficient, what percentage met 23 their growth target. So that is one recommendation 24 and something to consider. 25 Any questions on this one?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 wait for the winter lower than the spring, that gets 2 really complicated because it's actually -- you 3 should see better results after a year with the kid 4 than you should after three months with the kid; 5 right? So I think there's some ways for us to think 6 through that. 7 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Is this bottom one 8 your example? 9 MS. BOAST: So the next example -- 10 actually we can move to it. These were two examples 11 that were actually pulled from contracts. Does 12 something look wrong here? 13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No. I don't 14 remember. I must not have been around. I don't 15 ever remember seeing -- and that was my question. I 16 didn't know if this was an example of a suggestion 17 by you. 18 MS. BOAST: No, these are actual. 19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Okay. 20 MS. BOAST: These are actual. 21 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I don't ever 22 remember seeing anything that looked like this, 23 because I don't know what -- yeah, because average 24 student growth, my only concern is: Average student 25 growth of the school? Because if average student</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 growth -- and the average student growth could be 2 less than a year, you know, so that's -- 3 MS. BOAST: A couple really important 4 things here. This could be a very old goal and 5 maybe that's why you don't see it. There are a 6 couple of things to point out here. There's 7 obviously a lot of text. One is that you do have 8 schools -- these are both NWEA examples -- so you 9 got two schools with two different benchmarks to 10 meet. Obviously, you want to move towards having 11 consistency. 12 The one on the left that references 13 average student growth is actually more in line 14 with -- the terminology is actually more in line. 15 And you're not going to want to hear this, but a 16 year's worth of growth, you know, which makes sense, 17 like, did they make a year's worth of growth, for 18 NWEA, a year's worth of growth is making average 19 growth; right? Those targets are making average 20 growth. And I think you would be very concerned 21 because you can make an average growth, meet your 22 growth target, and still be years behind 23 proficiency, and that growth could be completely 24 insufficient to reach proficiency. 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So they're just</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 MS. BOAST: Okay. So this example, 2 obviously, there may be -- I think the one on the 3 right also combines that growth and proficiency. 4 Oh, no, the one on the left has that combination, so 5 that's also got that example. Let's see. I thought 6 that I had one. 7 Okay, I'm going to skip -- I'm sorry to do 8 this to you, but I'm going to skip ahead to this 9 sample goal, and this is on page 14, and then we'll 10 come back in a moment. This is language that was 11 pulled from one of the contracts. So this shows -- 12 there are a couple of things highlighted here. One, 13 this is identifying FAY students. So again, some of 14 the goals have them, some don't. I think it would 15 be good for you as a Commission to decide, What do 16 we want to see and have that be consistent? And 17 then this also is one that is looking at the three 18 assessments. The three administrations of MAPS, 19 spring, winter, and fall. This also combines, I 20 believe, the -- but what I wanted to point out here 21 is that this gets back to that capacity required, 22 because if you truly evaluated this in the way that 23 it's written, staff would have to look at the data 24 sets from the fall, winter, spring, looking at 25 student level data. It's unlikely they would be</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 using the term "average." They're not creating an 2 average. 3 MS. BOAST: What happens is, every 4 student -- and then I'll let you -- so in the NWEA, 5 it's similar to the way we were talking about growth 6 earlier. The NWEA takes a look -- so if a student 7 makes 100 on the fall assessments, they have 8 historical data telling them how all students across 9 the country with a 100 -- where you'd expect them to 10 be in the spring. And that's their target, average 11 growth for students with 100. 12 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So it's not an 13 average of the school or something. 14 MS. BOAST: No, the whole country, and 15 it's an individual target. But it is based on 16 average growth, and the average growth for a kid 17 three years behind could be wildly insufficient to 18 ever get them to proficiency. So this is really 19 about peer-referenced growth and that's what it 20 tells you. So I would move away from that year's 21 worth of growth because it's what everybody wants to 22 know, but really what most growth models are talking 23 about is average growth and is the student making 24 average growth or not. 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Okay.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 able to assess are all the students even who should 2 be on this list here; are they FAY? And then you're 3 having to link, you know, this, and did each of 4 those students -- there's quite a bit of work to do 5 that. 6 If we can move towards a way that you 7 could still perhaps include that winter and the 8 spring but be using the reports already generated by 9 NWEA, that's not going to allow you to get down to 10 the student level; but if you're separating 11 proficiency and growth, you don't need to be looking 12 at each student and saying, did they meet this or 13 that. You can just be looking at percentages of 14 students that met growth target, percentages that 15 met proficiency, and then decide how you're going to 16 weight one or the other. That would vastly 17 streamline your process, make it easier for schools, 18 make it easier for staff, and I think you would then 19 get the results that you want to be seeing. So you 20 lose a little bit in terms of that either/or, but I 21 think it gives you better results to work off of. 22 Again, we want to build out some recommendations and 23 a guidance for you, and I'm sure there will be a lot 24 more conversation. 25 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: You're also</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 saying, which I think is good, that CSD only has so 2 many people and so much time and what do we want 3 them to spend that time on, if they're doing this? 4 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I think 5 initially the expectation was that the school would 6 be doing -- that was the expectation, that the 7 school would be doing it; this wasn't just 8 information that was being, "Oh, here. It's on you 9 now, and you do it." 10 That wasn't what was -- that the data 11 person at the schools would be doing all that work 12 and they would just be transmitting it to CSD. So 13 that's where this became not as cumbersome for CSD 14 because this was supposed to be done at the school 15 level. 16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But it wasn't 17 done at the school level and we don't know how 18 accurate that is, either. 19 MS. POULOS: I think the concern on our 20 part -- and you guys can choose how you want to do 21 this -- we're then relying on schools who are facing 22 accountability, which is hard, to -- we're trusting 23 that data and we're saying we're going to absolutely 24 without oversight, without verification, 100 25 percent, trust this and use this as a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: There you go. 2 So in a way, I hear what you're saying, because in a 3 way, if you have the great goals that you have met 4 from doing NWEA or whatever test we're talking about 5 and they say, "Wow, look all our kids made 6 whatever," the growth, and then you see PARCC scores 7 and they're in the pits, something isn't right. 8 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And that is 9 potentially the only check that you would have, that 10 if they're knocking it out of the park on their NWEA 11 and whatever state assessment is being used, the 12 school is tanking that, you know, there can always 13 be variances, but there's usually not that -- it's 14 like the kid who took the SATs and did really badly, 15 and the second time they take the SATs, they get 16 this bang-up score, they're calling that kid in and 17 saying -- 18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I had a friend 19 who was called in. 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Absolutely. We have 21 kids all the time called in. And I know kids who 22 took -- made a good living taking the SAT tests. 23 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Katie, a question 24 for you, when you talk about score validity. And 25 we're talking about the interim assessment that the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 decision-making tool, which -- and I'm just going to 2 use our most extreme example. That's what the board 3 at Southwest Learning Centers said about everything 4 that Scott Glasrud did. We're just going to trust 5 what he's doing and what he's telling us. 6 And I have a problem personally doing 7 that. When we're talking about an accountability 8 system, it's important to trust and verify, but that 9 "and verify" part is essential and that's where we 10 can't do it. And since my team is the one that 11 checks the box and says this is either met or not, I 12 don't feel comfortable having my team check the box 13 that says yes, this exceeds or meets when we haven't 14 done the work to verify. 15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: What I want to 16 say -- and it's an unfortunate comment I'm making -- 17 but from multiple psychological studies, what it 18 shows is that when you put lots of pressure on the 19 teacher to get the scores up or the school to keep 20 the scores up, they cheat. I'm sorry, but that is 21 the research on that. 22 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No. 23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes. And I 24 think we have teachers going to jail for that. 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: My principal.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 schools are not required to submit those interim 2 assessment results to the PED in any way; right? 3 MS. POULOS: No. So in the past, there 4 was, through NMTEACH, but we removed that and so 5 interim assessments are not submitted to PED. 6 They're not subject to any of PED's accountability 7 requirements for test coordinators or anything like 8 that. 9 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So those are -- 10 the difficulty with that, would Charter Schools 11 Division be comfortable if we go through the process 12 of -- we find interim assessments, that everybody's 13 not giving three different kinds, that results come 14 in three different ways; if we went to the ones 15 that -- if we found ones and we identified them, and 16 then Charter Schools Division had access to those 17 results directly without going through the school, 18 the MOU you were talking about, would that satisfy 19 that validity question that you have? 20 MS. POULOS: I think there's value to the 21 information that they're giving, absolutely, to the 22 school first and foremost. The schools should be 23 using these, and our schools that are doing well on 24 PARCC, actually, we see that they are; right? Like 25 we talk about Mission Achievement and Success and</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 what they do, and they use that data really well. 2 So I think to answer your question, like, 3 in my mind, if I were in Katie's perfect world, 4 right, we rely on what we have from the State and 5 when a school is not meeting the expectations that 6 we have from the state assessments, there's a 7 provision of our law that says, "make substantial 8 progress." So then those assessments could actually 9 be a good way of saying, "Are they making 10 substantial progress, because they're more in real 11 time; right?" 12 That's not the world we're operating in, 13 right? So if we can all get to a place where we 14 have goals that are clear, that aren't what we see 15 here, right -- and I wanted to make the comment on 16 slide 24, page 12, that's why we're pulling our hair 17 out, because they are coming in so many different 18 forms and so many different goals and there's no way 19 for us to verify -- which, again, I want to trust, 20 but I also know if my team is the team saying yes or 21 no, I want them to feel comfortable that they have 22 verified and that they know that they're comfortable 23 writing yes or no. 24 So if we get that clear, we know what 25 assessment, we have access to the data, the goals</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 there could be a discouragement or, you know, 2 certain students not administered, right, because 3 you don't know -- you would not know if everybody in 4 the school at that time -- also, given that usually 5 they're at looking at fall to spring results, you 6 can have a deemphasizing of the task or no 7 preparation on the fall, so that you have a 8 depressed starting point; right? And then also you 9 can have that over. So hopefully, you would not 10 have it, but if there was -- 11 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Ultimately, I want 12 to trust in the professionalism of the schools and 13 say that, you know, there's always going to be those 14 that skirt the system and don't do what they're 15 supposed to do. But I also don't want to tie the 16 hands of everyone else, the majority, for the few 17 that misbehave, and I want to give the credit to the 18 schools and trust that they're going to do what -- 19 because ultimately they're supposed to be using this 20 for their students, and secondary, reporting it to 21 us. So if they're in it for the best interests of 22 the students, then they're not going to be cheating, 23 because that's not going to serve their purpose. 24 But you know -- 25 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And at the same</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 are understandable for all of us, schools and 2 Commission alike, that we're not creating a system 3 where, again, the kid hits the bell once, whether 4 that was a valid one or not, and then the next time 5 they tank, and there's nothing said about that, or 6 done about that, yes, I am comfortable. 7 I do think it's important to think about 8 the weighting, simply because we do know there's in 9 some ways some mismatch. We do know there's a lack 10 of controls on, is the teacher looking over the 11 shoulder and giving some hints? 12 So I think it's important just to weight 13 that and think about how much weight you put on that 14 versus where there is more control over this system. 15 But that's ultimately a decision you're going to 16 have to make. That's what's in my head when I think 17 about that. I do think it's still important and 18 valuable. 19 MS. BOAST: And I want to say, I think 20 that -- I hope this is answering part of your 21 question. There are some ways that you could 22 have -- hopefully, schools are acting in the best 23 interests of kids. But if you had some bad 24 behavior, how that could still work with an 25 administered test and then the MOU coming back is,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 time, I will say that I spoke with a kindergarten 2 teacher, not in the charter school, and DIBELS, for 3 example, so they just gave it the way you're 4 supposed to give it. I don't mean they cheated in 5 how that was given, but they didn't do a lot of 6 help. 7 So in a way, that's gaming the system. 8 But the other side, you actually didn't know what 9 that kid knows and doesn't know. You know, it's 10 kind of a double-edged sword in that sense. So then 11 the second time you gave the test or the third time, 12 whatever -- I don't even know how many times they 13 gave it; three maybe -- there was a little bit more 14 emphasis, like pay attention to this or do whatever. 15 So I can see that as I probably, if my 16 teaching profession were based on that, yeah, and 17 that's what I was saying before, and I'm not sure 18 that's exactly cheating, either, in the same way. 19 But I think that is kind of what you want to do. 20 You don't want to give a lot of help to the kids the 21 first time they take the test because then you don't 22 really know if they're doing it because they -- I 23 don't know. It's so complicated. 24 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm sorry, but I 25 need to go back to make sure I understand. So the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 state-required test, the reported test, the PARCC -- 2 those are the ones that are required to be 3 submitted. What we're talking about with the NWEA 4 or any interim assessment is an optional indicator, 5 which is what you are saying, Katie. And so you 6 already have that level of the state-required and if 7 that assessment is not reflective of success with 8 students, we would have the option of including some 9 sort of data, but you want to be sure that that 10 optionally included data is -- 11 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: The school has an 12 option by statute. 13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yes, I know that. 14 MS. POULOS: And what I would actually say 15 is, yeah, I mean, again in my world, it's like, we 16 don't; right? We only do it to show substantial 17 progress. That's not the world we're in. So the 18 school gets to opt: Do they want to add this? But 19 they don't get to opt year by year. Like, they opt 20 at the beginning -- 21 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: For the contract. 22 MS. POULOS: -- for the beginning of the 23 contract and say, "We want this included." This is 24 something that is part of it. And so then every 25 year when that assessment data comes in, we're able</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 Commission need to have all that in your mind as you 2 think about how much weight you put on that. 3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: The weight is the 4 other thing. 5 MS. POULOS: And I think, too, again, the 6 other things I have told you I have concerns about 7 is either proficiency or growth. Because again, 8 then we're saying those proficient kids don't need 9 to grow. I don't think any of us agree with that. 10 Then we're also saying, "Well, fine, as long as they 11 hit one of the things at one point in time, right, 12 and we don't worry about it at any other point in 13 time." 14 So those are things I just don't like, I 15 don't feel good about it. 16 MS. BOAST: But I think also their 17 approach is, so if you keep those separate, you can 18 still look at proficiency and growth, and then also 19 Katie suggested earlier, perhaps instead of, like, 20 you hit the bell either here or there, you're 21 looking at both the administration. You know, it's 22 more, you know, the winter and the spring, so it's 23 not either/or. But you could be looking at sort of 24 the average of the two or -- 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Or taking a look and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 to get the program honestly at some point to run it 2 for us, validate everything is okay, get it in, and 3 it says either they met the goal, they exceeded the 4 goal, they didn't meet the goal, and then that's put 5 in. 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And that becomes 7 part of the supporting details for their next 8 renewal. There used to be a list. It was long. 9 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I know. I have 10 used NWEA, and this goal that is here is the way 11 that NWEA should be used in the school. And the 12 difficulty -- I mean, if everybody used it this way, 13 we would really be able to -- those RIT scores would 14 show us that average growth like you're talking 15 about. But what we have now is, we have so many 16 different ways of doing it, so if we could 17 standardize that -- and the State has really drawn 18 back on that. But if you had direct access to NWEA 19 as a supporting indicator that would be valid to 20 you, you wouldn't -- it's a supporting indicator. 21 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Partly. 22 MS. POULOS: I just think it -- 23 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: The concern is the 24 administration of it. 25 MS. POULOS: I just think you as a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 saying, "Okay, you did it in the winter. You didn't 2 do it in the spring." So that it's -- you know, you 3 get a couple points off or something because of 4 that. There's ways of looking at it. 5 MS. BOAST: Let's look at the bottom of 6 page 14, because I think this is where we really 7 want to get your input on building the guidance. So 8 in looking at all of the goals and doing this review 9 of them, these are essentially recommendations that 10 we have. So the first says, "Approved goals that 11 augment external evaluations of school performance." 12 We would actually recommend to streamline 13 your process. Right now your framework has a 14 separate mission-specific goal and then additional 15 assessments. If you consider those as a single 16 category, school-specific goals that would be 17 mission-specific and include external, you know, 18 evaluations that augment -- because that almost gets 19 it towards a mission-specific; right? If they're 20 making an argument, "We would like this, it augments 21 our external," they're saying, "This is important to 22 describe the program that we are administering in 23 the school, our quality." 24 But to have one indicator I think would 25 streamline things a bit.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 Second is keeping proficiency and growth 2 targets separate. We talked about that. And we 3 also talked about using a standard set of 4 performance expectations. So it does seem as though 5 in the more recent contract, there has been a move 6 toward that having standard percentages match, so 7 making that more: If you are using NWEA, here are 8 the recommended targets. I think that provides a 9 clarity to schools and also in your process. And 10 there would be a way to look at them as commonly 11 used assessments and have sort of standard 12 performance benchmarks for those. I think that's 13 reasonable and certainly can be done and be backed 14 up by precedent and research for you. 15 The other is, there's a fourth bullet: 16 Use data that do not require substantial additional 17 data analyses. You have already talked about 18 perhaps having a list of recommended "These are the 19 assessments that we would prefer you choose from," 20 and then for those, having in place MOUs or a 21 process, hopefully, that you can receive the reports 22 directly. I would assume that schools would 23 appreciate that, and we've talked about why that 24 would be useful. 25 The next one, limit the number of goals</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 is a one-to-two-page document that really lays out 2 the recommendations, the guidance, and, you know, 3 provides clarity so that, again, when schools are 4 coming into the contract process, it's laid out what 5 your expectations are, and if we can narrow it down 6 to the assessments that you would recommend schools 7 be using and have those performance expectations, I 8 think that that will really streamline your process. 9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: On the 10 New Mexico DASH that we've sort of been taught, what 11 is that based on? The PARCC? When schools are 12 going to look at their lowest-performing students, 13 where did they get those lowest-performing students 14 from? The PARCC? Is that where they're getting 15 them? Or is it, like, from the NWEA? 16 MS. POULOS: DASH is an improvement system 17 that's really helping schools target and understand 18 the continuous improvement cycle. They're supposed 19 to do things like convene a team that's 20 representative of all the right parts of the school, 21 the right levels at the school, and the district. 22 Targeting on looking at where are they successful 23 and where do they need to grow. 24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: How do they know 25 that? How do they know where they're successful?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 per school. I know that you need to doctor -- some 2 of them had up to five, six. You know, I think 3 really encouraging them what are the most important 4 goals. There may be times you have to have five, 5 but encouraging a fewer number that really get to 6 the most important parts. 7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: What number were 8 you thinking about? Three? 9 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Two or three. 10 MS. BOAST: I certainly think more than 11 two or three, you're getting -- 12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: For academics. 13 MS. BOAST: For academics, right. That 14 still is a lot, but some of them also are divided, 15 ELA and math. I think those really could be almost 16 combined into a single target or goal or 17 expectation. 18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: They seem to be 19 different. 20 MS. BOAST: But you would still look at 21 them differently, but essentially you're saying 22 whether they're NWEA scores. 23 And then the final is more a process 24 setting clearer reporting expectations, exact 25 deliverable and the timing. So what we're imagining</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 MS. POULOS: They get to make that choice. 2 That's a choice they make. We ask them to use valid 3 and reliable data and they need to make that case, 4 but the schools are really -- it's not us saying, 5 "You have to do it." It's, again, a system to help 6 people understand what continuous improvement cycles 7 are. 8 MS. BOAST: So they could use Istation or 9 NWEA or any other option. 10 MS. POULOS: Yes. Or graduation rate data 11 or attendance data or discipline data. We're not 12 telling them what to do. We're asking them to be 13 thoughtful educational leaders about what's 14 happening in their building, what sources of data 15 they have, so we're not telling them, "You do this 16 or that." 17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, I'm asking 18 that because of a couple reasons. One is just 19 reading the renewal apps, well, we are going to -- 20 we met to make reading a priority. And that's fine. 21 That's a good idea. But what data are they using to 22 say that they need to make reading a priority on 23 Lyria? 24 MS. POULOS: They have to be thoughtful 25 educational leaders. They have so much data, you</p>

Page 78

1 have so much data. And if you are not being a
 2 thoughtful educational leader, you're not going to
 3 do well even if you use DASH. So they have to be
 4 thinking -- and the push of DASH is to think, What
 5 is the root cause? A lot of our schools can't get
 6 past conditions to root causes. They're confusing
 7 and conflating those two things rather than saying,
 8 what is the cause for us as adults in what we are
 9 doing in this building, right, and that could be
 10 their first piece is: Our discipline is out of
 11 control; and our root cause is: We haven't
 12 established discipline expectations as a school and
 13 we haven't held our teachers accountable for that.
 14 Right?
 15 So then that's very different data from
 16 setting a goal as a reading goal; right? They have
 17 to be those thoughtful educational leaders to look
 18 at what is the world of data that they have, what is
 19 it telling us is their highest priority right now,
 20 focus in on that, get it to a good place, take your
 21 data and say, "Okay, now what's our new highest
 22 priority?" Focus on that, focus in, get it going
 23 the way it should, make sure nothing slid on the
 24 other one, go back to your data, say, "Okay, now
 25 what's our third highest priority?"

Page 79

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I guess I'm
 2 thinking that my school has difficulty with math,
 3 and that's probably most of them. And I could be
 4 right there with them. But anyway, so why am I
 5 having -- why are these students not doing as well
 6 as I would expect with the instruction that's being
 7 given? And the first thing could be: You know
 8 what? The discipline in this room is, like -- it's
 9 so chaotic they can't possibly learn. So I would
 10 work on discipline first, and how I understood that
 11 the kids are needing more help in math would be from
 12 some score. I would think it would be because it's
 13 data that's right there, NWEA or Scholastic or
 14 whatever they use, or it could be the PARCC. But
 15 the PARCC is not until the end of the year and
 16 you're doing something in January. The PARCC was
 17 from last year, so you would need some sort of
 18 ongoing data and that's how -- that's why I said --
 19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You would hope.
 20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That would be
 21 true. I would hope. I'll add that to it. So
 22 that's why I have been saying, well, if they're not
 23 doing -- it's for their protection and maybe
 24 edification to have an ongoing assessment that shows
 25 you not only that they're not doing well in math but

Page 80

1 what areas in math they're not doing well in. It's
 2 the geometry section, it's the calculation system,
 3 whatever. I don't know. But they're asking that.
 4 So if we don't require them to do some sort of
 5 something --
 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Well, we're not --
 7 this is an option. We're not requiring them to do
 8 this. This is a school saying, "I want to do this."
 9 MS. POULOS: And you shouldn't. Let's go
 10 back to being charter schools. Charter schools have
 11 autonomy. The second you say, "You must do a short
 12 cycle assessment," you're taking their autonomy
 13 away. They as school leaders may decide it's valued
 14 and make that choice, and that's how they're going
 15 to do well. But if they can do well without it
 16 because they do something else, you should let them
 17 do that.
 18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So then they can
 19 choose whatever they want to do.
 20 MS. POULOS: Or not do.
 21 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Within the framework
 22 of their school, yes. Outside of the contract, if
 23 they choose to do an assessment, they could
 24 certainly do that. But if they choose to put it
 25 into the contract, then they're obligated to do it.

Page 81

1 They can't --
 2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I don't know why
 3 they would choose to do that, then.
 4 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: You have schools
 5 that are doing very well without DASH and they have
 6 been doing that. DASH is recent. And so the option
 7 for DASH is those that really have to do something
 8 systematically, because it's not part of their
 9 school culture to get there. But some schools are a
 10 school culture where the teachers, the principal,
 11 parents, are all in sync for some stuff that they're
 12 doing and they don't need DASH.
 13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And some schools
 14 believe that they can give us a better snapshot of
 15 their school by doing this as opposed to just
 16 relying on the statewide assessment. So that's
 17 their choice, because it's part of their autonomy.
 18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Or they could
 19 choose only to base their evaluation on PARCC.
 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: The challenge I
 21 think still is those schools that have missions that
 22 become difficult to quantify in an assessment, and
 23 that becomes the challenge. It really does.
 24 Because NWEA doesn't necessarily give you a snapshot
 25 of a school who's focusing on art, you know? It's

Page 82

1 great that they're doing this, and certainly the
 2 academic is important. But to find that challenging
 3 measure so that we can feel comfortable that they
 4 are fulfilling their mission, which is in addition
 5 to the academic component, but that they were
 6 authorized because they made this promise that
 7 they're going to do this; and how can we adequately
 8 and accurately assess that, yes, they're doing that,
 9 and --
 10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Do you think
 11 it's more difficult if a school says, "Our goal is
 12 to make -- to have students be ready for career or
 13 for post secondary education"? That's a harder
 14 measure than to say they will all participate in a
 15 dance or a media.
 16 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Well, we've had
 17 schools that wanted to track that their students --
 18 to show that they were college-ready, we want to
 19 show you that two years out they're still in
 20 college. Okay. How are you going to show that? So
 21 that it becomes a challenge because you can't --
 22 those records are very, very difficult.
 23 MS. BOAST: Do you have National Student
 24 Clearinghouse coverage here?
 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.

Page 83

1 MS. BOAST: There you go.
 2 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: No, I don't think
 3 so. Do we track our students? I have been asked,
 4 and I hear --
 5 MS. BOAST: Well, wait. Do you all get
 6 National Student Clearinghouse? Okay.
 7 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: We do. Every high
 8 school in the state.
 9 MS. BOAST: Oh, perfect. Then they should
 10 be able to track that. I would actually love to get
 11 any -- this obviously needs a lot more conversation,
 12 and so I would love to get any feedback; either
 13 you're missing something or doesn't work in terms of
 14 those bullets and recommendation, because I would
 15 like to move into the rolling up and the weighting.
 16 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: The only thing
 17 that I look at this for things like drama and dance,
 18 I have done both, but maybe we can put in there a
 19 recommendation from our group to identify -- or we
 20 identify a person that's well-versed in drama,
 21 dance, to come and give their evaluation of overall
 22 what they're doing. Because --
 23 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You mean we would
 24 send --
 25 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: An evaluator.

Page 84

1 Let's say a consultant in that area to come and say,
 2 well --
 3 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Except the PEC
 4 itself, we don't -- we do not do compliance
 5 ourselves. So it would be challenging for us to do
 6 it. Like if you went into a school, we don't do
 7 compliance checks. So I think it would be
 8 challenging for us to send someone in because we're
 9 basically sending --
 10 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: With the school
 11 sending --
 12 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: -- to do a
 13 compliance check.
 14 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Have somebody --
 15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's hard to
 16 measure dance. Do they dance well?
 17 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And we have had
 18 these preliminary discussions and they have never
 19 gone anywhere, of really sitting down with those
 20 schools that have the more challenging missions, and
 21 having -- you know, really trying to iron out how
 22 can this be done, and talking with folks from all
 23 over the country. It's the most challenging thing
 24 to do, is to, you know -- you -- I have not been
 25 able to find an adequate measure that any other

Page 85

1 state even uses.
 2 MS. BOAST: That's an interesting and
 3 efficient way; have an expert evaluate. And I think
 4 the challenge would be the evaluation criteria would
 5 have to be written into your contract --
 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.
 7 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: So the school
 8 will know. But it's not difficult to evaluate that.
 9 Or drama. It is not. I was in a dance group and we
 10 did folkloric dance in college and we had the
 11 University of Mexico City send their folkloric dance
 12 group, and we did better than they did and we were
 13 all Mexican-Americans. These guys were Mexican.
 14 And so even their instructor said, "You guys are
 15 awesome. If I could get my guys do to do that," and
 16 they're Mexican. But it can be done.
 17 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I just think by us
 18 it can't be. Because we're not -- we're the PEC.
 19 We're not the compliance side of it. So it would be
 20 challenging for us to do that. But I think there's
 21 certainly conversations that have to take place to
 22 come up with a pathway to figure out these more
 23 unique missions.
 24 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I think these
 25 seven recommendations that you made lend themselves

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 to the conversations we're having at all levels in 2 many ways, because this gives us -- these 3 recommendations give birth, to me, that thought that 4 takes them to the next level, that gives us 5 rationale in evaluating. That is, that we can 6 support and that's what's important for the 7 school-specific goals, is that we be able to address 8 them, that the school be able to present that 9 information, that Charter School Division brings 10 forth that data, and then we have something to base 11 our decision on concretely. This I think for me -- 12 this is good.</p> <p>13 MS. BOAST: So what we will do in terms of 14 just drafting is, again, a one-to-two-page 15 recommendation that then will, I'm sure, have a lot 16 of additional conversation. But I think we'll try 17 to do that as quickly as possible, so that you can 18 grapple with some of these issues, because you'll 19 need this in the spring; right? Okay.</p> <p>20 Terrific. So we have half an hour until 21 lunch. I would love to start into the rollup 22 conversation; you know, how do we get to this 23 overall rating? Because I think it actually might 24 be good to give you some time to think through 25 things while you're having lunch.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 and these could be schools that would be eligible 2 for an expedited renewal, if you decide to have that 3 in your performance, in your accountability plan and 4 process.</p> <p>5 Tier 2. This might be a large group of 6 schools or not, but they are schools that are 7 meeting your expectations. You do not see the need 8 for intervention or revocation. These are clearly 9 meeting expectations. Right?</p> <p>10 Tier 3 would be schools that are showing 11 weakness on more than just a single indicator or 12 measure; you know, have some concerns. They likely 13 would be ones that entered an intervention plan or 14 process in your accountability plan. So these are 15 schools that may be headed on a downward trajectory 16 that you want to catch early, that you want to 17 highlight. It allows you to have conversations with 18 schools and initiate interventions where possible.</p> <p>19 Distinguished from that, tier 4, which are 20 schools that are consistently across many indicators 21 falling in the lowest -- on par with the lowest 22 schools in the state or other options. These would 23 be in your intervention plan that you have talked 24 about having in your accountability document, and 25 would also be schools that would be possibly</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 In both the June and August meetings with 2 you, we heard consensus around the use of an overall 3 academic rating and the reason for that, so this is 4 a bit of a review, but to clarify your monitoring 5 and renewal process and also to provide clarity to 6 schools so that there's some clarity about how 7 renewal decisions are made and send -- so by the way 8 that you categorize or do that overall rating, 9 schools are clear where they stand. It's not a 10 surprise when they come to renewal that, "Oh, we may 11 be shut down." They have a good sense of what's 12 happening.</p> <p>13 And then also we heard very clearly from 14 you that you do not want this to stigmatize or label 15 schools. So you know, the way it's communicated and 16 the way needed to be one that felt more of a support 17 and a clarification as opposed to a pejorative or 18 punishing.</p> <p>19 So we also had talked in August about what 20 that overall rating would look like, how many 21 categories would be useful, what would be the 22 purpose of those categories. So at the bottom of 23 page 16, you have the tier, the idea of tiers. So 24 tier 1 being the highest-performing schools, the 25 schools that really are exceeding your expectations,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 nonrenewed or even in the middle of a cycle could be 2 subject to revocation if performance was of a large 3 enough concern.</p> <p>4 So again, this is meant to be tied to your 5 oversight action; right? So that if a school is 6 tier 3, hopefully they would be initiating 7 conversations with you about, "What do we need to 8 do?" or what concerns, and it provides clarity, 9 again, for schools.</p> <p>10 This is what came out of our last 11 conversations. Any concern about the language 12 that's used here?</p> <p>13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: My only concern is 14 that this language only addresses academic, and to 15 me it has to be an -- they can be banging out of the 16 park on academic and their financial reporting is 17 falling; that it has to be overall language that 18 covers each of the areas so that they're not 19 blindsided because they have a revocation because 20 they're in financial reporting problems, and it's, 21 like, "Well, I didn't know that."</p> <p>22 So I would prefer that this language be 23 all-encompassing for indicators; and that's 24 academics, financial, and organizational. And that 25 there be language in there at least between -- that</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 maybe with two -- like -- well, no, tier 2 is kind 2 of okay. But at least with tier 3, or -- let me go 3 back. 4 Tier 2, there is a likelihood that there 5 may be a letter that goes out, because it's saying 6 that they're consistently meeting but there may be 7 an area where they're not meeting. So that a letter 8 goes out, you know, like an advisory letter, you 9 know, because they're not performing, or through 10 DASH or something, that we know that there's proof 11 that there has been communication that they're 12 behind somewhere; you know, they didn't meet. So 13 that communication is there. 14 But at least if they hit tier 3, then I 15 think there has to be a formal notice to the 16 school -- and they need to be clear on that -- that 17 you have hit tier 3, and you have to provide the 18 plan for how you're going to fix this and a timeline 19 for when it's going to be fixed. And then you'll 20 drop back to tier 1 if it's been -- sufficient 21 information has been provided. And maybe we did 22 that, but here we didn't get it in time, so that 23 there's an acknowledgment that, yes, we received 24 this, this is how it already has been fixed, but we 25 know that they're off that step. But I think there</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 concerned about. That's very, very important. 2 And it stayed in my mind, I once had an 3 LFC meeting where a senator was very emotionally 4 distraught because his son said, "Dad, our high 5 school went from A to this year -- I'm a senior, and 6 it's an F. How am I going to be able to go to 7 school at this college, which is my target, coming 8 from a school that has an F?" 9 And so he looked into it and it wasn't the 10 grades. It was all this other stuff that brought it 11 down to an F. And so he was so concerned that he 12 says, "That stuff about A, B, and C should go out 13 the window." 14 And at that point, I realized, yes, 15 there's got to be some more things that we look at. 16 And so I want to be able to say, "Let's keep this 17 the way it is, so that teachers and students know 18 that if they're performing well in academics, it is 19 shown." 20 If governance is screwing up, governance 21 has to face it. If the finance department is 22 screwing up, they have to face it. And maybe a tier 23 1 school is a tier 4 if that's what you want to keep 24 it, over here, and we're looking at intervention. 25 Well, parents, students and teachers know</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 has to be clarity as to what the communication is 2 going to be to the school at that step. 3 MS. POULOS: So I'm trying to -- 4 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: While you 5 think -- 6 MS. POULOS: Would it be like -- indicator 7 by indicator, they're hitting a tier 1, 2, 3, or 4, 8 and then we roll that up to all indicators; right? 9 But our overall look is, if any one indicator is a 10 tier 3 or 4, they do receive notice: We're 11 concerned about this. And so maybe they're a tier 2 12 overall, but it's because a single indicator is tier 13 3 or 4, and that's why a tier 2 might receive a 14 notice to say, "Hey, you're good overall, but please 15 make sure that you focus in on this area." 16 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes. Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: My concern is, I 18 want to get away from -- and I'm looking at this; 19 this is why this is beautiful, in that if we look at 20 a school with a D or an F, that's not the complete 21 picture. And we're looking at everything else, but 22 if we lump everything else into this, I'd rather, 23 for the sake of teachers and students, primarily 24 students, we keep this separate and we devise 25 something else for all the other stuff that we're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 that it's not their performance that we're 2 evaluating, because once you go to public, the only 3 thing that stays is that one A, B, C, or D and we're 4 stepping away from that here. So we need to step 5 away from it because this is clean, this is really 6 nice, and if I were to send my son to a school, I 7 want to know whether I need to help out, as a 8 parent, with some of the stuff or I need to get a 9 tutor for my son, or I need to pull him out. 10 Because the most important thing to me is academics, 11 not governance or not finance, but that's important 12 to government, which is us. 13 And so I think that when we heed the point 14 of view for teachers and students and parents, we 15 should keep this clean on academics, and then do 16 another one on everything else. Maybe not calling 17 it tier 1, 2, or 3. Maybe call it something else. 18 I don't know. 19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Carlos, I want 20 to make sure I'm understanding what you said. And I 21 see your point. First of all, I'm not sure that 22 colleges look to see what your high school was, but 23 maybe they do. I don't know. But anyway, we're 24 looking at academics. I see that. That's what this 25 one is reflecting. But then there's also something</p>

Page 94

1 that we ought to be looking for, organizational, and
 2 financial, so they'd almost have three things,
 3 because most of the time that we actually close a
 4 school, it's financial or that they don't have
 5 enough students. We've closed some who were F
 6 schools.
 7 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: All of that is
 8 administration.
 9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Not always.
 10 Sometimes it's all the way across.
 11 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We haven't closed a
 12 school --
 13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: For a while.
 14 MS. POULOS: If I can jump in, what I'm
 15 thinking -- and I think I agree with all three -- we
 16 would have an overall rollup for the academic
 17 performance, and that would be tier 1, 2, 3, or 4 on
 18 your academic performance grade mark. And then
 19 separately we would also want to roll up on our
 20 organizational framework, which would be your
 21 organizational frame, you're either a tier 1, 2, 3,
 22 or 4 organizational. And then also for your
 23 financial, you'd be a tier 1, 2, 3, or 4. So then
 24 they would all be separate. What you're saying is:
 25 "I don't want only to do this for academic," which I

Page 95

1 agree with.
 2 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.
 3 MS. POULOS: And I think the reason that
 4 Lyria only has it for academic is because today
 5 we're talking about academic.
 6 MS. BOAST: Yes.
 7 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: This all has to go
 8 into a single contract that has to be clear for the
 9 schools so that it provides clarity for them for not
 10 only how they have to report, but how they're going
 11 to be notified so that they're not blindsided by,
 12 "Oh, by the way, you're on the agenda because
 13 there's a revocation hearing," so they know that
 14 there is opportunity, most of the time, for them to
 15 be able to fix it. You know, there's always that
 16 clarifying sentence at the bottom that you can go to
 17 tier 4 immediately because this -- you know,
 18 something happens. It's not a guarantee that this
 19 is going to be a progressive stage. You can, you
 20 know --
 21 MS. BOAST: Most authorizers do -- not
 22 that it matters, because you can do what is the best
 23 here -- but do keep them separate.
 24 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I didn't mean --
 25 with respect. And overall, this is the one thing.

Page 96

1 But it has to be -- there has to be for each of the
 2 pieces. Well, each of the pieces of the contract.
 3 MS. POULOS: And I don't think -- and I
 4 will say, I would not want to have one overall, and
 5 I don't think anybody here is proposing that we have
 6 one overall rating, because those three areas do
 7 have to be evaluated separately and it is impossible
 8 to roll them up into one.
 9 MS. BOAST: Jumping ahead a little bit,
 10 the piece of the project after establishing how we
 11 deal with academics is to finalize the
 12 accountability plan document. We've been referring
 13 to that -- I don't know what you'll name it -- but
 14 which is the document that lays out for schools and
 15 for your internal process, Here's how we are going
 16 to consider the academics, the financial, the
 17 organizational, and how it will play into our
 18 renewal position.
 19 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I was just going to
 20 say that in the cases where the academic is related
 21 to the teaching rather than the students, because
 22 you can have poor performance academically because
 23 of poor academic delivery versus a student who is
 24 just not up to par. I'm looking at students and I
 25 look at RFK, and I know that's not one of ours; it's

Page 97

1 an Albuquerque charter, but they're taking students
 2 that were failing in APS, that dropped out and
 3 everything. So they can have very good teachers and
 4 everything and maybe the students still aren't going
 5 to do well. You still wouldn't go in and
 6 necessarily close them. Even though they may be
 7 tier 4 academically, you may not close them.
 8 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. And that's
 9 that, you know --
 10 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: You have to weigh
 11 everything.
 12 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.
 13 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I have to run.
 14 (Commissioner Robbins left the meeting.)
 15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Four is not a
 16 magic number for organizational and financials. I
 17 don't know, like, you -- oh, \$700,000. It doesn't
 18 have to be four. Four is not a magic number.
 19 MS. BOAST: Typically 3 is the more
 20 typical, because I think in the compliance or
 21 organizational and finance, it's more you want to
 22 know they are meeting our expectations, we have
 23 concerns, or we have very large concerns. Usually
 24 you see three.
 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We have looked at

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p> <p>1 that language with them that it's not as much 2 working to meet, meeting; that a lot of it is a yes 3 or a no. 4 MS. BOAST: Exactly. 5 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: They're doing it or 6 not doing it. There's not a lot of middle ground in 7 some of the areas with the financial and the 8 organizational so that -- yeah. It may not look 9 exactly like that. 10 MS. BOAST: Exactly. But we'll need to 11 tie it together. Great. 12 So in terms of -- so we mocked up, you 13 know, an aggregate rating. Let's talk about 14 decisions. To get from the indicators that we 15 looked at, you know -- so your printout, to get from 16 all of this to one of 4 tiers, there are two things 17 you really need to decide in terms of how you will 18 do that. 19 So we're on page 17. One, you need to 20 decide how each of the indicators will be weighted. 21 Are they all going to be the same? Are some more 22 important to you than others? And we will talk 23 about that in detail in a moment. 24 And then the second question is: Where do 25 those sort of benchmarks for each of the tiers need</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p> <p>1 examples. 2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I have a 3 clarification. What we're looking at is K-8. 4 MS. BOAST: What you see here is there's 5 an option 1 for K-8, an option 2 for K-8, and then 6 we only ran one option for high school. Okay? So 7 I'm going to give you two pieces of paper. One has 8 these options, and you're actually going to be 9 giving feedback on this, so you'll notice that. 10 (A discussion was held off the record.) 11 MS. BOAST: So what you can do now is you 12 can just tuck away that first multicolored handout 13 that you received, because the new one that you have 14 has all of that same information but two additional 15 columns on the far right, which shows the option 1 16 and option 2, what each school would, you know -- 17 which tier they would land in, given the approach 18 that we used. You know, the tests that we have. 19 Okay? 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I like the first 21 colored one better than this one. Because this one 22 is like, "Crap." 23 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I'm still 24 confused. I'm sorry. For the high school, we don't 25 have option 1 and option 2.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p> <p>1 to be? And this is really why it's important to 2 think, you know, what is the performance that you 3 need to distinguish in that highest and lowest 4 category? Because the way that -- you can move 5 those so that more or fewer schools are there, and 6 it really depends on what you want to be capturing 7 there. 8 Okay. So in order to give you just some 9 examples to work with, we ran two sets of weights, 10 and this is that weighting option on the bottom. 11 The first was heavier on growth. So it has -- 55 12 percent of those measures that cover growth, 13 subgroup growth, school level growth, you know, had 14 50 percent of the weight. 15 Option 2, there was more weight on the 16 proficiency measures. So graduation rate, 17 proficiency for all students, and then proficiency 18 for students in subgroups. 19 And we looked at -- these two options were 20 applied to the K-8 schools. For the high schools we 21 didn't have that distinction because there's more of 22 a focus on the graduation, the college and career 23 readiness. 24 So I'm going to show you the two options 25 that we used. And again, these were to show you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 MS. BOAST: Exactly. I'm sorry. On the 2 high school side, you'll notice that the results are 3 all the same in the two columns. It's just a 4 single. 5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's not two 6 options. I can breathe now. I'm good. 7 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I wonder if the 8 schools that are in tier 4 are the same schools -- 9 okay. Thanks. 10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And these options 11 that we're looking at now for K-8, these weights, 12 you're going to define the different approaches to 13 determining the weights. Those are the options. 14 MS. BOAST: Yes. So now it's useful to -- 15 you'll have the two, because this sheet shows you 16 the option 1 and the option 2. So I think what 17 would be useful is if you have your K-8 page, the EL 18 color page, and you have those two columns that say 19 option 1 and option 2. So option 1 has a 30 percent 20 weight on proficiency and then all of the different 21 growth measures combined, 30, 40, 55 percent on 22 growth. 23 So if you take an individual school, you 24 should be able to sort of see, like, oh, yes, 25 they're doing better on the growth. So in many of</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 these years you're getting the same tier, no matter 2 how you look at it. But where you see differences, 3 it would be because the school has higher or lower 4 proficiency or growth. 5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And these 6 different weights, are they based on -- how did you 7 come to those? How did you come to the option? 8 MS. BOAST: To these options. So we 9 looked at -- this also shows what the current weight 10 within the A-through-F system is. So in option 1 11 this is the one that has a higher growth weighting. 12 In the past -- 13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Look on page 17. 14 MS. BOAST: So option 1 has that higher 15 weight on growth, and so what we did was to -- this 16 is where you all are going to have to say, We agree 17 with this or we don't." 18 But for that option 1, we put a 20 percent 19 weight on the disaggregated A through F grade for 20 current standing, and then 10 percent for subgroup 21 performance, subgroup proficiency. That could be 22 something that you said, you know, no, those should 23 be equal or one should be higher. But you know, 24 that was how we weighted them. 25 And then for the growth measures, we put</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 standing has 40 percent. The subgroup proficiency 2 has 10, and then you have a lower weight on the 3 growth measures. Again, you know, you have these 4 empty columns on the right because we're going to 5 want your feedback here on what you think ideal 6 weight should be. 7 I'm going to show you some graphs that 8 show how the two options come out, but before we 9 kind of dive into that, any questions on this? What 10 do you think about the number of schools that are 11 falling into each of the tiers according to this? 12 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Wow. 13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I know. 14 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Proficiency is 15 very elitist in elementary school. It is quite 16 elitist. We have one school -- 17 MS. BOAST: Yes. 18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: -- that's tier 1. 19 But maybe that's the way it's supposed to be. Is it 20 a bell curve? 21 MS. BOAST: No, because we're looking only 22 at charter schools, and much of this is based on 23 that statewide comparison. So it feels as though 24 there could be more -- you also only have two 25 elementary schools that received an overall</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 15 percent weight on the value-added A-through-F 2 grade, just 5 percent on the Q1 and Q3 disaggregated 3 growth rate. You may decide you think they need 4 more, you know, higher weights, but we gave quite a 5 bit of weight to the subgroup growth performance. 6 So this option is really valuing that subgroup 7 growth quite a bit. 8 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Is that written 9 down somewhere that I'm not looking at it? The 10 numbers you're saying? 11 MS. BOAST: Yes, that page. 12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I saw that, but 13 she was using more numbers. It's this one. 14 MS. BOAST: Here's option 1. This shows 15 subgroup growth, and then this is then corresponding 16 to these values. Okay? 17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Thank you. 18 MS. BOAST: You need to take time, look at 19 these. Yeah. 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Thank you, God, I'm 21 not color-blind. 22 (A discussion was held off the record.) 23 MS. BOAST: So then option 2 has a much 24 higher weight on proficiency. So if you're looking 25 at the option 2 column, again you see that current</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 A-through-F grade. The intention here is to include 2 more considerations, so it could be that you feel 3 this needs to be more inclusive in that tier 1. 4 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Option 2 puts more 5 schools in tier 4 also. 6 MS. BOAST: Yes. 7 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But what I don't 8 know yet is whether I think that's a good thing or a 9 bad thing. That could be a -- rigor is what we're 10 after. 11 MS. BOAST: Right. So for that, an 12 interesting school to look at is number 23 on the 13 K-8 page. So if you look at school 23, it received 14 a D grade, and if you scroll across, you see there 15 are quite a few greens. Their top 75 percent of 16 students in subgroups are actually doing well above 17 the state average. That's what gives them a tier 3 18 in option 1. Right? But because option 2 is more 19 focused on proficiency, they wind up in tier 4. 20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And their bottom 21 25 percent are not being nearly as successful as the 22 top 75 percent. 23 MS. BOAST: Exactly. It's a balancing 24 act; right? That's why we want you to know, this is 25 more important to us than this, or -- all right.</p>

Page 106

1 Now, not to throw more at you --
 2 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: But.
 3 MS. BOAST: Don't look at the screen if
 4 that seems confusing. But similarly to when we were
 5 looking at the subgroup, whether you're looking at
 6 option 1 or option 2 or the high schools, many of
 7 the tiers ratings are pretty well correlated with
 8 the overall grade that they received on the state.
 9 So many of them. Where it gets interesting is where
 10 they don't. You know, again, that's what tests --
 11 like, how much additional information is this
 12 providing you? Right? So you don't have any A
 13 schools in tier 4 or F schools in tier 1. But what
 14 you do have are these additional measures that are
 15 making, for example, a D school a tier 2 in some --
 16 so you're usually only seeing a shift of one up or
 17 down, but that's where I really want your feedback.
 18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Can you say that
 19 one more time, please, so I can read this chart?
 20 MS. BOAST: What this chart is attempting
 21 to answer is how much are tier results aligned with
 22 the A-through-F. So this shows you, if you look
 23 here, these are A schools on the A through F that
 24 wound up in each of the tiers. Okay? So with
 25 option 1, you have pretty strong almost complete

Page 107

1 alignment that all your A schools are in tier 1, all
 2 your B schools are in tier 2, and here you have a
 3 little more -- some of your A schools that are
 4 actually getting pulled down a little bit in tier 2.
 5 What may be more interesting to you all is what's
 6 happening to the F schools and the D schools,
 7 because I think that's where your concern is, are
 8 they being evaluated, you know, are they really --
 9 is their subgroup success not being considered if
 10 they are being successful? So here, you can see
 11 that a number of your F schools actually are winding
 12 up in tier 3, which I think is what you want to be
 13 able to see; right? Is this truly a failing school,
 14 or are there other things that we need?
 15 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Are they making
 16 progress?
 17 MS. BOAST: Yes. Right.
 18 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And this can
 19 potentially change to some degree because we don't
 20 have the school-specific goals in there if --
 21 MS. BOAST: Yes.
 22 MS. POULOS: Right now we're saying they
 23 all meet those. We're assuming they all meet their
 24 goals rather than dividing them into exceeding,
 25 meeting, not meeting, or falling far below.

Page 108

1 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.
 2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And if you look at
 3 the F schools, in options 1 and 2, those percentages
 4 simply flip.
 5 MS. BOAST: Yes.
 6 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And so if you have
 7 F schools, if you have 14 percent in tier 3, does
 8 that give us more opportunity to do corrective
 9 action before we go to revocation, whereas with
 10 option B, with 14 percent in tier 1 and only 7
 11 percent are our indicators that year before, or do
 12 we have some kind of a precursor to, "Huh-oh"? I
 13 mean, if you only have 7 percent in tier 3, and then
 14 it jumps to 14? And knowing nothing about
 15 statistics, I have no idea. That's my gut speaking.
 16 I don't know.
 17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I had a
 18 question. So when we're looking at these grades
 19 that you looked at, the A-through-F thing, that
 20 includes all of those categories, right, on the
 21 report card that schools get; is that correct?
 22 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Overall grade.
 23 MS. BOAST: For this rough look, it's just
 24 the overall, which is not actually proposed to be
 25 part of your framework right now, just the

Page 109

1 disaggregated. But we want to look to see, what is
 2 this giving you when compared to just looking at the
 3 overall grade.
 4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: The reason I
 5 said that is, this is just an opinion that I have.
 6 When you ask a traditional public school child's
 7 parents, "How do you think this school -- do you
 8 feel safe? Do you like the teachers?" I don't know
 9 what all those ten questions are. I think the
 10 information you get is a lot more varied and comes
 11 from the fact that you don't have a choice of where
 12 you're going, pretty much, in many places. You need
 13 the school, we have one, you go there. Do you like
 14 it? Yes, no, no.
 15 But when you're talking about schools that
 16 you choose to go to, just when I have been looking
 17 at some of these scores, they get much higher scores
 18 on that one indicator on the survey question, but
 19 that would make sense because if you're choosing to
 20 send your child to Patty's school, well, if I hated
 21 you, why would I send you there?
 22 So to me, it skews the grading a little
 23 bit. And I'm not sure where I'm going with this. I
 24 just wanted to make that statement because sometimes
 25 it can make you have a higher score, higher letter

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 with some of those scores. Does this make sense to 2 you?</p> <p>3 MS. BOAST: Yes, and all of the charters 4 have an A or a B in that category.</p> <p>5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I would 6 expect that.</p> <p>7 MS. BOAST: So you might -- based on that, 8 you would likely agree with a lower weight on the 9 opportunity-to-learn measure; right? It currently 10 was given only 5 percent in all of the options. It 11 could be higher. It could be lower based on your 12 rationale. But it's fairly low -- it has a fairly 13 low weight right now.</p> <p>14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I may have 15 just -- but it can make a significant difference on 16 your final score number, if you got 10 points or -- 17 whatever, how we rate it.</p> <p>18 MS. BOAST: Right. We've gone over the 19 noontime. Are we okay to take a couple more minutes 20 to set you up for --</p> <p>21 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: It depends on 22 what time we come back.</p> <p>23 MS. BOAST: All right. We'll shift it. I 24 want to make sure -- I want to cover just one other 25 thing so you understand how these were run, because</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 from this, my take-away from this is that the 2 differences in performance on school-specific, 3 because of the ratings that they're getting and all 4 the rest makes more of a difference when they fall 5 far below than when they exceed, because you can see 6 that from those tier 1 columns, you can see that it 7 doesn't change at all if all the schools meet or all 8 the schools exceed. That doesn't change their 9 tiering.</p> <p>10 But you see a pretty big difference in the 11 tier 4 columns when you're moving down. And I think 12 that that's just because unfortunately you do have 13 more schools that have on average more at the lower 14 ratings. To get into that lowest tier 4, you have 15 to have consistently low across everything. So it 16 kind of tips a school, you know. Some of those 17 schools that have consistently low performance, it 18 tips them into that tier 4.</p> <p>19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I don't necessarily 20 know if that's a bad thing.</p> <p>21 MS. BOAST: Right. It shows --</p> <p>22 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Seriously, right. 23 Because it's just tipping them lower. It's not 24 taking them from okay to really not okay. It's 25 taking them from bad to really bad.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 again, I'm trusting you will take them to lunch and 2 use it as your placemat and --</p> <p>3 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: It won't even look 4 like I spilled food on it.</p> <p>5 MS. BOAST: So as we discussed, we don't 6 know what each of these schools would earn for 7 '16/'17, in terms of their school-specific goals. 8 So as Katie mentioned they're all assumed in this 9 printout to have met. We did, though, run some -- 10 and they also received -- in each of scenarios they 11 received 10 percent, so that's something to talk 12 about, how much weight should that category have.</p> <p>13 But we did just run some mockups of what 14 happens to the tiers if the results of the 15 school-specific changes. So this is at the top of 16 page 20. It's the same thing that's up here.</p> <p>17 So what this shows is the percentage of 18 schools that falls into each of the two -- each of 19 the four tiers. The first row shows if they all 20 exceed their school-specific goals. Second shows 21 that they all met, if they all didn't meet, and if 22 they all fell far below.</p> <p>23 Now, this would never happen, that all of 24 your schools get the same rating. But it's trying 25 to show you how sensitive this is. And what you see</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 MS. BOAST: Yes. The school-specific goal 2 cannot -- just because of the averaging, because 3 you're taking a weighted average, it cannot take a 4 school that has consistently sort of C or D or -- 5 and pull it down to --</p> <p>6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And vice versa.</p> <p>7 MS. BOAST: Exactly. All it can do is 8 sort of even out, yes, everything is in this 9 falling-far-below and so it can pull it down.</p> <p>10 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But also, for them, 11 it was their choice to do this, so if they didn't 12 meet it, then they only have themselves to look in 13 the mirror and say, whose fault is this, because it 14 was the school that said, "Hey, we really want to do 15 this, because we want to show you that that's not a 16 good picture of us. So okay. Show us what you 17 want." And they weren't able to do it, so it kind 18 of eases your conscience a little bit.</p> <p>19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And as a part of 20 the progression of improvement for charters and 21 applications, the charters that were accepted this 22 year had had really good training about writing 23 those charters. And so perhaps with 24 strengthening -- would that strengthening of the 25 written charter and the compliance that you're</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 talking about, you wrote it, you're responsible for 2 it, we accepted it, and this takes it right through 3 to that evaluation each year, or that examination of 4 "How are you meeting your goal?" 5 And in my head, it's becoming more 6 concrete. I can see where one is to the next to the 7 next to the next. 8 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. And for me, 9 it's just a little -- this starts everything for me, 10 you know. And everything else just falls into place 11 because these are the expectations, so that 12 everything played off the performance framework. 13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Starting at the 14 end and moving to the beginning. 15 MS. BOAST: That's just one other set of 16 graphs I want to show you and then break for lunch. 17 And this is a correlation with poverty. And we 18 had -- so you have a series of three charts and I 19 want to explain them, and then again, you can look 20 at them and we can talk a little bit more after 21 lunch. The first one is showing schools' grades on 22 the A-through-F system so across the bottom you have 23 schools earning an A through an F. Up the left-hand 24 side is the percentage of FRL enrollment, okay, so 25 the higher-poverty schools are in the top of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 what you want, we can rerun these and provide those 2 to you, hopefully as quickly as possible. But now 3 that we have this nice spreadsheet that puts all 4 this in and spits it out, after lunch what I would 5 like to do is really look at that weighting, but we 6 can then rerun these so that you see the ultimate 7 weighting that you decide on, how does that read 8 out. 9 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: This chart 10 solidifies or shows me visually what my suspicions 11 were just by looking at the percentage of students 12 in charter school and how well they were doing and 13 then looking at all the other charter schools that 14 were doing according to the A, B, and C doing very 15 bad, but I knew that they had the high, high 16 percentage of students. And those charter schools 17 are not going to get balance, because of where 18 they're at, and they're going to attract a high 19 percentage of poverty. 20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Of course, 21 that's our case. What they're saying they can do. 22 They can help those students more. I have one 23 question. Did we lose a school down here? There's 24 five schools on option 2 and six on option 1. Did 25 one --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 group, the lower at the bottom. And so in the A 2 column, each dot is an individual school, and you 3 can see, you know, they all earned As and you can 4 see that while there are more of them, towards the 5 low poverty, there are schools, you know, that are 6 high-poverty earning As. 7 B is a little more well distributed. 8 Unfortunately, F, you do have more of the 9 high-poverty schools earning an F, and I think this 10 is one of the big concerns toward adding additional. 11 The next two charts just show each of the two 12 options. So option 1, tier rating, again, we see a 13 nice spread on the tier 1. Tier 4, though, is 14 predominantly high-poverty schools, and it's good to 15 dig in here again and see what you're seeing. And 16 option 2 also has sort of almost a better 17 distribution on tier 2 and 3, but not so much on 18 tier 4. 19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Looks like they have 20 significantly more. 21 MS. BOAST: Now, one thing that could 22 address this is the weighting on your subgroup 23 measures, okay? Because I think the higher 24 weighting that you have on that subgroup measures I 25 think you'll see a little bit more. And deciding on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 MS. BOAST: Which one. 2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I'm on page 21. 3 The first one is tier rating correlated with poverty 4 and there are six in tier 1. There's six little 5 blue dots. Right? And when you go down to option 6 2, there's only five. 7 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Because there's two 8 different runs. 9 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: One moved over 10 because it was in a different option. 11 MS. BOAST: And it's actually this number 12 2 school. Now, it is important to look across. You 13 do have high-poverty schools that are in 1 and 2, 14 over there. What you don't have are low-poverty 15 schools in tier 4. But we're not saying that all 16 high-poverty schools are automatically ending up in 17 tier 4 at all. 18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: What's the 19 definition of "low poverty"? 20 MS. POULOS: You need to figure out what 21 you want to call that. 22 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: This is free and 23 reduced lunch. 24 MS. BOAST: So 40 percent is the Title I 25 cutoff, so generally under -- but when we have</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 done -- we'll usually even look at category 0 to 20, 2 20 to 40, 40 to 60. But if you look at these ones 3 that are below 40, those are non-Title I. So after 4 lunch, what I'd like to do is discuss questions that 5 come up, you know, look at these options again, but 6 then really look at what is the weighting that you 7 would like to consider a draft framework. Again, 8 it's not final, but to take to schools for feedback. 9 And I can be fast or I can be slow, but we're ahead 10 of schedule, so hopefully we can get to that point. 11 So in terms of -- we are 20 minutes behind, so we 12 said lunch would be from 12:00 to 12:45. So I guess 13 that makes it go to 1:15. 14 (Recess from 12:19 p.m. to 1:25 p.m.) 15 (Commissioner Robbins is present.) 16 MS. BOAST: What we're going to want to 17 get to fairly quickly are these weights, and again, 18 coming to weights. But before we get to that, any 19 thoughts that came up over lunch? Any questions? 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We didn't talk about 21 it at all. 22 MS. BOAST: Anything percolate? Okay. 23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I was just 24 trying to overhear David, not that you were being 25 secretive, but you didn't think graduation was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 think she had a successful education. 2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: She did. 3 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: But she's 4 considered a dropout and in these numbers, guess 5 what, she wouldn't count; whereas my middle son, who 6 is severely disabled, he graduated, but he has the 7 mind of about a five-or-six-year-old. He couldn't 8 add five and five together. But yet he graduated. 9 So that's why I'm saying graduation rate is not 10 necessarily meaning that you're career or 11 college-ready, that you're actually learning the 12 full scope. You may have attained the potential of 13 yourself, but you're not independent at that time. 14 And that's why, to me, having it as a measure is 15 fine. I just wouldn't give it that high of a 16 weight. 17 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I have to ask, 18 because it says four-, five-, and six-year rates, am 19 I wrong? Because schools have expressed concerns 20 that their graduation rating, grade, is being based 21 on a four-year graduation rate and -- 22 MS. POULOS: So point is, there's 15 total 23 points. Eight points are for the four-year grad 24 rate. Four points are for graduation improvement. 25 That's improvement. So we would put 12 points are</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 important to rate? Is that what you said? Maybe I 2 misheard you. 3 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I wouldn't give it 4 as much weight as we tend to give it because to me 5 it doesn't mean that you learned anything 6 necessarily, because there are students who 7 graduated that failed in one or more subjects. They 8 actually literally just failed, and exceptions were 9 made because of this or that. To me, it's a result. 10 If you're highly proficient and you have these other 11 things, you will graduate. So graduation in and of 12 itself to me is more a result rather than something 13 you're measuring to say a school is successful. 14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I guess I hear 15 what you're saying, but I'm thinking if you're an A 16 school and you have all these As and all those 17 little indicators and you're a D in graduation, and 18 that's what in the end -- it didn't mean you're 19 proficient. 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'm sorry, there has 21 been deep discussion about how that graduation is 22 calculated. 23 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: If you drop out and 24 get a GED, which my daughter did, and she went on 25 and got her associate's degree and became an RN, I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 on what we could consider four-year grad rate. 2 Eight points for the grad rate, four points for the 3 improvement grad rate. Two points for your 4 five-year grad rate, and one point for your six-year 5 grad rate. SAM schools have a whole -- like another 6 supplemental measure that we actually -- anybody who 7 is enrolled on the 40th day and identified as a 8 senior, if they graduate at the end of that year, 9 they actually count in the four-year grad rate as a 10 graduate. So they're actually getting a huge boost 11 from that. But it is not wholly based on a straight 12 four-year grad rate. 13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But the five and the 14 six give them little points. 15 MS. POULOS: Two points for the five, one 16 point for the six. So that may be something that 17 you choose to break out and reallocate points, which 18 they could do. 19 MS. BOAST: To break out those points? 20 MS. POULOS: Right. Because we now know, 21 right, it would be pretty easy -- we know they could 22 get eight points, we know they did get so-and-so 23 points. That would be the percentage of points 24 earned. You could reallocate the point and multiply 25 the percentage of points earned and recalculate that</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p> <p>1 pretty easily.</p> <p>2 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think for the most</p> <p>3 part for most of our schools, I don't know whether</p> <p>4 that's necessary, but I think that's something maybe</p> <p>5 that would be a good option for those alternative</p> <p>6 schools that are servicing, you know, other</p> <p>7 populations that I think that's maybe some way where</p> <p>8 we could say, look, this is what we'll do to also</p> <p>9 help, is break out.</p> <p>10 MS. BOAST: That could be their</p> <p>11 school-specific goal.</p> <p>12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I would like to</p> <p>13 see us consider right now if you complete your GED,</p> <p>14 you're classified as a dropout, even though the</p> <p>15 State collects that data and knows the names of all</p> <p>16 of those students who complete the GED. As charter</p> <p>17 schools, maybe we could explore the option of</p> <p>18 completed GEDs for some of those alternative</p> <p>19 schools, counting into the graduation rate as</p> <p>20 positive and I think we could handle those numbers</p> <p>21 and it would be validated. But I think it would</p> <p>22 behoove us to do that because it might jump that up</p> <p>23 some.</p> <p>24 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You're right. That</p> <p>25 could help. That could be one of those areas where,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 have a GED. The application won't be accepted.</p> <p>2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: If you go to the</p> <p>3 website and you look at the application, and you</p> <p>4 look at the job, the posting, it says, "High school</p> <p>5 diploma or GED."</p> <p>6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But you will not get</p> <p>7 an interview.</p> <p>8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Then that is</p> <p>9 discrimination, because --</p> <p>10 MS. BOAST: Okay. We're going to focus</p> <p>11 you here now. It's time to do some math. Okay. So</p> <p>12 if you all could take this, and there are three</p> <p>13 columns on the far right. The first is just to</p> <p>14 confirm that this indicator, you agree, should be</p> <p>15 included in the framework. We're assuming that, you</p> <p>16 know, these are ones that have been suggested that</p> <p>17 have been tested, but we just want confirmation</p> <p>18 there. Then what would be the weight for the K-8</p> <p>19 and then the high schools?</p> <p>20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I have a</p> <p>21 question about these because we spent some time as a</p> <p>22 group weighting, and are these the numbers that we</p> <p>23 did?</p> <p>24 MS. BOAST: In August what we did was to</p> <p>25 take that, and there was quite a bit of range in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 you know, the schools that are servicing those</p> <p>2 challenging populations that they don't fit into</p> <p>3 this box, we can say, "We'll also include the GED."</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And it would free</p> <p>5 those schools up to guide some of those older</p> <p>6 students into that program so that at some point --</p> <p>7 because what you have to do to take the GED is, you</p> <p>8 have to literally drop out of high school.</p> <p>9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.</p> <p>10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But if we could</p> <p>11 count that back in and there could be tutoring</p> <p>12 towards that direction when it became appropriate,</p> <p>13 and we'd have a lot more graduates, valid graduates,</p> <p>14 don't you think?</p> <p>15 COMMISSIONER CRONE: Yes.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And we'd save a</p> <p>17 whole lot of money because we wouldn't have</p> <p>18 25-year-olds in the school.</p> <p>19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: The problem is, I</p> <p>20 know with Las Cruces, if you want to work for the</p> <p>21 City of Las Cruces you cannot work --</p> <p>22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I looked it up,</p> <p>23 Patty, and --</p> <p>24 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Well, the City</p> <p>25 councilors have told us that. You can't work if you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 those, and that's really how we developed this</p> <p>2 option 1 and option 2.</p> <p>3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Okay.</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So my question is,</p> <p>5 my feedback is, do I have to indicate an option</p> <p>6 or -- because when it --</p> <p>7 MS. BOAST: No, if you wouldn't mind</p> <p>8 actually putting a number there, and then an actual</p> <p>9 number.</p> <p>10 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Okay. I'm still</p> <p>11 confused. I understand the number for weights. But</p> <p>12 am I doing option 1 or option 2? Am I basing my</p> <p>13 numbers on option 1 or option 2?</p> <p>14 MS. BOAST: Depends on which one you</p> <p>15 prefer.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So I have to tell</p> <p>17 you which one?</p> <p>18 MS. BOAST: No, if you just put a number.</p> <p>19 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: You could be in</p> <p>20 between.</p> <p>21 MS. POULOS: Column 1 is: Do you want</p> <p>22 this measure included? Column 2 is for elementary</p> <p>23 school. You can look at option 1 and option 2, and</p> <p>24 if you don't like either of those, you could put</p> <p>25 your own numbers. If you like one of those, you</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 could keep those numbers. 2 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I would just put 1 3 there. 4 MS. BOAST: You would put 20. 5 MS. POULOS: Put the numbers from option 6 1. 7 MS. BOAST: Put in the actual weight. 8 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And that 9 question that Patty and Daniel were talking about, 10 the GED thing, that's not -- I know. But it's not 11 an option to give -- I mean, we can't give it to 12 charter schools without giving it to all schools. 13 Isn't that true or not? 14 MS. POULOS: You're creating your own 15 performance framework. You may want to consider the 16 fact that you are creating a different system that 17 could be seen inequitable, and that might contribute 18 to a negative conversation about charter schools. 19 So you want to be thoughtful about that as you make 20 your decision. 21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And that's why 22 I'm asking you, we could do it, but there would be 23 consequences. 24 MS. POULOS: You have to think through 25 what that narrative is in public.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 MS. POULOS: More challenging. 2 (A discussion was held off the record.) 3 MS. BOAST: What I'd like to do is go down 4 measure by measure looking at the range. So while 5 that's working, there are a couple of other points 6 that I want to bring to you and just get your 7 feedback. So this is the discussion page, which is 8 22 in your packet. When we put together an approach 9 for calculating this overall -- doing a weight 10 average, there will have to be some business rules 11 that you all need to agree on and decide how to deal 12 with certain situations. So the first one is what 13 to do in cases where one of the measures within an 14 indicator, or kind of a submeasure, is missing, but 15 you have others. So for example, in your subgroup 16 growth you have some schools that have ELL, but 17 don't have SPED or have -- all of them have FRL, but 18 they might have only one of the three subgroups or 19 two of the three subgroups. Okay? 20 The two choices there are the first -- and 21 this is the usual approach -- is that if you have 22 decided that that subgroup measure is getting 20 23 percent, then it's going to get 20 percent no matter 24 how many of the -- so it winds up, yeah, you have 25 FRL, that would get 20 percent, if that's all you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I don't want to 2 do that. 3 MS. BOAST: I think, though, a very valid 4 option B is, I have been actually making a list of 5 potential school-specific goals. 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. I don't see 7 it as an issue, as a school-specific goal. 8 MS. POULOS: Yes. 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. 10 MS. POULOS: But what I'm saying is, if 11 you're creating a different world and saying 12 graduation rate for charter schools means something 13 different, then that could get -- I'm not saying it 14 will. I'm saying it could be problematic. 15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Like they -- 16 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. But as a 17 school-specific goal, it's something that they could 18 offer up as an option. 19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But it all has to 20 add up to 100. 21 MS. BOAST: Yeah. But you know what, it's 22 okay. We can adjust over here. 23 MS. POULOS: Make it add up to 200, that 24 may be easy. Just divide them all in half. 25 MS. BOAST: If it adds up to 126 --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 had. If you had all three, each of them would get 2 6.66, or you could preserve it so that each of those 3 subgroups is getting a certain percentage and if the 4 others are missing, you're not sort of assigning 5 that weight to other subgroups, if that makes sense. 6 The rationale or the thinking that you 7 would have behind this would be, subgroup growth is 8 important to us and we want to value that, you know, 9 a certain percentage of our framework regardless of 10 how many subgroups are there. 11 So thoughts? And I will say that 12 generally is the approach that is taken, that you 13 have decided we're prioritizing subgroup performance 14 this percentage. But we can easily also say, No, 15 you're going to -- if they're missing -- 16 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: The way I 17 understand it, the way you're saying is that if I 18 have a charter school and I understand that if I 19 have no poverty kids, I'm still going to get those 20 20 points, so I'm going to make everything possible 21 to have no -- 22 MS. BOAST: No, no, you wouldn't get the 23 credit. What you're suggesting is if you had no 24 subgroups, and that's our second bullet. The first 25 bullet is, you only have one or two. Some of the</p>

Page 130	Page 132
<p>1 subgroups are not present in the school; right? So 2 do you want to still say, "We're going to give 20 3 percent of the weight of the results on whatever 4 students we have that are in these subgroups"? If 5 they're all in FRL, that's fine; that's who we're 6 focusing on. If they're all missing, the school 7 doesn't get credit, and we'll discuss that in the 8 second one. But it's whether you want to have that 9 focus on subgroup students regardless of which group 10 they're in. 11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: How many schools 12 do we have who have none of one of those three 13 groups? 14 MS. BOAST: They all have reported 15 results. So this is where you can look at the blank 16 spaces, you know, in this subgroup. So actually, 17 you do have -- if you look at subgroup proficiency, 18 schools 8, 20, and 25 have none. They're not going 19 to get credit for this, so don't worry about that. 20 But you do have a lot of white spaces in the 21 subgroup growth, so these are the schools that, you 22 know, are you going to -- 23 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Is this not -- won't 24 some of this be filled in because only some of that 25 information was suppressed?</p>	<p>1 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think that's fair. 2 MS. BOAST: Okay. 3 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Because there's not 4 going to be that many schools, once these other ones 5 get filled in. 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And if it ended up 7 that somehow they were penalized -- and I can't see 8 it happening -- we can revisit that, you know, 9 but -- 10 MS. BOAST: Okay. Are people comfortable 11 with that? Okay. Great. 12 So the second question, this isn't so much 13 a question but something that you'll need to 14 consider is that you could have an entire indicator 15 missing. So for example, you can conceivably have a 16 school that has no students in any subgroups, or you 17 could have a school where -- or you could have a 18 school whose school-specific goals can't be 19 evaluated. You may have some situations where an 20 entire indicator is missing. 21 Generally, the approach that's taken there 22 is that is just taken out of the calculation, you 23 know. They don't get points for having it missing, 24 but if that was a third of it, suppose you had three 25 indicators that were all equally weighted, a third,</p>
Page 131	Page 133
<p>1 MS. BOAST: Yes. 2 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So if that 3 information is not suppressed, we won't have as many 4 blanks spots there. We may still have some. 5 MS. BOAST: You still will have some. 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Although I find it 7 very hard to believe that a school has no SPED 8 students -- 9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That's why I 10 asked that. 11 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: -- in any of these. 12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Sometimes they 13 don't rank them. 14 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: It's conceivable. 15 But a lot of this white will go away because that 16 information won't be suppressed. 17 MS. BOAST: Yes. 18 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So how many schools 19 would we be talking about that would have few to 20 none of those subgroups? Probably very few. 21 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And that's where I 22 think if you just redistribute within that 23 indicator, because there's the three groupings, just 24 put it to the other ones in the same proportion. I 25 think that's fine.</p>	<p>1 a third, a third, and that one is missing, the other 2 two would get half. It would become a 50/50. 3 The only other option here -- and it has 4 some real downsides -- is that in some cases, in 5 systems that will be built in, that if one or more 6 indicators is missing, the school will not be 7 evaluated, so it wouldn't be placed in a tier. Now, 8 that leaves you at a disadvantage of not having the 9 discretion that you need. So I just want to confirm 10 this with you and just have you be aware that if an 11 entire indicator is missing, essentially you're just 12 looking at what's present. We would go ahead and 13 calculate the rating. But that could be of concern 14 if it's something you think is very important. 15 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Of course, I guess 16 the teacher part of me, when I see that an indicator 17 is missing, I'm thinking they didn't submit 18 something. So I have to change my mind-set a little 19 bit with that. And I know there's -- this is hard. 20 Because I know there's challenges down the short 21 road because of those old contracts. 22 MS. BOAST: Exactly. 23 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: There's a piece of 24 me that would like to say, "Okay, maybe we do need 25 to start a project and have schools look at those</p>

Page 134	Page 136
<p>1 and say, maybe they need to be changed, so that we 2 can -- so that there's not" -- because you know, I'm 3 concerned that something -- not going to be, you 4 know -- the school -- this school wasn't able to do 5 this, so they're not -- I know they're not getting 6 the points for it, but still, they're not -- you 7 know, that's not being looked at. 8 MS. BOAST: Evaluated on. 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I'm really 10 concerned with the scenario that it would be kicked 11 out and there would be -- you're out of the system. 12 That really concerns me. 13 MS. BOAST: So that sounds like not 14 nothing. Okay. That's good to know that. That's 15 what I assumed, but I wanted to check with you. 16 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think if that 17 happened that someone was kicked out, I think we 18 would immediately need to know that so we could say 19 why. But I can't -- no. That scenario. 20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Probably the 21 positive about New Mexico. 22 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: The whole notion 23 of school-specific goals, I think that the 24 shortcoming of not being able to evaluate a 25 school-specific goal is not the school. It's the</p>	<p>1 this? We want to set up a school for all sports. 2 We want to set up a school for all dance. But is 3 the school doing it? Is the school that's 4 advocating dance as a way to propel the students 5 into greatness -- are they doing dance? And if the 6 answer is yes, well, they're doing it. If we want 7 to evaluate how good they are, it's a different 8 question, and we kind of went through it. 9 Is the school that's advocating sports to 10 get things done and propel students to greatness, 11 and they're no good without it, before coming into a 12 school, then if they're doing it, they're doing it. 13 They have met that. 14 MS. BOAST: I think the problem -- so I 15 think that that's a valid point and it assumes, 16 though, that you have a good way to evaluate. And I 17 think we're trying to get you to a place to have a 18 good way to evaluate the mission, but unfortunately, 19 even -- hopefully we can get to that place, right, 20 but until then, you are bound by what was specified 21 in the contract. 22 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: So we accepted 23 it. This is my dilemma. We accepted it as a valid 24 thing to do, and now they're getting penalized 25 because we don't know how to deal with it. And so I</p>
Page 135	Page 137
<p>1 evaluators. It's on our side. 2 MS. POULOS: I'm sorry, just let me jump 3 in on that. 4 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: No, you jump in 5 when I'm finished. 6 MS. POULOS: Sir -- 7 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Jump in when I'm 8 finished. 9 MS. POULOS: No, no, no. 10 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Jump in when I'm 11 finished. 12 MS. POULOS: I do have a problem with you 13 saying there's a problem with -- 14 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Again, you can 15 have a problem all you want, but please wait until 16 I'm finished. 17 So this is where I'm at, is that either a 18 school is doing it or not doing it. How good it is 19 doing it is a different question. But if this body 20 accepted a charter that said we are going to be 21 about this, and accepted it and chartered it, that 22 means that we felt that it was something that was 23 going to be good and it could have been evaluated 24 somehow, or we could put some value to it. 25 Is there value by saying we want to do</p>	<p>1 would say they get the credit until we know how to 2 better evaluate it and evaluate them down. 3 MS. BOAST: But what about a situation 4 where they did actually say, "We will provide these 5 data," and they don't provide them? 6 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Well, either they 7 provide it or don't provide it. I mean, it's one -- 8 yes or no. The question is yes or no. They should 9 do the dance? The answer is yes. This is how much 10 dance we did. Are we looking at the grades? We 11 kind of question the dance did propel the students 12 into greatness, or you know, whatever. But if they 13 say we're going to do dance and not anything in 14 dance happened, then it's a yes or no. 15 MS. BOAST: In the short-term, you know, 16 right now, given that you have to deal with what was 17 laid out, if it is not possible to evaluate that 18 question, is it successful, should the school get 19 credit, get falls far below, or get missing? This 20 is my question. 21 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Because some of the 22 schools, by their own admission have said, "We 23 can't. We can't do it." So you know, it was -- 24 unfortunately, it was people treading waters that 25 were deep and dark at the time and everyone thought</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 sitting there -- this goes back, you know, however 2 many years, that it sounded good, but the reality 3 was -- and the schools were genuine in thinking that 4 they were going to be able to do this. And then 5 when they start going down that road and have to 6 evaluate it, it's like, what were we thinking? 7 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: But it's still a 8 yes or no. 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No, it's not. Some 10 of their goals are not yes and no. They promised to 11 provide certain things and they can't. So that it's 12 those -- that language in those contracts is not, 13 yes, we did that; no, we didn't do it. There's 14 qualifiers in there on what they were supposed to be 15 able to provide to show, and they're unable to do 16 that. So it's not just a yes or no by those 17 contracts. 18 MS. POULOS: And I think the conversation 19 we were having earlier -- which I have a problem 20 with anyone saying my team can't evaluate. We can 21 very easily go in and look and see -- and we do, 22 every single visit -- somebody -- are they 23 implementing expeditionary learning? Are they 24 dancing? Do they have science and math classes? We 25 have no problem doing that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 when you put that into a performance framework, it 2 becomes very problematic and you will lose in court, 3 which these are court-based documents, by having 4 subjective goals. And I would encourage this 5 Commission not to write goals, not to accept goals 6 as heavily weighted goals that are very subjective, 7 because where that will end you is in protracted 8 legal battles. 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And it's also a tool 10 that the schools should be able to use to 11 communicate to the parents of the students who are 12 attending that school. This is the promise, because 13 when they -- when that school is approved and they 14 sign that contract with us, this is a promise that 15 they're making to those parents and that community: 16 This is what we are promising you we're going to do. 17 And they should be able to show that community, yes, 18 this is what we are doing, you know, and it's more 19 than just a yes or no. Yes, we're dancing. Yes 20 we're rolling out a ball, so we've got sports. It 21 goes well beyond that. And it becomes challenging 22 to find rigorous goals that -- but I don't say we 23 dismiss it. I think it's a challenge we have to 24 take on to try to find it, and I have worked fairly 25 hard at it.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 The conversation earlier, which I think 2 was what you were intending to get at, was: What 3 happens when they have a goal, their mission is, we 4 are a college-and-career-readiness. How do you 5 measure that? And that goes to the question of does 6 there need -- and it's not about a yes or a no. 7 It's about the quality. Are we a good 8 college-and-career-readiness school? Are we a good 9 sports school? Are we a good architecture, 10 construction and engineering school? That's a very 11 different question. We can easily go in and look 12 at -- we are capable of going in and looking at 13 what's being done in the classroom and saying yes or 14 no. 15 The question is not are we, as our staff, 16 but is it possible to actually measure the 17 effectiveness, the quality of a specific mission? 18 And there are plenty of missions, right, where if 19 you're talking about dance, is it easy to measure 20 the quality of your dance program? That is a very 21 different question, and when you create goals around 22 that often -- and we can talk about reality TV 23 shows; right? You have got three judges who all 24 feel that the quality of a singer is very different. 25 So those end up being very subjective things, and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: So the schools 2 that can never be evaluated are not out there. 3 There's always some kind of evaluation. We just 4 have to figure out what that is. 5 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. Right. But 6 jointly, we have to be able to figure that out so 7 that there's an agreement between us and the school 8 and this is how it's going to be, and that it's 9 something that CSD can say -- you know, the school 10 can say it's measurable so that CSD can, you know, 11 sign on the dotted line that, yes, this is -- you 12 know, they have provided this information in 13 whatever form it is, but it's got to be -- it's 14 got -- you have to be able to measure it somehow. 15 It can't just be a yes or no. 16 MS. POULOS: To this middle question, 17 though, this is -- and I'll give you the one -- this 18 is Amy Biehl that that data -- they wrote it in. It 19 doesn't exist; right? They said, "We are going to 20 measure ourselves on blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, 21 and unfortunately blah, blah, blah, blah, blah 22 doesn't exist anywhere, and nobody can create it. 23 Then what do you do? 24 MS. BOAST: Right. And so the challenge, 25 I think, is to develop those metrics, figure out how</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p> <p>1 to evaluate, and have it be in the charter contract; 2 right? Because with your schools that are 3 midcontract, even if you figured out what that is 4 right now, could you hold them accountable to that? 5 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Right. But don't 6 leave the charter schools hanging with no evaluation 7 and maybe a negative if nothing can be done and 8 that's not right. 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No, I don't think 10 they'd be penalized. You know, I'm not -- no. I'm 11 not looking to penalize them if -- you know, going 12 forward, the schools understand that through 13 whatever negotiations occur from now until whenever, 14 that it will look different. And it should be 15 measurable. We're going to hit big bumps in the 16 road with some schools like an Amy Biehl and like 17 some others that it's, like, holy cow, what was 18 anyone thinking, you know. And that's going to 19 happen. So the question is, what do you do with 20 those schools that are still back in the dark ages 21 of the old contracts, so that we can deal with them 22 now until they come to renewal and it can be fixed? 23 And they shouldn't be penalized for it. 24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Don't we even 25 have schools saying that their students -- some</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p> <p>1 career-ready, and opportunity. They just get bumped 2 up. 3 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: If it can't be 4 measured, then you split it out. 5 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Or if they say, "We 6 choose not to set a goal in that area," they're 7 given the option to set goals which have to be 8 specific and measurable, but if they choose not to, 9 that ten points goes somewhere else. Just like we 10 were saying, if they don't have a subgroup, the 11 points assigned and the weighting would go to the 12 other things in that category. 13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And there's a piece 14 of me that has a real hard time saying we're not 15 going to measure their mission, because their 16 mission is why they were created. So that if 17 there's nothing in that contract that measures how 18 they are carrying out that mission, then there's 19 nothing to stop them from mission drift, because 20 they're not being held accountable anywhere. So I 21 can give you this lofty plan -- 22 MS. BOAST: This is a really important 23 question that I don't think we're going to solve 24 here, but it's going to need to be resolved by the 25 time you adopt your framework, because we have in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p> <p>1 language like this -- will be prepared for post 2 secondary whatever, and so to measure that, you have 3 to do, like, an academic kind of thing? How would 4 you measure that? Or how would you measure -- 5 didn't we just approve two great schools who were 6 wanting to make sure that these kids were 7 college-ready, and it's a K-5. 8 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And we expressed 9 that concern. 10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I agree. We 11 didn't have an answer. 12 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. 13 MS. POULOS: I think this is getting away 14 from the question at hand, although it's an 15 important conversation of: Do we actually require 16 any goals to be written? Do we require goals to be 17 written? Do we say, you must have a school-specific 18 goal that's related to your mission or not? That's 19 a very different conversation than this one. And we 20 may want to do this one just so we can move forward. 21 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I think if we put 22 down a weight for the school-specific goals, and 23 they don't want to do that, then that weight just 24 gets spread to the other ones. If we go with number 25 one, then they would just go with graduation,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p> <p>1 the past talked about two components -- or the law 2 says schools have to have the option to have 3 additional assessments. Right? It does not say 4 they have to have a mission-specific goal. But 5 there's strong feeling on some of your body that 6 that should be required. So I don't think we're 7 going to resolve that today. 8 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I think the law 9 does include that it has to be a school that has a 10 mission, has a -- 11 MS. BOAST: But in the accountability, 12 like the rules, in the accountability, performance 13 framework. 14 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Right, because 15 we're following the same performance framework as 16 the public schools, but -- 17 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No. Public schools 18 don't have performance frameworks. 19 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Well, I read that 20 the general law that -- before everything else 21 underneath -- and well, it was somewhat lofty, but 22 they talked about putting schools that had a mission 23 and can start new ways of teaching kids, trying new 24 things, so that the public schools can copy them and 25 be successful, also, and so I always thought that if</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 not all, most of the charter schools had that, and 2 they were all struggling with that, some more 3 successfully than others. And so I tend to think 4 that we can't get away from that, but we have to do 5 something with it. 6 MS. BOAST: So I think -- right. So 7 Katie, I think, is going to have some law. But this 8 obviously is a larger issue. The question being, 9 are schools required -- or are you going to be 10 requiring schools to have mission-specific goals? 11 We can establish this weighting, whether that is 12 answered today or not, because we would assume if a 13 school has any school-specific goals, how would that 14 be weighted. 15 So Katie, can we come back to that? Okay. 16 Great. 17 So one last thing to consider is whether 18 you would want to have any kind of triggers in your 19 tiering system. The most obvious would be a 20 condition that if a school received an overall 21 A-through-F grade -- so for example, this would just 22 be something to consider -- if they received an F 23 overall, would you want to limit where they could 24 land on a tier? We saw that there's quite a bit of 25 alignment, but would it be okay with you if the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 of the intervention tier, so if you have -- and 2 you're right, it's unlikely, but things happen. So 3 I can't see -- because tier 2, to me, is just a kind 4 of passing e-mail or letter that's saying, "Hi, just 5 be aware that," and that F grade should trigger a 6 little bit more than that. So I have a hard time 7 with them being above a tier 3. 8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: They're going to 9 need some sort of intervention if they have an 10 overall F. There has to be something. 11 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. 12 MS. BOAST: And what about D grades? 13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I would put D and F 14 in the same category, that they can't go above a 15 tier 3. Because you know, in all likelihood they 16 have been bouncing, you know. 17 MS. BOAST: Okay, terrific. So I'm making 18 notes. Again, this is all going to come back to you 19 as a proposed section. So is everybody ready? 20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I need to ask a 21 question, because we just made a decision. And are 22 we correct, Katie, if we have an overall grade of F, 23 there needs to be some intervention? It seems to me 24 that a tier 3 or a tier 4 would be -- a tier 3 would 25 be the appropriate place, because then that requires</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 school got an F on the overall school state grade, 2 which is not included in your framework, and then 3 somehow wound up getting an A, or tier 1? Would 4 that sit well with you? 5 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No. 6 MS. BOAST: Would that be okay? So you 7 might want to consider whether you want to just have 8 a condition of, you know -- for example, we have 9 worked with frameworks where in very similar 10 A-through-F, where an F school could not be above a 11 certain tier, or you know, would -- because you 12 automatically would want to have some type of review 13 so you would be directing, you know, sort of what 14 they could and couldn't. So thoughts? Thoughts 15 there? That, again, can be something that's decided 16 with your final framework, but it's important to 17 think about. 18 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I have a hard time 19 thinking they'd be above a tier 3, in all honesty. 20 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Like you could be 21 one tier higher or one tier lower than your grade. 22 MS. BOAST: Uh-huh. 23 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: But if there's four 24 tiers and there's five grades. 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But tier 3 is more</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 an intervention. Is that realistic? 2 MS. POULOS: I think that's going to be up 3 to you as a Commission. I don't think you would 4 want a D or F to be a tier 2. 5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Okay. I wanted to 6 confirm, because I'm wondering how much we're 7 messing with statistical implication with what we're 8 doing around the table, and making decisions on 9 deleting things out and putting things in. 10 MS. BOAST: This will actually be a 11 safeguard, this trigger thing, that a D or an F 12 could not be a 1 or a 2 tier. It is very unlikely, 13 given the run, you know, the trials that we've done 14 that that would ever happen. But things happen. 15 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. 16 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And not weighting 17 some, making the decision that we're going to 18 redistribute things to other areas, or if something 19 can't be evaluated, then we just don't evaluate it, 20 and that goes away. And to me, that has somewhat -- 21 but the statistical work that you all have done with 22 this leads me to think that it's very small, but I 23 want to be sure. 24 MS. BOAST: Yes. And the other thing, 25 just to reassure you, is that, again, no decisions</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 are being made today. What we're trying to do is 2 refine the model to then get feedback from schools 3 and do a final run for you with the unsuppressed 4 data, so you will actually see, okay, what happens 5 when we think we should be having all the subgroups, 6 how many actually are missing with that. So I don't 7 take it lightly.</p> <p>8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm just being 9 really cautious because I don't want to penalize 10 anybody or I don't want to penalize us if we need to 11 do something and what we have said tips that 12 statistical balance.</p> <p>13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So the schools 14 have a five-year contract. Some don't, but we'll 15 just use that for example. And so at the end of -- 16 let's just say we adopt this in whatever form. So 17 at the end of this year, the school year, when they 18 get these PARCC tests back, they get one of these 19 tiers. We don't wait until -- they immediately go 20 to either help or they're okay. And that happens 21 each of the five years -- or really, it will be 22 four, because we generally don't have the fifth one, 23 because that's the year we redo them.</p> <p>24 MS. BOAST: The renewal year, yes.</p> <p>25 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So if a school</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 MS. BOAST: Except for their 2 school-specific, so --</p> <p>3 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But adding into our 4 accountability system will also be the other 5 component, the school-specific. So that there's 6 other pieces besides just the -- the school report 7 card can, but something else could as well. You 8 know, in addition to the organizational and 9 financial.</p> <p>10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Do not pass go.</p> <p>11 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I mean, in 12 reality, so could an academic, and we're getting to 13 that point where it could be, but that's why we want 14 to dig into those other subareas so that we're not 15 just putting the hatchet down because you got an F 16 on that school grade, because there are other 17 mitigating factors.</p> <p>18 MS. BOAST: Okay. So Katie has up here -- 19 because I can't put my computer -- these are the 20 results of the weights that you all put down. So 21 you have got the elementary. So there are six of 22 you who gave feedback, so they're the elementary in 23 columns B through G, and then high school in H 24 through M.</p> <p>25 So if we start with the easiest ones, it</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 that is a 3 or 4 and there for more than a year or 2 something, is that a reason to bring that school up 3 to say, wait, are we going to let it go for five 4 years being a tier 3 or 4?</p> <p>5 MS. BOAST: That's where your 6 accountability plan that you all will be considering 7 and drafting and revising hopefully in January 8 February -- December -- soon, that's where it will 9 be developed. Here are the actions, consequences, 10 for performance issues, for compliance issues, for 11 financial issues.</p> <p>12 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: They should not be 13 in that tier for a year, but a timeline should be 14 established so they comply with whatever the 15 corrective plan is for them to get out of it, and 16 then they can come back into it. But you know, some 17 schools may be cycling in and out, unfortunately, 18 all year because they're here --</p> <p>19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And how do they 20 get here? What scores got them here on these? How 21 did they get to tier 3 or 4?</p> <p>22 MS. BOAST: That would be based on 23 these --</p> <p>24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And these were 25 based on PARCC; right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 looks as though you all sort of agree on a subgroup 2 performance of 10 percent is a good weight. So 3 that's an easy one. We can start there.</p> <p>4 And then let's see, I think there was 5 another -- likewise, the Q rows 7 and 8 that have 6 the Q1 and the Q3, that seems to be consensus for 7 elementary to be -- we've got four of you for 5, one 8 2.5, one 7.5. And likewise for the high school, I 9 see that as being sort of a consensus around 5. Any 10 of you who either put 2.5 or 7.5, would you be 11 comfortable with that at 5?</p> <p>12 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: That's fine.</p> <p>13 MS. BOAST: Okay. Great. So other easy 14 ones. Well, let's look at school growth, which is 15 row 6. We've got two 10s, three 15s, and one 20. 16 That seems to land us at a mode of 15, so those of 17 you who have either the 10 or the 20, how do you -- 18 would you be comfortable with a 15?</p> <p>19 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Yes.</p> <p>20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: You're talking 21 about at the K-8?</p> <p>22 MS. BOAST: At the K-8, yes, on the K-8 23 side.</p> <p>24 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yes.</p> <p>25 MS. BOAST: Okay. Good. And then for the</p>

Page 154	Page 156
<p>1 high school, we've actually got an even split 2 between 10 and 5. And so I would throw starting 3 with the 7.5. So we're on line 6, school growth. 4 Again, this is the school -- the whole school level 5 growth. Any concerns with a 7.5 there? That's just 6 evenly sort of splitting the difference. 7 Okay. Then I think another one that might 8 be -- let's go to row 13, which is opportunities to 9 learn. We've got a lot of range here. We lost two 10 people. 11 MS. POULOS: They want zero. Two people 12 said zero. 13 MS. BOAST: Okay. So when I had to scan 14 this -- 15 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I don't care if they 16 learn. 17 MS. POULOS: They have an opportunity to 18 learn clearly if they're learning. 19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I took it completely 20 away. 21 MS. BOAST: You took it completely away. 22 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I did. 23 MS. BOAST: So for elementary, I had put 24 down in sort of a drafting, a 5, because you know, 25 we've got folks, but does anybody want to advocate</p>	<p>1 care about what I did at home or -- you know, you 2 have people with 150 kids and, no, I don't know that 3 they can -- I don't know. So I just don't think 4 that that's valid to me. 5 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And that's part of 6 the reason why on the elementary level, in 7 particular, I took it away because I just thought 8 that it's significantly harder for an elementary 9 school child to answer that question. 10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: She didn't like 11 me, though, this morning, so it's over. 12 MS. POULOS: Teachers don't like them, 13 honestly, or teachers don't like these surveys. 14 That being said, we are working on developing a new 15 survey. So you could always come back to this 16 question in two years when we make revisions under 17 ESSA and see if you like those surveys better. But 18 then the other kids, for case 2, it's not even a 19 student. It's the parents. And how much do they 20 know? And then the last one is -- 21 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And most of them 22 like their elementary school. 23 MS. BOAST: And all your schools are 24 getting As or Bs on this. 25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's almost a</p>
Page 155	Page 157
<p>1 either for -- 2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Tell me all this 3 is an opportunity to learn in an elementary. 4 MS. POULOS: It's attendance, and we look 5 at attendance rate, we're hoping it 95 percent. 6 They can get a few extra points if they go -- they 7 can get a few extra points if they go above the 95 8 percent attendance rate, and then it's the 9 opportunity-to-learn surveys, which are administered 10 with the assessment. So it's administered with the 11 PARCC assessment, the ten questions. Does my 12 teacher know when I'm upset? Does my teacher make 13 sure I understand? And the goal out of a 50 point 14 survey is 45 points. If they get more than 45 15 points, they can get extra beyond the points that 16 they -- like the maximum number points, so they can 17 actually get over the maximum of points. 18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And this is just 19 my opinion. I actually thought the questions were 20 very good that they're asking kids. I'm just not 21 sure kids' answers to that as good an indicator as 22 the questions are, because I do believe that that is 23 what a good teacher does. You make sure that the 24 kids understand it, and if they don't, you go over 25 it. Now, do I think they every teacher needs to</p>	<p>1 give-away, and it's almost a point of hope because 2 you know you'll do well on college and career, and 3 you know you'll do well on opportunities to learn, 4 and maybe that will give you some points that will 5 carry you over. 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I left it on the 7 high school because I had 5 points. So I put it 8 there. 9 MS. BOAST: Are you comfortable with 5 10 points here? Or do you want to consider taking it 11 out? 12 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I'm good for 5. I 13 went with 10 only because -- I'm the 10 -- only 14 because I feel that attendance is so important, 15 truancy is such a huge problem. And again, you're 16 penalizing a school grade for something that the 17 parents have control over in the elementary school. 18 But I think it's indicative of letting the parents 19 know, "Your kids need to be in school. You're going 20 to get better credit. That school is going to get a 21 rating." 22 So you're really telling the parents -- 23 because truancy is a huge problem in school. If we 24 don't measure it, if we don't put a weight on it, 25 it's going to continue.</p>

Page 158	Page 160
<p>1 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I guess my 2 problem is, it's because the survey's attached with 3 it. If the survey -- if it was just attendance, I'd 4 have less of an issue with it. 5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I think 6 attendance is what people look at. 7 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I'm willing to go 8 with a 5, but let's keep it -- I don't want to drop 9 it off. 10 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I don't want to 11 drop it, either, because I kept looking at the six, 12 seven, and eight, and I was trying to remember my 13 six, seven, and eight, and I was completely ignored 14 in the sixth grade. Completely. I was very 15 fortunate that at the seventh and eighth, the 16 teachers decided to do an experiment, and things 17 changed dramatically. 18 It was a dramatic shift. Whatever I 19 learned in seventh and eighth, it was the same BS at 20 eighth and ninth in high school. So it was 21 accelerated learning. There was a grand experiment, 22 and nobody picked up. But I value what the kids 23 would say at six, seven, and eight. I don't know 24 about the younger kids, but if a student is sitting 25 there -- and I had all As, but I was still ignored,</p>	<p>1 about college and career readiness. There was 2 almost total agreement at 15, but one 20. 3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I have a question 4 about opportunities to learn for the high school. 5 Because I'm the 15-pointer there, because of just 6 what you said, because it's truancy. And if you 7 don't hold schools accountable for attendance, 8 particularly in the high school, if it's not 9 valuable -- and truancy is what gets kids in high 10 school. It's what everybody fights with. And I 11 think to make that less important is letting the 12 kids know you really don't have to be there. It's 13 just 5 points now. Because it's not about the 14 surveys. I agree with you, those surveys have been 15 around 100 years, but that attendance -- 16 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: But your 20 is in 17 college career and readiness. 18 MS. BOAST: She's got 15. 19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Opportunity to 20 learn. I haven't left opportunity to learn yet. I 21 needed to say that about high school, because I was 22 right with you. 23 MS. BOAST: One important thing to 24 remember is that attendance is in your operational 25 framework, so it's not being ignored. So</p>
Page 159	Page 161
<p>1 because I was very bad-behaved. I was still ignored 2 and maybe that's why I decided -- I don't know. 3 MS. BOAST: Do you feel comfortable with 4 5? 5 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I'm comfortable 6 with 5. 7 MS. BOAST: Or there's enough of a 8 sense -- 9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So I hear what 10 David is saying, and I am with you, actually, on the 11 attendance. My gut thing is, I don't like the 12 surveys and I don't know how to do that because we 13 can't -- again, going back to what Katie was saying 14 before, you can't say it's not going to count for 15 charter schools, but it's going to count for 16 traditional public schools. So you know, that's 17 where you are; right? That's what you would say to 18 me. 19 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: It's not a Waterloo 20 point for me. 21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's just that I 22 don't want them to get more points. 23 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'd prefer it to be 24 gone, but it doesn't -- 25 MS. BOAST: Okay, so 7.5. Let's talk</p>	<p>1 essentially this has a very low weight because it's 2 together with the survey. 3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But I still am 4 concerned with 5 points for attendance in high 5 school. But that's my concern. 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I gave it less 7 weight because it does appear in the operational. 8 So I think it has the weight in the operational that 9 isn't necessary here, because it's attached to the 10 survey. 11 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: We could go back 12 and forth. 13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So because -- 14 MS. POULOS: I do think it's important for 15 you to think about it, and you may still land in the 16 same place. This is your academic performance 17 framework. This is academic. 18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Attendance very 19 much links to -- 20 MS. POULOS: You can't learn if you're not 21 in school; right? And we do have the 22 organizational, where the organizational -- I think 23 we have suggested putting something in about truancy 24 rates, but we definitely have been looking at the 25 school's process, but we could add an attendance</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 162</p> <p>1 rate into the academic -- or, sorry, to the 2 organizational pretty easily where we're actually 3 just saying we expect the school to have a 95 4 percent attendance rate, and if you're not meeting 5 that, then to -- 6 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: What are you 7 doing? 8 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Have a plan to 9 address it. 10 MS. POULOS: Right. So that is something 11 for you to think about. Do you want it here or do 12 you want it somewhere else? 13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm fine with the 14 5. I just had to say that. 15 MS. BOAST: Okay. So college and career 16 readiness. All 15, but one 20. 17 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I find that very 18 interesting, because coming from a high school 19 perspective, college and career readiness -- that's 20 a dadgum giveaway. That 15 points, that is -- oh, I 21 can count on that. That is mine. So to give it 15 22 points is saying, "That's all right, we'll do that 23 for you, because that's an easy one." 24 MS. BOAST: Why didn't you put it lower? 25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Because I figured</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 164</p> <p>1 highest -- so if you're getting these I'll just call 2 them gimme points, and I don't really mean that as 3 negatively as it sounds, an opportunity to learn, 4 which attendance -- I agree, it's important. But if 5 you're going to be guaranteed that you're going to 6 get this many points out of 100, or whatever, then 7 these other things we're looking at is: Are 8 students learning? You're giving them less 9 importance. And so we're looking at a school that 10 has an F grade or a D -- let's say they have a D -- 11 or a C. Let's make it a C. And yet they're pretty 12 low scores. They could have Ds or Fs in these 13 things that I think are important, like learning. 14 MS. BOAST: Well, you have two F schools 15 that have Bs in college and career readiness. 16 MS. POULOS: Just so that you understand, 17 because I'm not sure -- maybe you all do understand 18 how the college-and-career-readiness indicator 19 works. And I think, Danielle, what you're referring 20 to is, you can enroll students in dual credit study 21 skills, and we're going to use that because that is 22 the most egregious. It is literally not a course. 23 There is no rigor. Every student will pass that 24 course without any problem, and that will count as 25 both participation and success for a student in dual</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 163</p> <p>1 15 points. Yeah, why not. 2 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. 3 MS. BOAST: Anybody want to arbitrate for 4 higher? Anybody advocate for higher? 5 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I would advocate 6 for higher only because we're really not doing 7 anything and I don't know what needs to be done. 8 Earlier in the week, I was very privileged to look 9 at that from people from out-of-state, and we're 10 nowhere close to what other states are doing. 11 MS. BOAST: In terms of what's considered 12 in the -- 13 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Right. Right. 14 And career readiness and jobs and jobs that pay good 15 money. We're just lame in that. And I was puzzled. 16 I thought that 15 was good enough, but I wasn't 17 quite sure whether that was true or not. I felt 18 like we needed to do something, but I wasn't sure 19 whether 20, 25, or 15 would benefit. I'm at a loss. 20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I'm right 21 there with you, because from a sense, you're saying 22 it's a giveaway because you take these classes, in 23 that sense, so then it diminishes -- because we're 24 talking about points now -- how much I think is 25 important that the lowest quartile growth and the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 165</p> <p>1 credit, which then counts that student as a 2 college-and-career-ready student. So that's what 3 Danielle is referring to, which you have to 4 understand what's behind there and whether it's 5 actually getting at what you want it to get at; 6 right, and why Danielle says, "It's kind of a 7 gimme." So is that actually measuring the things 8 you think are important, or Karyl Ann, to your 9 point, is the outcome on the end-of-year assessment 10 more important? 11 (A discussion was held off the record.) 12 MS. BOAST: You would feel more 13 comfortable with a higher weight if you were more 14 confident in the rigor of the indicator. 15 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: And my answer is 16 yes, I would feel comfortable if it was rigorous and 17 it was with substance. I would add a higher value, 18 because we're just nowhere in career and college 19 readiness. We're nowhere. 20 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I agree, but to 21 Katie's point, if you can give them a gimme class 22 which qualifies them, we're giving them 15 or 20 23 points, and it doesn't mean anything. 24 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Right. 25 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: So in that case,</p>

Page 166

1 based on how they meet that criteria, I say make it
 2 only 5 or 10 points --
 3 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes, you're right.
 4 I changed.
 5 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: -- if that's how
 6 we're measuring it, so it comes down to how do we
 7 evaluate that? Because if you go back and say 50
 8 percent of the students graduating from high school
 9 still have to take remedial classes in college, then
 10 they're not ready. I don't care if they pass this
 11 class in high school. They're not ready.
 12 MS. POULOS: And I'm not saying everybody
 13 does that. But I am saying when you have a D and F
 14 school, I will tell you if you go look at their
 15 college-and-career-readiness indicator, it may be
 16 the COMPASS or ASVAB or whatever, but it is a very
 17 low rigor.
 18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: You have to
 19 administer those. You are required. And it's not
 20 anything to do with the outcome. It's the fact that
 21 you simply offered the ASVAB, or you offered the
 22 COMPASS or you offered the dual credit.
 23 MS. POULOS: It's both. We give points
 24 for participation and we give points for success.
 25 Both of those are built into this indicator.

Page 167

1 MS. BOAST: 10?
 2 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I'm still at a
 3 loss.
 4 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'm fine with 10,
 5 but I don't know at this point, you know, where do
 6 we feel the need to put the other 5?
 7 MS. BOAST: We're actually over on that
 8 column --
 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Oh, okay.
 10 MS. BOAST: -- in terms of what I have.
 11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Danielle has
 12 144.
 13 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Just go to the
 14 bottom and do a net sum on all the columns.
 15 MS. BOAST: We'll review this again, we'll
 16 type them up.
 17 So then for graduation rates, this one is
 18 a little tougher, because you have two 10s, two 15s,
 19 a 5 and an 8. So I would have you consider either a
 20 10 or a 12.5 here, unless there's strong feelings
 21 for the higher or lower.
 22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Graduation rate
 23 drives smaller high schools to keep kids in school
 24 and to look at options. There is the penalty and
 25 Dave said with his daughter, his daughter left high

Page 168

1 school as a sophomore and took her GED, she was
 2 considered a dropout.
 3 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: We home-schooled
 4 her two years and she passed her GED, went to T-VI,
 5 CNM now, for a year and transferred to Eastern, got
 6 an associate's degree and became an RN, making \$26
 7 an hour coming out of college.
 8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And we're losing
 9 all those children, but what it does is, it forces
 10 schools into finding options for students who learn
 11 differently and to deal with graduation requirements
 12 creatively. And I fear if we take the emphasis off
 13 of -- well, it goes right into the dropout rate, the
 14 graduation rate, that's published across the state
 15 that everybody's talking about. I just don't feel
 16 like we can -- I can't back off, but if it's
 17 consensus, whatever we have to add.
 18 MS. BOAST: Do you advocate for 15?
 19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Absolutely.
 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I was to 5, so --
 21 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I was the next
 22 one higher, only because --
 23 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: For many of those
 24 other reasons that I, you know --
 25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I'm looking at

Page 169

1 it from a small rural perspective, not a large
 2 district.
 3 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I know.
 4 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Which one are we
 5 on?
 6 MS. BOAST: Graduation rates.
 7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: You're becoming
 8 like us now.
 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So what was the
 10 number you floated out there?
 11 MS. BOAST: Initially, 10 or 12.5. But I
 12 think --
 13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm one person.
 14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, it
 15 mystifies me. And I understand the GED and I
 16 understand that the kids come in and you have to
 17 count them, which is a problem. That would be nice
 18 if we could get the legislature to actually make it
 19 what it should be. But when I see an A school with
 20 a D graduation, I want to know what happened to
 21 those kids.
 22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I come in and it's
 23 not on the 40, 80 or 120th day. I come in and I'm a
 24 nontraditional student who doesn't have the habit of
 25 school. And very, very quickly, the school can

<p>Page 170</p> <p>1 purposefully or unintentionally push me right back 2 out where I was, and it doesn't count against the 3 school. 4 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Well, in the larger 5 metropolitan areas, looking at Albuquerque, maybe 6 Las Cruces, Santa Fe, you have a lot of substance 7 abuse by the parents. So you have a lot of students 8 that drop out to either care for siblings or to care 9 for themselves, and it contributes to that low 10 graduation rate, but it's not a fault of the school 11 or the student. It's economic or other 12 socioeconomic reasons that are causing it, and it's 13 not really a failure of the school. It's a failure 14 of society or the community. But you're penalizing 15 the school by lowering the grade if you do that. 16 So that's why I only gave it 10. 17 Graduation is a 10. Because graduation is 18 important, but you know, you can graduate and not 19 know anything. And worse, you can know a lot but 20 you don't know how to think critically. 21 So I think that's the danger of just 22 saying we're going to give you a piece of sheepskin 23 and say, "Here, go on," and then you go and you get 24 a job, because you have a certificate, and you get 25 fired because you can't read the manual of how to</p>	<p>Page 172</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We issued 2 certificates of attendance. 3 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Certificates of 4 completion. 5 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Ours was, you 6 attended, you attended four years of this school. 7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Anyway, I don't 8 know. Maybe we just need to put less points. I 9 don't know. 10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm fine. 11 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Katie, you put up 12 the scores there, which is the average of what we 13 have; correct? 14 MS. BOAST: So we're getting sort of -- 15 the ones that are in black text in those two green 16 lines are the ones we finalized. The others you 17 should sort of ignore for now. So we're talking 18 about -- the light ones are the ones, just average. 19 We haven't gotten to them, though. 20 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Well, could I 21 suggest this? That we maybe go and look at some of 22 the other ones that we haven't settled on, because 23 if we want it to be higher, that means we have to 24 lower something else, because we're at 100 overall. 25 MS. BOAST: Right. So we'll come back to</p>
<p>Page 171</p> <p>1 operate the piece of equipment that they want you to 2 operate. It's a disservice. 3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I don't 4 think I disagree with you. Now we're talking about 5 New Mexico. I'm only talking here, that the 6 majority of this state is low socioeconomic. It 7 just is. Look at these schools. It's like a huge 8 amount. So I see that they are at a disadvantage 9 forever, and I absolutely agree with what you're 10 saying. It's just that, to me, it's sort of like 11 what we just said in the last conversation. If you 12 don't put a lot of points on that this is really 13 important, then it's saying, like, well, it's not 14 that important. And yet, I totally agree with you. 15 So I'm truly conflicted in what I'm 16 saying, and I'll tell you in my perfect world, you 17 would graduate from high school with an academic 18 diploma if you passed the entrance into a college. 19 I mean, I totally agree with you when I say that. I 20 think you shouldn't graduate. If we have special 21 ed. kids and they graduate, I think that's fine. 22 And I don't think that they -- my high school had 23 different kinds of diplomas. So if you had an 24 academic diploma, then it meant that you actually 25 could go to school and didn't do something.</p>	<p>Page 173</p> <p>1 graduation. I think that is a good idea. 2 Why don't we look next at proficiency. 3 Current standing. The very top first one. So we 4 had sort of a split. Let's see. Three for 20, two 5 for 30, and one for 40, which lands us somewhere 6 around 30. 7 MS. POULOS: Just a little piece of 8 information there. You all probably know this. But 9 in current standing, proficiency, we are actually 10 considering both proficiency and growth. That is a 11 dual measure, includes both proficiency and growth. 12 MS. BOAST: Right. Value-added adjusted, 13 yes, proficiency. 14 MS. POULOS: Yes. 15 MS. BOAST: So the proficiency part, the 16 true proficiency, straight, just what percentage of 17 students is proficient will be half of whatever 18 weight you put on this. 19 MS. POULOS: Slightly more than half. 20 MS. BOAST: Slightly more than half. 21 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Proficiency and 22 growth. 23 MS. POULOS: Proficiency and growth. Yes. 24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But more 25 proficiency.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 174</p> <p>1 MS. POULOS: More proficiency than growth. 2 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I thought the 3 second option threw more schools, not necessarily 4 appropriately, off skew a little bit. 5 MS. BOAST: Into that option 2. 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: That's why I went 7 with -- 8 MS. BOAST: A lower -- 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. 10 MS. BOAST: Would you all be comfortable 11 with 30? We're going to have to do a final 12 adjustment because I think we're going to be a 13 little off and have to look. But I'd rather that we 14 look at each one and then have to say, okay, we're 15 10 off, or however much off, and come back. So are 16 people comfortable with 30? That's pretty much the 17 middle. Okay. Why don't we finalize 30. 18 And then for high schools, again, we had a 19 range of from 20 to 40. Are you comfortable putting 20 30? We're going to have to make some adjustments 21 here, but as a starting -- okay, let's go with that 22 to 30. 23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Can I ask a 24 question of you, Katie? So a school who has high 25 proficiency may not have such a high growth. It's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 176</p> <p>1 but they're capable of it; so they're not 2 encouraging them and directing them into those 3 things where they could raise the proficiency score. 4 They're just going along, getting along, type thing. 5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That's why I 6 like that. 7 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: In a way, we put a 8 lot of focus on special ed. over the years, and you 9 know, we get criticized because so much money goes 10 into special ed., being D-level special ed.; right? 11 And we ignore the gifted, which is also special ed. 12 And the thing is, if you ignore the gifted, you can 13 still have proficiency, but you are not having a lot 14 of growth by ignoring the gifted, and I think we 15 need to be supporting those gifted. 16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So what I am 17 saying is that I am happy that it's a score that 18 kind of rewards both, as opposed to only one. 19 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Right. 20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: We agree. Got 21 it. 22 MS. BOAST: Okay. Great. Let's look 23 at -- we have two more before we can come back to 24 graduation and then do some adjustments overall. 25 So line 9, which is the subgroup</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 175</p> <p>1 possible. 2 MS. POULOS: It is possible. 3 MS. BOAST: Absolutely. 4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So this 5 particular measure would not penalize them for less 6 growth, but high proficiency. They could have a 67 7 percent proficiency. 8 MS. POULOS: They could have really high 9 proficiency and if they are not growing their 10 students and their growth score is really low, they 11 could have a low current standing score, and we do 12 see that. 13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So this kind of 14 gives them a little bit of both. People who have 15 great growth and low proficiency, they could be 16 doing well, too. 17 MS. POULOS: Yes. 18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So it kind of is 19 good for everybody, or not? 20 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And I think by 21 balancing growth and proficiency, it's forcing 22 schools to not ignore those who are doing well but 23 could do better. You know, we have students that 24 are taking algebra 2 but they're not taking an 25 advanced algebra, not taking those advanced classes,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 177</p> <p>1 performance, growth, subgroup growth, for elementary 2 school, four of the six we've got 30. So pretty 3 high. But then we've also got a 15 and a 20. I 4 would suggest that 25 here, unless the 15 feels 5 really strongly about talking about something lower. 6 25 would be a quarter of the whole framework. It's 7 clearly very important in terms of your priority and 8 your focus. But 25 would be a significant statement 9 that you'd be making. 10 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: That's fine. 11 MS. BOAST: Okay. Again, we'll have to 12 come back. 13 And then on the high school side, we've 14 got -- it looks like we're landing at around 15 15 because we've got three at 10, two at 15, one at 20. 16 So if we went with 15, does anybody feel that that's 17 not enough or too much? 18 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Uh-huh. 19 MS. BOAST: Okay. So that takes us to the 20 school-specific goals. What I would just propose, 21 just looking again -- not trying to balance yet, but 22 just looking at what we have there -- I would say 10 23 is definitely -- we have four 10s, a 15, and an 8. 24 So I would suggest 10 there and actually a 12.5 for 25 high school. But --</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 178</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yeah. 2 MS. BOAST: Okay. So that is going to 3 leave us, then, with needing to adjust 5 points for 4 elementary. Why don't we do that before we talk 5 about graduation? That might be a little easier. 6 So something in the elementary model needs to be 7 reduced by 5. 8 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Or two pieces by 9 2.5. 10 MS. BOAST: Exactly, which might be 11 easier, you know. You have got 30 percent on the 12 current standing. 13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Elementary is 14 K-8; right? 15 MS. BOAST: Yes. And you might also 16 consider -- so this has 40 percent on proficiency, 17 that top group, and then 50 percent on the growth 18 measures. 19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: You said -- 20 MS. BOAST: 40 percent on proficiency, 50 21 percent on growth. Given that your current standing 22 has a bit of -- you know, does represent some 23 growth, it may be that you want to bring the school 24 growth value-added to 10. Then you'd have an exact 25 50/50 split between proficiency and growth if you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 180</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And that's fine. 2 MS. BOAST: And 20 is still a very high, 3 you know -- places a priority on that subgroup 4 performance. 5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And part of the 6 lowest performer -- the highest performing group and 7 the lowest performing is also part of that. 8 MS. BOAST: Yes. Okay. So people are 9 comfortable with this? And again, this is not 10 finalizing, but this would be what would be taken to 11 schools, and you get feedback on it, and probably 12 there would likely be some final tweaks that you may 13 make. 14 Okay. So we are 10 points over on the 15 high school, but we still haven't really resolved 16 where you want to be for graduation rates. 17 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: That's without 18 graduation rate. It's 10 points. 19 MS. POULOS: That is cutting 10 points. 20 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We're 10 points over 21 with 10 points in graduation. 22 MS. POULOS: Just take graduation rate 23 out. I'm kidding. 24 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You could take the 5 25 that I wanted and get yourself 5 points there.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 179</p> <p>1 went that direction. If you wanted to maintain a 2 higher on growth, then you could either bring 3 current standing to 25 or... 4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Take out a loan 5 for 5 more points? 6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Well, we could 7 either reduce the 30 to 25, or we could reduce the 8 30 to 27.5 and maybe the subgroup performance growth 9 to 22.5, and shave 2.5 points from those two larger 10 numbers. 11 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: The subgroup is 12 included in the current standing proficiency; right? 13 Because it's all the students. 14 MS. BOAST: Yes, exactly. Yes. 15 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And it's going to 16 be included in that growth figure also. 17 MS. BOAST: Yes. 18 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And growth is also 19 in part of the proficiency. 20 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Right. But the 21 subperformance growth is in the top one as well as 22 in the next one down. I mean, I would feel better 23 by lowering the subgroup to 20 and leaving the 24 proficiency growth at 30, since we're in essence 25 counting growth twice.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 181</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I guess I'm the 2 one who's always the one about the school-specific 3 goals. And maybe I'm just looking at this 4 incorrectly, but to me, the goal, period, is the 5 kids can do math, reading, and writing. And the 6 specific reason the school was established, for want 7 of a better word, is because they think by doing 8 this or adding this, that that will help students 9 who are not -- don't like or not doing well, 10 whatever, in a traditional public school, and that's 11 why they have this goal. That's why we're going to 12 do dance, that's why we're going to do music, or 13 hands-on, or whatever. 14 So to me, it's less important, not to the 15 point where if they say they're doing expository 16 learning and they're doing project-based learning, 17 that's a way different thing. But to me, it's less 18 important than the other ones are. So that's just 19 my stand on it. That's why I think I gave it a low 20 score. 21 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I'm the 22 opposite, because I think the mission -- and if the 23 school has -- can -- and I think if there's an area 24 where there's going to be major pushback from the 25 schools, it's going to be in lessening the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 182</p> <p>1 importance of the school-specific. And I think that 2 that's one of our primary obligations, is to make 3 sure that they are holding true to that mission. 4 And just because they're performing academically -- 5 and I applaud that -- it does not mean they're 6 holding to their mission. They're performing 7 academically. But they could be doing nothing for 8 what they -- you know, and that's where I think 9 we've got that obligation, a fiduciary obligation, 10 to make sure; otherwise, why aren't they going to 11 the local school? Because -- 12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: If they're doing 13 really well at whatever they're doing, then -- 14 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So are many at the 15 local school. But they said that they wanted to do 16 this. So therefore, if they're not doing that, then 17 why do they exist? 18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I have a question. 19 Patty, do you feel it's more important -- the 20 school-specific goals at elementary have 10 points. 21 At high school they have 12 and a half. 22 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. 23 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Is it more 24 important to have school-specific goals at the high 25 school?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 184</p> <p>1 MS. BOAST: At 100. 2 MS. POULOS: Graduation is still a 10. 3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I'm fine with 4 10. I was the one who was fighting that. These are 5 just numbers. 6 MS. BOAST: Well, and again, you will 7 be -- 8 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: It's a number, but 9 it tells the schools what they can focus on to 10 maximize their score for their grade. Let's just 11 say that they're not doing very good at college and 12 career readiness, but they can work on these other 13 things and focus on them and get the score up and go 14 ahead and do that. 15 If you're missing somewhere, focus on the 16 ones; but if there's ones, you're going to get your 17 25 points and you're not working on growth and 18 proficiency there, you're going to lose a lot of 19 points. So we are basically giving them a target of 20 what they should be focusing on. 21 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That's right. 22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And that's where 23 I'm coming from, because I think that's what they 24 should be focusing on. 25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But look at it</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 183</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No. 2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So that should 3 maybe be 10 instead of 12. 4 MS. BOAST: Because if you make an 5 adjustment of that, it probably should be the same 6 on both of them. Right? Okay. 7 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So they would take 8 that 2.5 points. 9 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Your mission is your 10 mission regardless of what grade level you're 11 serving. 12 MS. BOAST: One other thing to consider 13 here for the high school is that generally in high 14 school, you're adding graduation and college and 15 career readiness, so you're having to take away from 16 proficiency and growth. We have the exact same 17 proficiency here for the K-8 and the high school. 18 So you might consider bringing those down only 19 because the expectation is you're reducing -- you're 20 taking some of the weight of both proficiency and 21 growth to include graduation and college and career 22 readiness. So -- 23 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Drop that to 25. 24 And then if we took school growth to 5, that puts us 25 at 100.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 185</p> <p>1 relative to all the other numbers. If it's higher 2 in that area, it's going to have the same emphasis 3 to the school within the context of that 100 4 percent. I agree with you, the more points you put 5 in there, the relative importance increases and it 6 gives them some options. I'm fine. 7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So we're not at 8 140 anymore. 9 MS. BOAST: We're at 100 on both. 10 So thank you. We actually accomplished 11 the goals for today that -- what I will do is send 12 an updated table with the tier based on these 13 weights, so that you can see that. And then, of 14 course, this is just the draft framework, which will 15 get feedback. 16 So my question for you is, Patty, this may 17 be a question for you. We had on the agenda -- it's 18 3:00. We are a little behind. That took a long 19 amount of time. One other topic was starting to 20 discuss a timeline for implementing. Is that 21 something you want to take the next half hour for? 22 Is that a topic for tomorrow? 23 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Tomorrow. 24 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think it can be, 25 because on the agenda for tomorrow is an agenda item</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 186</p> <p>1 for rolling out. 2 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: And the schedule. 3 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So I think we can do 4 that tomorrow. 5 MS. BOAST: A lot of good thinking today. 6 Thank you. Okay. 7 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I'm very 8 satisfied, except that we left the career readiness 9 off from middle school. And the one thing I learned 10 yesterday was that that is critical for young men 11 and women to make a decision about their future in 12 middle school. 13 MS. POULOS: But that's not something we 14 actually measure. So that would be requiring you to 15 require charter schools to do something that all the 16 other public schools aren't required to do. 17 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: In the 18 curriculum. 19 MS. POULOS: But that's not what that 20 measures. What that measures is, are students 21 enrolled in AP/IB dual credit? Are they taking the 22 AP assessment? Are they taking SAT, PSA, vocational 23 assessment? 24 MS. BOAST: But you would argue for a 25 different set of --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 188</p> <p>1 do something different. We don't have the authority 2 to require something different of the charters in 3 the sense that we're going to create this whole 4 completely different standard for college 5 and-career-readiness assessment than the, quote, 6 unquote, traditional public schools. But if the 7 school wants to come to us and say, "Hey, I have got 8 this bang-up idea about doing this for college and 9 career readiness," they can take that on and then 10 show it as a model to the rest of the schools. 11 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And wouldn't that 12 fall under the school-specific goals? 13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes, absolutely. 14 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: They could include 15 that if that's their specific goals. When I was in 16 sixth grade, I remember -- boy, it's a long time 17 ago -- I had to write six -- pick six occupations 18 and write at least one page on the occupation, what 19 it was, and what I could possibly earn. It was 20 sixth grade. 21 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: That's different. 22 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And I picked a 23 policeman, a doctor, a lawyer, a fireman, a 24 builder -- which my father was -- and an accountant. 25 Well, guess what I am. I'm not really an</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 187</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Yes, yes. A lot 2 of the states are getting tuned into this whole idea 3 of starting to prepare young men and women in middle 4 school so that by the eighth and ninth grade they're 5 choosing their path. And it has worked out very, 6 very well in some states where graduations rates 7 have now skyrocketed because these students 8 understand that school matters in terms of their 9 future, and I think that we have to do that at some 10 point. 11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think that's 12 statewide. I don't disagree with you. I think it's 13 a really state -- sort of, like, should we have 14 early childhood education, even though all the data 15 shows that it works and we don't have it. So I 16 would agree with you that opportunities to see 17 careers and know about careers, and I think it's -- 18 I don't think I could name 20 careers right now. 19 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Can it be done 20 within the charter schools? Can charter schools -- 21 can we do stuff different than the public schools? 22 And the answer is, to a large extent, we can. 23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Someone could 24 have that as their mission. 25 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: A charter school can</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 189</p> <p>1 accountant. I'm a finance, a numbers person. I 2 don't have a degree in accounting. I do have a 3 degree in economics and finance. 4 MS. BOAST: It worked. 5 COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I kind of went in 6 one direction. But without even thinking about that 7 later on, I was kind of setting a course of where I 8 was going without even realizing it. 9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think it would 10 really be interesting to see a charter say, I want 11 to do six, seven, and eight, and I'm going to 12 concentrate on career readiness. 13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: If you look at 14 PAPA, that's what they started with as a middle 15 school, fine arts. Public Academy for Performing 16 Arts. 17 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: The healths science 18 that we closed, that was their goal, was to get kids 19 on the path for -- and we've got a magnet school in 20 Cruces that does health sciences. 21 MS. BOAST: Thank you so much. I won't 22 see you in December. My colleague Tim will be there 23 for the coalition meeting. But please feel free if 24 something occurs to you tomorrow or next week about 25 the waiting or the rollout or any questions, please</p>

1 contact me.

2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: How is that
3 working on the 8th and 9th? We are attending --

4 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'll do that
5 tomorrow.

6 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: It's on your
7 agenda.

8 MS. BOAST: Okay.

9 (The Work Session concluded at 3:03 p.m.)

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO

ss

2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

3
4 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

5 I, MARY ABERNATHY SEAL, New Mexico

6 Certified Shorthand Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that

7 I did report in stenographic shorthand the
8 proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing is a
9 true and correct transcription of proceedings.

10
11 _____
12 Mary Abernathy Seal

BEAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.

13 NM Certified Court Reporter #69

License expires: 12/31/17

14 (9113L) MAS

Date taken: November 16, 2017

Proofread by: RM

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25