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COMMISSIONER GIPSON: This is a work session, so we don't have a formal opening. We are starting. The transcription is starting.

MS. BOAST: Wonderful. So you should have a copy of the presentation in front of you. It's the same that will be popping up behind you. Hopefully it's big enough that you can just go off of this, but use that as a reference, if you would like. Whatever works best for you.

Okay. So the agenda for today -- there is a lot to get through, and the reason for the work session is based on the conversations that we had in August and the conversation about which additional indicators you as the Commission would like to consider for a revised academic performance framework. We at Public Impact ran a number of subgroup measures looking at proficiency and growth, and then also looked at taking the disaggregated A-through-F grades from the A-through-F system and looking at -- so what we were doing is trying to test for you how these measures would work together as a framework. So there's not a plan to try to finalize anything until the new year really. This is a chance to look at these test trial run indicators and see what works, what doesn't, you know, what notifications need to be made. So today we'll be looking at first the subgroup indicators because that's a whole new set of indicators from what you're used to seeing for the charter schools. Then we will look at some of the issues around the school-specific indicators. And we have that all scheduled before lunch. If we go more quickly, we'll move into the next topic, which is a pretty important one, how you take all the indicators and roll them up into an overall rating or tier to assist you in both annual performance monitoring and renewal decisions. So that will be a big topic. And then the final topic for today, which will really, I think, go more to an internal conversation is some initial conversations about how the eventual framework would be rolled out.

So that is the agenda. Again, we may be able to spend a little less time on some and more on others, and we'll just flex as we go, if that works for you all.

So before we dive in, I also printed out for you the timeline that we had set for -- in the summer when first looking at this project to revise the performance framework. So it's very small type. Sorry about that. We have already -- we had the
not anticipating from the schools, I think we've got clear sailing with being able to move the timeline in terms of approving it. And then maybe if we hit some bumps in the road with the data or whatever, then we might need either calls or a visit at that point in time, because we've already started the process.

MS. BOAST: Yes, and that is a typical additional point that often we will come back in person to meetings at the point of approval if there are issues. But if we can do that by phone, by conference -- so again, we're flexible there.

Any other comments on timeline or questions?

Okay, so goals for today. This is fairly ambitious, but we're going to review the trial run results, but then we ultimately would like to leave with you in possession of a draft set of indicators and a draft plan for rolling up. This is not a final approved. It is not final. But it's a draft to share with schools. We would expect that when we've gone through this process with other authorizers, we would expect there will be some more revisions and tweaks, so hopefully that takes a little pressure off feeling we're finalizing the

next April? No, actually, I don't. But I know from August on. So I was just thinking that before we finalize something, we might coordinate with you, but it sounds like you're a lot more flexible.

MS. BOAST: We're flexible.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And we're fairly inflexible.

MS. BOAST: That will work together well.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That's why I mentioned it.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And actually, Lyria and I spoke a little bit about this last night because in my perfect world, I would like the approval to be done before April/May, because I think it would be challenging to negotiate with the renewal schools and the other schools that we have backed up when we haven't approved the performance framework. I think it presents just challenges, you know, that I would like to avoid. So if we could get it in place so that, you know, we don't have schools saying, "I didn't really know that's what you were going to do," and you know, I think it would just be a little smoother if -- and I'm hoping that we're closer than further away in agreeing to this, so that barring incredible pushback, which I'm
Before we dive in, both of these were additional information this gives you.

we're going to present it all and see sort of what look at proficiency because that can give you some it's new in that you're looking at it in a
disaggregated way, but the system itself is not new.

We'll start with the subgroup performance,

turning over to page 4 and 5 and 7. And so just to review, again, you know why this was considered as an addition to the framework. A couple important points. First, in the statute there is the requirement for disaggregation of statement assessment results, and while it's available on the report card informational part, actually having it in your framework has you meeting statute requirements that are fairly important.

The most important thing, though, and what really came up in what we heard from you all, is that you feel the need -- or the subgroup performance indicators give you a better ability to dig into the performance of a school, especially if they're serving large groups of kids in subgroups that are traditionally lower-performing. So giving you the ability to say, well, the school is getting a D or an F in a certain component, but do we really think that is a good reflection of what's actually happening in the school?

And that's very important to many of the Commissioners in terms of what you shared were priorities. It also will hopefully strengthen your review process during renewal. Because often those are some of the stickiest issues, right, like you know, because schools will often, you know, have valid complaints that accountability ratings aren't truly reflecting who they're serving and how they're doing with those students. So we're trying to shed some more light here for you.

So we took a look at both proficiency and at growth. You know, I think there was more interest in the growth and what that can tell you, because that's really trying to tell you how much students are learning at that school. But we did look at proficiency because that can give you some good insights as well into school performance. So we're going to present it all and see sort of what additional information this gives you.

Before we dive in, both of these were provided by PED, but there are a couple of important data notes that I need to give here, and anybody who really wants to dig into the weeds, I'm happy to talk to you during break if you have really specific questions, or now. But subgroup proficiency -- we were looking at school results that covered all assessments and all grades. So this includes -- and these are the data files that were provided to us, so it does include K through 12. Whatever is available, we used the results there.

And the subgroups that we looked at were initially -- we set out to look at the free and reduced lunch, so economically disadvantaged students, English language learners, and students with disabilities. As it turned out, you'll see as we go through, there were too many results suppressed for the ELL and the SPED for us to be able to feel comfortable with the results and the categories. So you're going to see the results for free and reduced lunch, but we are going to follow up to try to get unsuppressed data because ultimately if this is added to your framework, you do want all available subgroups.

For subgroup growth, we were able to look at all of the subgroups who had sufficient students.

There are some schools that just don't have enough students, so you're not going to see those. The subgroup growth, you're going to see quite a lot of detail today, because the results that we received from PED were disaggregated results of that Q1/Q3 growth. So I think you're familiar with seeing the growth of the bottom students in the bottom quartile compared to the top three quartiles. So what you're going to see today is both of those results then disaggregated to those three subgroups.

We did not -- another thing that could possibly be a discussion point are additional subgroups. So race, ethnicity, migrant is sometimes something that can be reported. When we looked at the results for the charter schools, I think there were only four schools that had results for African-American students, and a majority had Hispanic. That will be a discussion ultimately if you do decide to add the subgroup measures. You'll want the main FRL, ELL, and SPED, but for schools that have enough students in other groups, do you want to include those? So that will definitely be a discussion point.

Okay. So any other questions? We're going to now dive into subgroup proficiency. Any
## Page 14

| 1 | questions so far? I think I may have actually already covered all of this. |
| 2 | For subgroup proficiency, as I said, we tried to look at the three main subgroups, only looked at FRL. And the evaluation that we did was to look at each charter school and see how students in each of the three subgroups compared to their peers across the state. So there are a couple of things that are important here. We have a graphic here. This is an example of a school, a charter school who has enough FRL students for their performance to be evaluated, and we're looking at the ELA proficiency rates here for their economically disadvantaged students. This school serves grades 6 through 12 and their FRL proficiency for ELA is 15 percent. So 15 percent of those students are at or above proficiency.
| 10 | When we look at all other schools in the state and the performance for grades 6 through 12, this school falls into the second quartile. And you can see that at the 75th threshold, 33 percent of the FRL students are proficient in grades 6 through 12 at the median, you know, so that state average performance is 22 percent proficiency rate. The bottom quartile, 13 percent proficiency. So you can see this school falls between that 25th and 50th, so this would be a second-quartile school. Does that makes sense in terms of -- so you'll see all the results in terms of quartiles, quartiles statewide. Just a caveat, it's very important to be looking at making those grade-served distinctions because proficiency rates are very different, you know, grade by grade. So we did all those adjustments behind -- again, if you want more details about the methodology, I'm happy to talk through that. But as we're looking through results, you're basically seeing quartile comparison.
| 13 | Okay. So on page 6 of your handout, we showed two examples. This is really to highlight why are we even looking at adding or considering adding this? So the top graph shows two high poverty charter schools. One has 99 percent economically disadvantaged students, the second 95 percent. They both received an F in terms of their current standing grades. And in the A-through-F, again, the current standing is the one that looks at proficiency rates. So they have an F grade for current standing. Well, you can see that one of the schools, you know, for their students, economically disadvantaged students, it sort of aligns when you look at those students. They're in the bottom quartile statewide compared to other students, economically disadvantaged students. But the top school actually, when you do that statewide comparison, they're above the state median. So their students, you know, are actually faring better than the majority of students in poverty statewide.

## Page 15

| 1 | see this school falls between that 25th and 50th, so this would be a second-quartile school. Does that makes sense in terms of -- so you'll see all the results in terms of quartiles, quartiles statewide. Just a caveat, it's very important to be looking at making those grade-served distinctions because proficiency rates are very different, you know, grade by grade. So we did all those adjustments behind -- again, if you want more details about the methodology, I'm happy to talk through that. But as we're looking through results, you're basically seeing quartile comparison.
| 10 | Okay. So on page 6 of your handout, we showed two examples. This is really to highlight why are we even looking at adding or considering adding this? So the top graph shows two high poverty charter schools. One has 99 percent economically disadvantaged students, the second 95 percent. They both received an F in terms of their current standing grades. And in the A-through-F, again, the current standing is the one that looks at proficiency rates. So they have an F grade for current standing. Well, you can see that one of the schools, you know, for their students, economically disadvantaged students, it sort of aligns when you look at those students. They're in the bottom quartile statewide compared to other students, economically disadvantaged students. But the top school actually, when you do that statewide comparison, they're above the state median. So their students, you know, are actually faring better than the majority of students in poverty statewide.

## Page 16

| 1 | disadvantaged students, it sort of aligns when you look at those students. They're in the bottom quartile statewide compared to other students, economically disadvantaged students. But the top school actually, when you do that statewide comparison, they're above the state median. So their students, you know, are actually faring better than the majority of students in poverty statewide.
| 10 | This is a pretty important piece of information for you to know if you are monitoring performance or making a renewal decision, and I think this is exactly the kind of information that you had really prioritized.
| 14 | COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Right.
| 16 | MS. BOAST: And then similarly, the bottom example are two schools that are not -- you know, one has a 23 percent FRL enrollment, the other 45 percent. Again, when you dig in, you see very different stories than just that F current standing grade. So I'd love to just have your questions or comments on this, because while all schools are not -- many of the schools are aligned with their A-through-F grade, but what we're looking for are those exceptions and special conditions where you want to know whether a school has some performance aspects that you're not seeing in the A-through-F grade.
| 20 | Okay. So I am now going to give you the big -- here come the colored pictures.
| 23 | COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: For guys that could be color-blind.
| 26 | COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You're out of luck.
| 28 | MS. BOAST: And what you have is, you have the K-8 schools on one side and then high school on the other side, and you can see that on the second column. So in the handout, we pulled out some examples. Here you see all of the schools, okay? So let me give you a little -- if we start with the K-8 schools. You have all the A through F disaggregated grades in this left section. I think that's what you're used to seeing. Right? That middle section shows the subgroup growth, and you'll see because it's split out by the poor students in the bottom 25 percent and the top 75 percent, you have a lot of columns there. But basically what you have are the FRL, ELL, and SPED for ELA and math. We color-coded it so you can see that quartile. The final set on the right is subgroup proficiency. You can see that unfortunately right now we only have the FRL results, but ultimately, if
students do very well, and so they're well-balanced, charter schools that don't have a lot of poor been able to see. And we always wonder about think that it's a glimpse into stuff that we haven't think that it's a glimpse into stuff that we haven't which is the second colored; right? And so you'll see as you go down, if you kind of just -- you'll see that many of these are pretty aligned. Where you see green, you're seeing green in both places. Where you're seeing red, you're seeing red in both places. And what's valuable is where you're seeing differences.

I should also say, we purposefully did not put school names here because at this point we really want you to be looking at the usefulness of the information.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I don't know whether these particular ones -- but some schools are K-12, some are -- so is this the K-8 part of a K-12 school, or just a K-8 school, for example?

MS. BOAST: That's a really great point. And I think one that ultimately when we get a methodology document for you together -- in the trial run we followed the designation used in the A-through-F system, which I believe -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- if they serve high school grades, they're evaluated under that high school weighting system.

MS. POULOS: So all kids are included, no matter what. The way we're calling a K-8 is if they do not serve any high school students. The way that we're calling it a high school is they do serve some high school students. But no matter what, all of their students are included in the data. So this school on high schools, a school that could be K-12 or 6-12.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: It could be K-12, 6-12, 8-12, 9-12.

MS. POULOS: Right.

MS. BOAST: Any questions, any trends you're seeing? But I'd also just love to know how useful you think this would be, you know. Is this what you thought it would tell you?

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Well, for me, I think that it's a glimpse into stuff that we haven't been able to see. And we always wonder about charter schools that don't have a lot of poor students do very well, and so they're well-balanced, and those are weighted down by poor students who are having to struggle. And it probably doesn't mean they're not growing. It just means that they have that larger number of students in that category.

MS. BOAST: And we want you to be able to answer that question. Are they or aren't they?

MS. POULOS: I think in some ways it does disturb this idea that if you have a low percentage of free and reduced lunch students, you're not going to be good performing, because if you look at line number 21 on the K-8, their FRL percentage is low. It's 23 percent. They're a D; right. And then you go over and you look at this, and with their FRL students, they're not serving them well; right? And I think you can see that because they're actually doing that, quite frankly, with all their students; right? Which is why it's blending this way. I think that's really valuable.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I was actually -- when I saw this, I was actually kind of pleased, because -- and I think this was a fear of a number of the charters when they knew that we were starting to dig into this, that there was going to be this massive pack at the bottom and they were going to somehow be exposed and this isn't going to work well. And if that had been the case, they were exposed for the right reason, but there aren't that many that are at the bottom. You know, I was pleased with the number of schools that weren't at the bottom, and this also -- some of these schools could be SAM schools. So that's a different consideration, as well. So there may be even fewer, quote, unquote, more of a traditional charter because some of these six down here at the bottom could be a SAM school. And we had said that we would look at a SAM school in a somewhat different fashion, that there will be some formula that will be created for SAMs. So in all likelihood, it will be less than what's here. I'm assuming that one or two of these schools have to be SAM schools.

MS. BOAST: And that's something I can look at during the break so we can --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So I was kind of pleased, because I think you're right, I think this showed that schools that serve more challenging students, that are better -- in low income areas, for whatever reason, they can do it and they do do it. And school -- and there are some schools that should be knocking it out of the park because they don't have the other baggage that comes with many of
those students. But maybe they're just looking at it and saying, "Well, you should do better, because -- or we don't have to do this because, oh, you have got, you know -- you have got all this."

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

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

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

MS. BOAST: They have to drop out.

Because if they transfer to another school they go to that school's cohort.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: For a percentage of all the students.

MS. POULOS: For the time they're there.

You have to think, why is that? And it may be that the students are lower-performing, aren't feeling welcome at that school, which could be a problem.

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

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

MS. POULOS: A GED would be counted as -- COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: As a dropout.

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

(A discussion was held off the record.)

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Worth digging into.

MS. BOAST: Let's look at the subgroup growth. So again, you'll be able to look at examples. I'm going to pull out a couple of examples first that we highlight in your printout.

Let's see. So this school -- on page 8, on the bottom draft. Again, we're looking -- these are two schools that received Fs on both their Q1 and Q3 growth on the A-through-F grade. And again, by the colors, you can see that when you dig in, these are two very different stories; right? The bottom school really does appear to be struggling, because kids are not -- except for Q3, the special education ELA is the only one where they're above the special education median statewide average. But otherwise, you know, these students are not showing strong growth compared to peers statewide, whereas the top school -- actually, it looks as though students are growing, which is what you want to see when you're looking at that proficiency versus growth. You know, they may come in far behind, but how are they learning at the school? So this would be a very different picture and maybe different conclusions you would draw when you're reviewing the school results.

So we'll refer back to your multipage matrix, but here you would be looking at the Q1 and Q3 grades compared to that big section. So I'd love to just see, again -- sort of give you a couple of minutes to go through, see what you think, and I also would love feedback on whether the bottom 25/top 75 is useful or too much information.

Because one thing that we could ask of PED is: Can we have an all students disaggregated growth rate and see whether that's available.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think for me, you know, the top is important as well, because I think we end up with some schools saying, "Well, we're already up here, so how do you expect me to grow my students any more because we've already hit this."

It doesn't mean you can't stop growing.

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

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. And so I think it's important for those schools that are at the top level to understand that there's still a job to do; that it's not, okay, you have rung that bell, and now they're on their own, because we can't do any more for them; that there's always growth that -- it may not be -- it certainly is easier to show great growth with the lower students than it is.
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: If we're comparing when they're doing the -- when you're comparing the growth of the schools, you're comparing my score with Katie's score and we had exactly the same scores the last two years, and this year I got lower than she did, so my score is lower. Right?

MS. BOAST: Well, let's make sure I'm understanding your question. These growth results start at the student level and are really asking the question: Is this student making expected growth or not? Are they above or below?

MS. POULOS: Let me add, because this is what she's going for, in comparison to their peers, their performance peers, which is -- that's how we determine that expected growth.

MS. BOAST: Right.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So it's harder.

MS. BOAST: Can you repeat your question, though? I want to make sure that --

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Maybe. What I was saying is, because this is always the question, because it's hard for me to understand it, too, but what I understand -- and I'm sure I'll be corrected -- is that when I look at the growth in a school who has high-performing kids, I'm still looking at their first quartile, highest quartile.

And they may go down, because the people who they're being compared to, whose scores for the last two years were exactly the same as theirs, these kids did better than this child did. And that's why the scores went down? Is that right?

MS. POULOS: So it's not that the scores go down. Right. You're right. We group kids by who had the same scores for the last two years. And we find only looking at this year's scores what was the average score for that group, which then tells us how much each kid should have grown, right, the average amount. And then if they're above that, it's almost like you're applying two filters to it. If it's valuable, though, we certainly can leave -- I just don't want things to be so overwhelming. It's different to get 12 columns versus six, and if it's not adding that much information, then it's just more to process and --

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: To me that's a good thing because what I have been looking for all along is information on the subgroups. The bottom 25 and the top 25 become less important to me if I available for the subgroups that we've talked about, ELL, special education, free and reduced lunch -- do we need to have the bottom 25 and the top 25?

MS. BOAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Because by getting the information on those specific subgroups that we have been looking at would eliminate our need for that extra layer.

MS. BOAST: Yes. In a certain sense, looking at the bottom quartile is -- you know, accountability systems will do that to try to identify the most -- achievement gaps, which is what you're doing by looking at subgroups in the first place. So it's almost like you're applying two filters to it. If it's valuable, though, we certainly can leave -- I just don't want things to be so overwhelming. It's different to get 12 columns versus six, and if it's not adding that much information, then it's just more to process and --

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So what you're asking us to consider is if we have the data that's available for the subgroups that we've talked about, ELL, special education, free and reduced lunch -- do we need to have the bottom 25 and the top 25?
can look and see how the economically disadvantaged group is doing in comparison, or the ELL group is doing in comparison, or the special ed. group is doing in comparison. That's what I would like to know. I don't need that other.

MS. BOAST: You saw value to it.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I see value in the top 25 percent when we're looking at schools that may be looking to, you know, offer a new location or do things. I think we get most of the information from the other subgroups with the bottom 25 percent. I don't necessarily think we get it with the top 25 percent.

MS. BOAST: Just to clarify, that's looking at the top 75 percent and disaggregated subgroup.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.

MS. BOAST: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I agree with what she just said in terms of the subgroups. I think that would be very useful, and I'm also wondering if it can be done or -- just as a heads-up, it has been done before.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I see value in the top 25 percent when we're looking at schools that are doing in comparison, or the district that -- the school I taught in, you know, the transient population was just phenomenal. We owned the first Trade Center.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Does it count for school, or just for the student?

MS. POULOS: The graduation rate. Right.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: The data is overwhelming. This is what schools are having to do. It's the amount of work that's going on. It's hard for schools to keep up.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Because some kids are gone before even all the paperwork is done and, you know, that's a district that -- the school I taught in, you know, the transient population was just phenomenal. We owned the first Trade Center.
bomber's children, so they were quickly gone after that.

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

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

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

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

So let's see. Where is Q1? I can't even quite read that. How far over is it? Oh, the highest. It's the fourth set over is the lowest 25 percent of students. It's the ones with the great big red bars. So we know that the way that over 50 percent of the schools in the state are getting an F on that Q1 bottom thing. So we talked about that being a little bit of a concern in terms of distinguishing performance between different schools. So that almost would be a reason for having lower weight on this disaggregated component, but if you don't have it, this is the only place you really capture all students in the school. This is going to be an important consideration for you all in terms of weighting, you know.

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

MS. BOAST: Yes.

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

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

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Just to clarify in my mind, when you say they have a high percentage of -- I can get a high percentage of ELL or 80 percent or something like that. What is the lowest amount that we are saying are free and reduced lunches or ELL or special ed.? What is that number or percentage?

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

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

MS. BOAST: Yes. Yes.

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

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Not in this state.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Quite honestly, I would expect the special ed. kids to be at the bottom quartile. That's why they are in special ed.
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Their growth is small.

COMMISSIONER ARMSTRONG: And it's small.

If they were in the top -- now, there are dually
exceptional kids. There are kids on the autistic
spectrum who might be higher. Clearly they're
exceptional, is what I want to say. But in general,
they are the kids who kind of plateau. Doesn't mean
they can't grow at all, not saying that. But they
plateau.

COMMISSIONER ARMSTRONG: Their growth is small.

COMMISSIONER ARMSTRONG: And it's small.

So that's why they're getting special help. It's
kind of like, "Duh." So I kind of understand those.
But my point is -- and I have said it to many
kids -- I get those. I even understand the ELL
kids not being as proficient and making as much
growth. But there's other kids in there, like the
"normal" -- I don't know if you can put quotes on
that -- but you know, they are also in that lowest
quartile. And there's something not okay with them
not showing the amount of growth that they should.

Does that sound right?

MS. BOAST: Yes. So you would advocate
for continuing to see these stats.

COMMISSIONER ARMSTRONG: Yes. It's so
hard. It's just so hard, you know. And of course,
think the whole reason you're interested in having a
subgroup growth evaluation, because these are the
schools that have performance that doesn't quit --
when you dig into subgroups, you're getting
additional information. You're learning, you know
what? If we actually look at the FRL students,
they're doing better or worse than the school as a
whole. Right? So this is where sort of the value
of these measures are. And you can see there are a
fair number of schools that fall into them. The
majority are aligned with their all-student grades,
but you know, this is where you have some additional
value or usefulness from digging into these.

COMMISSIONER ARMSTRONG: And it stands to
reason that the majority would, you know, fall into
it, but there's always those exceptions. And yeah,
I think we need to see those exceptions to make a
better decision. I guess the only problem with it
is, we wouldn't have that similar information if we
were looking at, okay, if we decide to close
this school, we won't have that information for the
school that they could be going to; so that you
could say, "All right, this is a better choice or
not a better choice," but at least we would have a
little bit more information as to what is being done
at that school.

MS. BOAST: Right. That's all the
prepared sort of aggregations and tables that I
brought for you all for the subgroup proficiency and
growth. So I think what you'll need to decide --
and again, when we get to that overall rating, we'll
be talking about which of the measures do you want
to include, how do you want to weight them, but you
know, there is a decision. Do you want proficiency
and growth? You know, do you want to have both of
those views? Do you think that they're giving you,
you know, two views that are valuable? That's a
decision point. And then again, they do want to
dive into that Q1/Q3. Those seem to be the two
really big decision points that you all have.

COMMISSIONER ARMSTRONG: Growth is always
important because hopefully it's always going up and
not going down. And proficiency in a sense to me is
important. I don't believe that all kids are going
to be -- or even just test. I don't even know about
test, but test proficient on that one day when
they're taking that test. But when you have kids
who are at the 98th percentile in proficiency, I
can't get real upset about not growing. I
understand we're comparing them and doing all that,
but if you're at the 98th percentile in proficiency,
I'm not totally concerned about you.

MS. BOAST: So I'm just going to have a
devil's advocate point. If you have a school that
is in a low poverty area and all of the students
that enroll are proficient or advanced, you could be
having that school a pass on really having to
provide much of an educational program.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Because they're just
letting them, you know, skate. And that's not --
their job is to grow the students to their
potential. So that they should be -- you know, it's
less -- well, and I can't even say it's less
challenging. Because some of those upper percentile
kids can be extraordinarily challenging, you know,
so it's just a different challenge, so that it's not
right -- to me it's not right for a school to just
sit on their laurels and say, "Oh, look, all our
kids are proficient, so we're okay."

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: My youngest son
flunked math in middle school. Flunked math. He
was supposed to redo math again in the summer. And
so I got called in, and I said, "Well, he's going to
have to bite the bullet. So what's his grade? An
F? How come I didn't get, as I requested,
now come up with creative ways to grow these
students. Yes. And that can be as challenging as
taking a look at the lower quartile, because in many
cases, there's significantly more material to how to
help the lower quartile than there is for the upper
quartile. The challenge becomes more, you know, on
an individual basis to go and create the material to
work with those students.

COMMISSIONER CRONE: A lot of our GED
students were that type of student. They reached 16
and said, "I'm out of here. I'm going to college."

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Sometimes
they're smarter than we are.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Sometimes it's
just -- unfortunately it's not challenging because
oftentimes at schools, because you're proficient,
you're doing well, I don't have to spend any time
with you. And in some cases, it's class size, that
I only have so many minutes in a day, and this is
what I have to do, so my time is focused on this
bank of kids because these kids get it, and it's
harder. And we have many schools whose mission is
to push those kids. So they have to show that
they're doing it.

MS. BOAST: Great. Well, it's time for a
monthly -- weekly reports? Because I know my son.
And he's very smart and he is trouble." And I said,
"Why don't you just send me a letter and be done
with it?"

"No, because his test scores on the
national test put him at the top 5 percent in the
nation. So we have a feather in our cap here at the
school, but he flunked math."

I said, "Well, what are you going to do?"

"Well, we have to flunk him."

I said, "No, I don't think so. If he had
done terrible in the exam, which is proficiency, he
didn't grow a darned point all year long, did not
grow, but he knew the stuff." And I said, "Did he
flunk all the tests?"

"No. He never submitted homework."

I said, "Okay. And the reports I asked
from the teacher I never got, what do we do with
that?"

And so the two are really, really
important, growth and proficiency. The top Q3, Q1.

If we want to make our charter schools not just
regular schools, but dynamic schools, then I think
we need to see all of that.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: The challenge is to
break, and then we'll dig into the school-specific
goals. We're a little ahead of time, so shall we
take a ten-minute break?

(Recess from 10:22 a.m. to 10:32 a.m.)

MS. BOAST: Let's talk about optional
school-specific goals. This time I want to first
say that we looked at this as part of the trial run,
but very differently than we looked at subgroup
growth data, because for the subgroup performance,
growth and proficiency, we had data sets for all
schools, all schools in the state, we could really
run all these analyses.

For the school-specific goals, obviously,
there are a lot of challenges that we talked about
in the last meeting, so I want to first say what we
did do in the trial run because it is different from
the others. We reviewed the goals and so I'm now on
page 11. We reviewed all the goals that are
currently written into contracts. And then for just
a sample of them, I think it was ten schools, we
actually looked at the submitted data. And the
rationale here was more aimed toward -- in past
meetings I think there was agreement that as part of
the developing accountability plan, you all wanted
clear guidelines for schools on setting those goals
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  

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

I had a number of conversations with authorizers at the NACSA conference and they actually pay for testing, you know, which that's -- but if there was some way -- because I don't know what -- when you're looking at all the schools, I don't know what that total cost would be. So I really don't know whether it's an astronomical amount of money or it's a reasonable amount of money to say, "Well, then why can't it be there?"

MS. POULOS: Could that cost be something that comes out of --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Exactly. If it's not, you know, a million dollars, right, if it's a reasonable sum of money, why can't that come out of the 2 percent budget?

MS. POULOS: And the challenge is making it limited; right? So then you have to say, "Well, we're going to do this. We want an assessment company rather than 15 different --"

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. Exactly.

And we've had that conversation to say there's either going to -- maybe we'll hone it down to, you know, this, because it has to be a reasonable number of assessments, only because we have to be able to get the information from those companies as to what is growth, what is proficiency, so that we know, when we're negotiating, we're negotiating in the same language.

So yeah. If NWEA was a similar cost, maybe we could say there's one of two choices you have, and that the --

MS. BOAST: And then you can have a common set of performance targets.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Get a deal, say we have 62 schools, we're going to do that.

I have a comment kind of on what you were talking about, Patty, is, you know, this, like, made us think, if nothing else. But oftentimes when we were doing the performance frameworks, we'd say, "And you must have 15 percent of your kids show more than one year's growth."

Remember, we have done that, not all, but some. And what I'm thinking about is, if Patty is three years behind and she makes one year of growth, you say, "Oh, you made that target growth." But Tim is already two years above grade level and he makes another two years, which isn't unreasonable to say it, actually, and I'm not sure that those -- I am concerned, and I'm glad he's making that two years but I'm thinking we need to distinguish when we're writing those goals that 15 percent of those who are below the grade level, are below grade, have to make those two years' growth. You understand? Does that make sense, what I'm saying?

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I understand. Sad, I understand what you're saying.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But I was looking back and I thought, Why did I say that? And I agreed to it.

MS. POULOS: We've definitely had some discussions about what data the assessment company actually calculates, which maybe then prevents the schools and us from having to redo -- identify -- you know, like, part of the problem is, when we get data from them, there's no identification of who's FAY, but the goal says FAY. So then we have to trust that they have taken out the right kids. We don't have any way to verify that; right?

Then we're calculating something that is not data, that the assessment companies calculate so then again, you're relying on people who aren't experts on how to calculate this. Is this the right thing to be calculating, et cetera; right? So I think the conversation we've had about how can this actually be workable is by looking at, again, why were we sending certain data but what is the assessment company calculating? Why do they calculate it, what value does it add?

MS. BOAST: And can you use those?

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And that's a challenge oftentimes with the conversations with the assessment companies, because you call and you get this answer, and then the schools come in and say, "Yeah, but we got this answer." So that, you know, you don't get the same conversation with these companies, so to try to be consistent is very difficult, because they themselves are not consistent.

MS. BOAST: So again, I think the end result here -- and not today or even tomorrow, but hopefully by December or January -- is to have a draft sort of set of recommendations that you all can review, go through, and then get feedback from schools on.

So we've already touched on some of the
any questions on this one?
growth -- and the average student growth could be less than a year, you know, so that's --

MS. BOAST: A couple really important things here. This could be a very old goal and maybe that's why you don't see it. There are a couple of things to point out here. There's obviously a lot of text. One is that you do have schools -- these are both NWEA examples -- so you got two schools with two different benchmarks to meet. Obviously, you want to move towards having consistency.

The one on the left that references average student growth is actually more in line with -- the terminology is actually more in line. And you're not going to want to hear this, but a year's worth of growth, you know, which makes sense, like, did they make a year's worth of growth, for NWEA, a year's worth of growth is making average growth; right? Those targets are making average growth. And I think you would be very concerned because you can make an average growth, meet your growth target, and still be years behind proficiency, and that growth could be completely insufficient to reach proficiency.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So they're just using the term "average." They're not creating an average.

MS. BOAST: What happens is, every student -- and then I'll let you -- so in the NWEA, it's similar to the way we were talking about growth earlier. The NWEA takes a look -- so if a student makes 100 on the fall assessments, they have historical data telling them how all students across the country with a 100 -- where you'd expect them to be in the spring. And that's their target, average growth for students with 100.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So it's not an average of the school or something.

MS. BOAST: No, the whole country, and it's an individual target. But it is based on average growth, and the average growth for a kid three years behind could be wildly insufficient to ever get them to proficiency. So this is really about peer-referenced growth and that's what it tells you. So I would move away from that year's worth of growth because it's what everybody wants to know, but really what most growth models are talking about is average growth and is the student making average growth or not.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Okay.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 62</th>
<th>Page 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I think initially the expectation was that the school would be doing -- that was the expectation, that the school would be doing it; this wasn't just information that was being, "Oh, here. It's on you now, and you do it." That wasn't what was -- that the data person at the schools would be doing all that work and they would just be transmitting it to CSD. So that's where this became not as cumbersome for CSD because this was supposed to be done at the school level. COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But it wasn't done at the school level and we don't know how accurate that is, either. MS. POULOS: I think the concern on our part -- and you guys can choose how you want to do this -- we're then relying on schools who are facing accountability, which is hard, to -- we're trusting that data and we're saying we're going to absolutely without oversight, without verification, 100 percent, trust this and use this as a decision-making tool, which -- and I'm just going to use our most extreme example. That's what the board at Southwest Learning Centers said about everything that Scott Glasrud did. We're just going to trust what he's doing and what he's telling us. And I have a problem personally doing that. When we're talking about an accountability system, it's important to trust and verify, but that "and verify" part is essential and that's where we can't do it. And since my team is the one that checks the box and says this is either met or not, I don't feel comfortable having my team check the box that says yes, this exceeds or meets when we haven't done the work to verify. COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: What I want to say -- and it's an unfortunate comment I'm making -- but from multiple psychological studies, what it shows is that when you put lots of pressure on the teacher to get the scores up or the school to keep the scores up, they cheat. I'm sorry, but that is the research on that. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No. COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes. And I think we have teachers going to jail for that. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: My principal. | COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: There you go. So in a way, I hear what you're saying, because in a way, if you have the great goals that you have met from doing NWEA or whatever test we're talking about and they say, "Wow, look all our kids made whatever," the growth, and then you see PARCC scores and they're in the pits, something isn't right. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And that is potentially the only check that you would have, that if they're knocking it out of the park on their NWEA and whatever state assessment is being used, the school is tanking that, you know, there can always be variances, but there's usually not that -- it's like the kid who took the SATs and did really badly, and the second time they take the SATs, they get this bang-up score, they're calling that kid in and saying -- COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I had a friend who was called in. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Absolutely. We have kids all the time called in. And I know kids who took -- made a good living taking the SAT tests. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Katie, a question for you, when you talk about score validity. And we're talking about the interim assessment that the schools are not required to submit those interim assessment results to the PED in any way, right? MS. POULOS: No. So in the past, there was, through NMTEACH, but we removed that and so interim assessments are not submitted to PED. They're not subject to any of PED's accountability requirements for test coordinators or anything like that. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So those are -- the difficulty with that, would Charter Schools Division be comfortable if we go through the process of -- we find interim assessments, that everybody's not giving three different kinds, that results come in three different ways; if we went to the ones that -- if we found ones and we identified them, and then Charter Schools Division had access to those results directly without going through the school, the MOU you were talking about, would that satisfy that validity question that you have? MS. POULOS: I think there's value to the information that they're giving, absolutely, to the school first and foremost. The schools should be using these, and our schools that are doing well on PARCC, actually, we see that they are; right? Like we talk about Mission Achievement and Success and
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what they do, and they use that data really well.</td>
<td>there could be a discouragement or, you know,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So I think to answer your question, like,</td>
<td>certain students not administered, right, because</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in my mind, if I were in Katie's perfect world,</td>
<td>you don't know -- you would not know if everybody in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right, we rely on what we have from the State and</td>
<td>the school at that time -- also, given that usually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when a school is not meeting the expectations that</td>
<td>they're at looking at fall to spring results, you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we have from the state assessments, there's a</td>
<td>can have a deemphasizing of the task or no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provision of our law that says, &quot;make substantial</td>
<td>preparation on the fall, so that you have a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress.&quot; So then those assessments could actually</td>
<td>depressed starting point; right? And then also you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be a good way of saying, &quot;Are they making</td>
<td>can have that over. So hopefully, you would not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantial progress, because they're more in real</td>
<td>have it, but if there was --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time; right?&quot;</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Ultimately, I want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That's not the world we're operating in,</td>
<td>to trust in the professionalism of the schools and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right? So if we can all get to a place where we</td>
<td>say that, you know, there's always going to be those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have goals that are clear, that aren't what we see</td>
<td>that skirt the system and don't do what they're</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here, right -- and I wanted to make the comment on</td>
<td>supposed to do. But I also don't want to tie the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slide 24, page 12, that's why we're pulling our hair</td>
<td>hands of everyone else, the majority, for the few</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out, because they are coming in so many different</td>
<td>that misbehave, and I want to give the credit to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forms and so many different goals and there's no way</td>
<td>schools and trust that they're going to do what --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for us to verify -- which, again, I want to trust,</td>
<td>because ultimately they're supposed to be using this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but I also know if my team is the team saying yes or</td>
<td>for their students, and secondary, reporting it to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no, I want them to feel comfortable that they have</td>
<td>us. So if they're in it for the best interests of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verified and that they know that they're comfortable</td>
<td>the students, then they're not going to be cheating,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing yes or no.</td>
<td>because that's not going to serve their purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So if we get that clear, we know what</td>
<td>But you know --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment, we have access to the data, the goals</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And at the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 67</th>
<th>Page 68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are understandable for all of us, schools and</td>
<td>time, I will say that I spoke with a kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission alike, that we're not creating a system</td>
<td>teacher, not in the charter school, and DIBELS, for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where, again, the kid hits the bell once, whether</td>
<td>example, so they just gave it the way you're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that was a valid one or not, and then the next time</td>
<td>supposed to give it. I don't mean they cheated in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they tank, and there's nothing said about that, or</td>
<td>how that was given, but they didn't do a lot of help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>done about that, yes, I am comfortable.</td>
<td>So in a way, that's gaming the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do think it's important to think about</td>
<td>But the other side, you actually didn't know what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the weighting, simply because we do know there's in</td>
<td>that kid knows and doesn't know. You know, it's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some ways some mismatch. We do know there's a lack</td>
<td>kind of a double-edged sword in that sense. So then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of controls on, is the teacher looking over the</td>
<td>the second time you gave the test or the third time,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoulder and giving some hints?</td>
<td>whatever -- I don't even know how many times they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So I think it's important just to weight</td>
<td>gave it; three maybe -- there was a little bit more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that and think about how much weight you put on that</td>
<td>emphasis, like pay attention to this or do whatever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versus where there is more control over this system.</td>
<td>So I can see that as I probably, if my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But that's ultimately a decision you're going to</td>
<td>teaching profession were based on that, yeah, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have to make. That's what's in my head when I think</td>
<td>that's what I was saying before, and I'm not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about that. I do think it's still important and</td>
<td>that's exactly cheating, either, in the same way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable.</td>
<td>But I think that is kind of what you want to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Boast: And I want to say, I think</td>
<td>You don't want to give a lot of help to the kids the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that -- I hope this is answering part of your</td>
<td>first time they take the test because then you don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>question. There are some ways that you could</td>
<td>really know if they're doing it because they -- I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have -- hopefully, schools are acting in the best</td>
<td>don't know. It's so complicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests of kids. But if you had some bad</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm sorry, but I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior, how that could still work with an</td>
<td>need to go back to make sure I understand. So the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administered test and then the MOU coming back is,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Second is keeping proficiency and growth targets separate. We talked about that. And we also talked about using a standard set of performance expectations. So it does seem as though in the more recent contract, there has been a move toward having standard percentages match, so making that more: If you are using NWEA, here are the recommended targets. I think that provides a clarity to schools and also in your process. And there would be a way to look at them as commonly used assessments and have sort of standard performance benchmarks for those. I think that's reasonable and certainly can be done and be backed up by precedent and research for you.

The other is, there's a fourth bullet: Use data that do not require substantial additional data analyses. You have already talked about perhaps having a list of recommended "These are the assessments that we would prefer you choose from," and then for those, having in place MOUs or a process, hopefully, that you can receive the report directly. I would assume that schools would appreciate that, and we've talked about why that would be useful.

The next one, limit the number of goals per school. I know that you need to doctor -- some of them had up to five, six. You know, I think really encouraging them what are the most important goals. There may be times you have to have five, but encouraging a fewer number that really get to the most important parts.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: What number were you thinking about? Three?

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Two or three.

MS. BOAST: I certainly think more than two or three, you're getting --

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: For academics.

MS. BOAST: For academics, right. That still is a lot, but some of them also are divided, ELA and math. I think those really could be almost combined into a single target or goal or expectation.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: They seem to be different.

MS. BOAST: But you would still look at them differently, but essentially you're saying whether they're NWEA scores.

And then the final is more a process setting clearer reporting expectations, exact deliverable and the timing. So what we're imagining is a one-to-two-page document that really lays out the recommendations, the guidance, and, you know, provides clarity so that, again, when schools are coming into the contract process, it's laid out what your expectations are, and if we can narrow it down to the assessments that you would recommend schools be using and have those performance expectations, I think that will really streamline your process.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: On the New Mexico DASH that we've sort of been taught, what is that based on? The PARCC? When schools are going to look at their lowest-performing students, where did they get those lowest-performing students from? The PARCC? Is that where they're getting them? Or is it, like, from the NWEA?

MS. POULOS: DASH is an improvement system that's really helping schools target and understand the continuous improvement cycle. They're supposed to do things like convene a team that's representative of all the right parts of the school, the right levels at the school, and the district.

Targeting on looking at where are they successful and where do they need to grow.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: How do they know that? How do they know where they're successful?

MS. POULOS: They get to make that choice. That's a choice they make. We ask them to use valid and reliable data and they need to make that case, but the schools are really -- it's not us saying, "You have to do it." It's, again, a system to help people understand what continuous improvement cycles are.

MS. BOAST: So they could use Istation or NWEA or any other option.

MS. POULOS: Yes. Or graduation rate data or attendance data or discipline data. We're not telling them what to do. We're asking them to be thoughtful educational leaders about what's happening in their building, what sources of data they have, so we're not telling them, "You do this or that."

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, I'm asking that because of a couple reasons. One is just reading the renewal apps, well, we are going to -- we met to make reading a priority. And that's fine. That's a good idea. But what data are they using to say that they need to make reading a priority on Lyria?

MS. POULOS: They have to be thoughtful educational leaders. They have so much data, you
have so much data. And if you are not being a
thoughtful educational leader, you're not going to
do well even if you use DASH. So they have to be
thinking -- and the push of DASH is to think, What
is the root cause? A lot of our schools can't get
past conditions to root causes. They're confusing
and conflating those two things rather than saying,
what is the cause for us as adults in what we are
doing in this building, right, and that could be
their first piece is: Our discipline is out of
control; and our root cause is: We haven't
established discipline expectations as a school and
we haven't held our teachers accountable for that.
Right?

So then that's very different data from
setting a goal as a reading goal; right? They have
to be those thoughtful educational leaders to look
at what is the world of data that they have, what is
it telling us is their highest priority right now,
focus in on that, get it to a good place, take your
data and say, "Okay, now what's our new highest
priority?" Focus on that, focus in, get it going
the way it should, make sure nothing slid on the
other one, go back to your data, say, "Okay, now
what's our third highest priority?"

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I guess I'm
thinking that my school has difficulty with math,
and that's probably most of them. And I could be
right there with them. But anyway, so why am I
having -- why are these students not doing as well
as I would expect with the instruction that's being
given? And the first thing could be: You know
what? The discipline in this room is, like -- it's
so chaotic they can't possibly learn. So I would
work on discipline first, and how I understood that
the kids are needing more help in math would be from
some score. I would think it would be because it's
data that's right there, NWEA or Scholastic or
whatever they use, or it could be the PARCC. But
the PARCC is not until the end of the year and
you're doing something in January. The PARCC was
from last year, so you would need some sort of
ongoing data and that's how -- that's why I said --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You would hope.
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That would be
true. I would hope. I'll add that to it. So
that's why I have been saying, well, if they're not
doing -- it's for their protection and maybe
edification to have an ongoing assessment that shows
you not only that they're not doing well in math but

what areas in math they're not doing well in. It's
the geometry section, it's the calculation system,
whatever. I don't know. But they're asking that.
So if we don't require them to do some sort of
something --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Well, we're not --
this is an option. We're not requiring them to do
this. This is a school saying, "I want to do this."

MS. POULOS: And you shouldn't. Let's go
back to being charter schools. Charter schools have
autonomy. The second you say, "You must do a short
cycle assessment," you're taking their autonomy
away. They as school leaders may decide it's valued
and make that choice, and that's how they're going
to do well. But if they can do well without it
because they do something else, you should let them
do that.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So then they can
choose whatever they want to do.

MS. POULOS: Or not do.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Within the framework
of their school, yes. Outside of the contract, if
they choose to do an assessment, they could
certainly do that. But if they choose to put it
into the contract, then they're obligated to do it.
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.

24 Clearinghouse coverage here?

MS. BOAST: Do you have National Student those records are very, very difficult.

22 that it becomes a challenge because you can't --

21 to show that they were college-ready, we want to

20 schools that wanted to track that their students --

19 show you that two years out they're still in

18 college. Okay. How are you going to show that? So

17 that it becomes a challenge because you can't --

16 those records are very, very difficult.

15 MS. BOAST: Do you have National Student Clearinghouse coverage here?

14 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: We do. Every high

12 school in the state.

11 MS. BOAST: Oh, perfect. Then they should

10 be able to track that. I would actually love to get

9 any -- this obviously needs a lot more conversation,

8 and so I would love to get any feedback; either

7 you're missing something or doesn't work in terms of

6 those bullets and recommendation, because I would

5 like to move into the rolling up and the weighting.

4 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: The only thing

3 that I look at this for things like drama and dance,

2 I have done both, but maybe we can put in there a

1 recommendation from our group to identify -- or we

state even uses.

2 MS. BOAST: That's an interesting and
efficient way; have an expert evaluate. And I think
the challenge would be the evaluation criteria would
have to be written into your contract --

6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.

7 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: So the school
will know. But it's not difficult to evaluate that.

9 Or drama. It is not. I was in a dance group and we
did folkloric dance in college and we had the
University of Mexico City send their folkloric dance
group, and we did better than they did and we were all Mexican-Americans. These guys were Mexican.
And so even their instructor said, "You guys are awesome. If I could get my guys do to do that," and they're Mexican. But it can be done.

15 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: An evaluator.

14 send --

13 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You mean we would

12 say a consultant in that area to come and say,
well --

10 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Except the PEC
itself, we don't -- we do not do compliance
ourselves. So it would be challenging for us to do
it. Like if you went into a school, we don't do
compliance checks. So I think it would be challenging for us to send someone in because we're basically sending --

9 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: With the school sending --

8 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: -- to do a compliance check.

7 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Have somebody --

6 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's hard to
measure dance. Do they dance well?

5 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And we have had
these preliminary discussions and they have never
gone anywhere, of really sitting down with those
schools that have the more challenging missions, and
having -- you know, really trying to iron out how
can this be done, and talking with folks from all
over the country. It's the most challenging thing
to do, is to, you know -- you -- I have not been
able to find an adequate measure that any other

4 to make -- to have students be ready for career or
for post secondary education"? That's a harder
measure so that we can feel comfortable that they
are fulfilling their mission, which is in addition
to the academic component, but that they were
authorized because they made this promise that
they're going to do this; and how can we adequately
and accurately assess that, yes, they're doing that,
and --

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Do you think
it's more difficult if a school says, "Our goal is
to make -- to have students be ready for career or
for post secondary education"? That's a harder
measure than to say they will all participate in a
dance or a media.

2 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Well, we've had
schools that wanted to track that their students --
to show that they were college-ready, we want to
show you that two years out they're still in
college. Okay. How are you going to show that? So
that it becomes a challenge because you can't --

1 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I think these
unique missions.
to the conversations we're having at all levels in many ways, because this gives us -- these recommendations give birth, to me, that thought that takes them to the next level, that gives us rationale in evaluating. That is, that we can support and that's what's important for the school-specific goals, is that we be able to address them, that the school be able to present that information, that Charter School Division brings forth that data, and then we have something to base our decision on concretely. This I think for me -- this is good.

MS. BOAST: So what we will do in terms of just drafting is, again, a one-to-two-page recommendation that then will, I'm sure, have a lot of additional conversation. But I think we'll try to do that as quickly as possible, so that you can grapple with some of these issues, because you'll need this in the spring; right? Okay.

Terrific. So we have half an hour until lunch. I would love to start into the rollup conversation; you know, how do we get to this overall rating? Because I think it actually might be good to give you some time to think through things while you're having lunch.

In both the June and August meetings with you, we heard consensus around the use of an overall academic rating and the reason for that, so this is a bit of a review, but to clarify your monitoring and renewal process and also to provide clarity to schools so that there's some clarity about how renewal decisions are made and send -- so by the way that you categorize or do that overall rating, schools are clear where they stand. It's not a surprise when they come to renewal that, "Oh, we may be shut down." They have a good sense of what's happening.

And then also we heard very clearly from you that you do not want this to stigmatize or label schools. So you know, the way it's communicated and the way needed to be one that felt more of a support and a clarification as opposed to a pejorative or punishing.

So we also had talked in August about what that overall rating would look like, how many categories would be useful, what would be the purpose of those categories. So at the bottom of page 16, you have the tier, the idea of tiers. So tier 1 being the highest-performing schools, the schools that really are exceeding your expectations,

and these could be schools that would be eligible for an expedited renewal, if you decide to have that in your performance, in your accountability plan and process.

Tier 2. This might be a large group of schools or not, but they are schools that are meeting your expectations. You do not see the need for intervention or revocation. These are clearly meeting expectations. Right?

Tier 3 would be schools that are showing weakness on more than just a single indicator or measure; you know, have some concerns. They likely would be ones that entered an intervention plan or process in your accountability plan. So these are schools that may be headed on a downward trajectory that you want to catch early, that you want to highlight. It allows you to have conversations with schools and initiate interventions where possible.

Distinguished from that, tier 4, which are schools that are consistently across many indicators falling in the lowest -- on par with the lowest schools in the state or other options. These would be in your intervention plan that you have talked about having in your accountability document, and would also be schools that would be possibly nonrenewed or even in the middle of a cycle could be subject to revocation if performance was of a large enough concern.

So again, this is meant to be tied to your oversight action; right? So that if a school is tier 3, hopefully they would be initiating conversations with you about, "What do we need to do?" or what concerns, and it provides clarity, again, for schools.

This is what came out of our last conversations. Any concern about the language that's used here?

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: My only concern is that this language only addresses academic, and to me it has to be an -- they can be banging out of the park on academic and their financial reporting is falling; that it has to be overall language that covers each of the areas so that they're not blindsided because they have a revocation because they're in financial reporting problems, and it's, like, "Well, I didn't know that."

So I would prefer that this language be all-encompassing for indicators; and that's academics, financial, and organizational. And that there be language in there at least between -- that
something else for all the other stuff that we're concerned about. That's very, very important.

2 And it stayed in my mind, I once had an LFC meeting where a senator was very emotionally distraught because his son said, "Dad, our high school went from A to this year -- I'm a senior, and it's an F. How am I going to be able to go to school at this college, which is my target, coming from a school that has an F?"

3 And so he looked into it and it wasn't the grades. It was all this other stuff that brought it down to an F. And so he was so concerned that he says, "That stuff about A, B, and C should go out the window."

4 And at that point, I realized, yes, there's got to be some more things that we look at.

5 And so I want to be able to say, "Let's keep this the way it is, so that teachers and students know that if they're performing well in academics, it is shown."

6 If governance is screwing up, governance has to face it. If the finance department is screwing up, they have to face it. And maybe a tier 1 school is a tier 4 if that's what you want to keep it, over here, and we're looking at intervention.

7 Well, parents, students and teachers know that it's not their performance that we're evaluating, because once you go to public, the only thing that stays is that one A, B, C, or D and we're stepping away from that here. So we need to step away from it because this is clean, this is really nice, and if I were to send my son to a school, I want to know whether I need to help out, as a parent, with some of the stuff or I need to get a tutor for my son, or I need to pull him out.

8 Because the most important thing to me is academics, not governance or not finance, but that's important to government, which is us.

9 And so I think that when we need the point of view for teachers and students and parents, we should keep this clean on academics, and then do another one on everything else. Maybe not calling it tier 1, 2, or 3. Maybe call it something else.

10 I don't know.

11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Carlos, I want to make sure I'm understanding what you said. And I see your point. First of all, I'm not sure that colleges look to see what your high school was, but maybe they do. I don't know. But anyway, we're looking at academics. I see that. That's what this one is reflecting. But then there's also something
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1 has to be clarity as to what the communication is going to be to the school at that step.

2 MS. Poulos: So I'm trying to --

3 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: While you think --

4 MS. Poulos: Would it be like -- indicator by indicator, they're hitting a tier 1, 2, 3, or 4, and then we roll that up to all indicators; right?

5 But our overall look is, if any one indicator is a tier 3 or 4, they do receive notice: We're concerned about this. And so maybe they're a tier 2 overall, but it's because a single indicator is tier 3 or 4, and that's why a tier 2 might receive a notice to say, "Hey, you're good overall, but please make sure that you focus in on this area."

6 COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes. Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: My concern is, I want to get away from -- and I'm looking at this; this is why this is beautiful, in that if we look at a school with a D or an F, that's not the complete picture. And we're looking at everything else, but if we lump everything else into this, I'd rather, for the sake of teachers and students, primarily students, we keep this separate and we devise something else for all the other stuff that we're
that we ought to be looking for, organizational, and financial, so they'd almost have three things, because most of the time that we actually close a school, it's financial or that they don't have enough students. We've closed some who were F schools.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: All of that is administration.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Not always.

Sometimes it's all the way across.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We haven't closed a school --

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: For a while.

MS. POULOS: If I can jump in, what I'm thinking -- and I think I agree with all three -- we would have an overall rollup for the academic performance, and that would be tier 1, 2, 3, or 4 on your academic performance grade mark. And then separately we would also want to roll up on our organizational framework, which would be your organizational frame, you're either a tier 1, 2, 3, or 4 organizational. And then also for your financial, you'd be a tier 1, 2, 3, or 4. So then they would all be separate. What you're saying is: "I don't want only to do this for academic," which I agree with.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.

MS. POULOS: And I think the reason that Lyria only has it for academic is because today we're talking about academic.

MS. BOAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: This all has to go into a single contract that has to be clear for the schools so that it provides clarity for them for not only how they have to report, but how they're going to be notified so that they're not blindsided by, "Oh, by the way, you're on the agenda because there's a revocation hearing," so they know that there is opportunity, most of the time, for them to be able to fix it. You know, there's always that clarifying sentence at the bottom that you can go to tier 4 immediately because this -- you know, something happens. It's not a guarantee that this is going to be a progressive stage. You can, you know --

MS. BOAST: Most authors do -- not that it matters, because you can do what is the best here -- but do keep them separate.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I didn't mean -- with respect. And overall, this is the one thing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 98</th>
<th>Page 99</th>
<th>Page 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. that language with them that it's not as much</td>
<td>1. examples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. working to meet, meeting; that a lot of it is a yes</td>
<td>2. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I have a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. or a no.</td>
<td>3. clarification. What we're looking at is K-8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MS. BOAST: Exactly.</td>
<td>4. MS. BOAST: What you see here is there's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: They're doing it or</td>
<td>5. an option 1 for K-8, an option 2 for K-8, and then</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. not doing it. There's not a lot of middle ground in</td>
<td>6. we only ran one option for high school. Okay? So</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. some of the areas with the financial and the</td>
<td>7. I'm going to give you two pieces of paper. One has</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. organizational so that -- yeah. It may not look</td>
<td>8. these options, and you're actually going to be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. exactly like that.</td>
<td>9. giving feedback on this, so you'll notice that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MS. BOAST: Exactly. But we'll need to</td>
<td>10. (A discussion was held off the record.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. tie it together. Great.</td>
<td>11. MS. BOAST: So what you can do now is you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. So in terms of -- so we mocked up, you</td>
<td>12. can just tuck away that first multicoloored handout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. know, an aggregate rating. Let's talk about</td>
<td>13. that you received, because the new one that you have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. decisions. To get from the indicators that we</td>
<td>14. has all of that same information but two additional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. looked at, you know -- so your printout, to get from</td>
<td>15. columns on the far right, which shows the option 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. all of this to one of 4 tiers, there are two things</td>
<td>16. and option 2, what each school would, you know --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. you really need to decide in terms of how you will</td>
<td>17. which tier they would land in, given the approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. do that.</td>
<td>18. that we used. You know, the tests that we have.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. So we're on page 17. One, you need to</td>
<td>19. Okay?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. decide how each of the indicators will be weighted.</td>
<td>20. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I like the first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Are they all going to be the same? Are some more</td>
<td>21. colored one better than this one. Because this one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. important to you than others? And we will talk</td>
<td>22. is like, &quot;Crap.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. about that in detail in a moment.</td>
<td>23. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I'm still</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. And then the second question is: Where do</td>
<td>24. confused. I'm sorry. For the high school, we don't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. those sort of benchmarks for each of the tiers need</td>
<td>25. have option 1 and option 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 99</th>
<th>Page 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. to be? And this is really why it's important to</td>
<td>1. MS. BOAST: Exactly. I'm sorry. On the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. think, you know, what is the performance that you</td>
<td>2. high school side, you'll notice that the results are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. need to distinguish in that highest and lowest</td>
<td>3. all the same in the two columns. It's just a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. category? Because the way that -- you can move</td>
<td>4. single.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. those so that more or fewer schools are there, and</td>
<td>5. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's not two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. it really depends on what you want to be capturing</td>
<td>6. options. I can breathe now. I'm good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. there.</td>
<td>7. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I wonder if the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Okay. So in order to give you just some</td>
<td>8. schools that are in tier 4 are the same schools --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. examples to work with, we ran two sets of weights,</td>
<td>9. okay. Thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. and this is that weighting option on the bottom.</td>
<td>10. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And these options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The first was heavier on growth. So it has -- 55</td>
<td>11. that we're looking at now for K-8, these weights,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. percent of those measures that cover growth,</td>
<td>12. you're going to define the different approaches to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. subgroup growth, school level growth, you know, had</td>
<td>13. determining the weights. Those are the options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 50 percent of the weight.</td>
<td>14. MS. BOAST: Yes. So now it's useful to --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Option 2, there was more weight on the</td>
<td>15. you'll have the two, because this sheet shows you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. proficiency measures. So graduation rate,</td>
<td>16. the option 1 and the option 2. So I think what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. proficiency for all students, and then proficiency</td>
<td>17. would be useful is if you have your K-8 page, the EL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. for students in subgroups.</td>
<td>18. color page, and you have those two columns that say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. And we looked at -- these two options were</td>
<td>19. option 1 and option 2. So option 1 has a 30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. applied to the K-8 schools. For the high schools we</td>
<td>20. weight on proficiency and then all of the different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. didn't have that distinction because there's more of</td>
<td>21. growth measures combined, 30, 40, 55 percent on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. a focus on the graduation, the college and career</td>
<td>22. growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. readiness.</td>
<td>23. So if you take an individual school, you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. So I'm going to show you the two options</td>
<td>24. should be able to sort of see, like, oh, yes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. that we used. And again, these were to show you</td>
<td>25. they're doing better on the growth. So in many of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And these different weights, are they based on -- how did you come to those? How did you come to the option?
MS. BOAST: To these options. So we looked at -- this also shows what the current weight within the A-through-F system is. So in option 1, this is the one that has a higher growth weighting.
In the past --
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Look on page 17.
MS. BOAST: So option 1 has that higher weight on growth, and so what we did was to -- this is where you all are going to have to say, We agree with this or we don't."
But for that option 1, we put a 20 percent weight on the disaggregated A through F grade for current standing, and then 10 percent for subgroup performance, subgroup proficiency. That could be something that you said, you know, no, those should be equal or one should be higher. But you know, that was how we weighted them.
And then for the growth measures, we put 15 percent weight on the value-added A-through-F grade, just 5 percent on the Q1 and Q3 disaggregated growth rate. You may decide you think they need more, you know, higher weights, but we gave quite a bit of weight to the subgroup growth performance. So this option is really valuing that subgroup growth quite a bit.
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Is that written down somewhere that I'm not looking at it? The numbers you're saying?
MS. BOAST: Yes, that page.
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I saw that, but she was using more numbers. It's this one.
MS. BOAST: Here's option 1. This shows subgroup growth, and then this is then corresponding to these values. Okay?
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Thank you.
MS. BOAST: You need to take time, look at these. Yeah.
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Thank you, God, I'm not color-blind.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
MS. BOAST: So then option 2 has a much higher weight on proficiency. So if you're looking at the option 2 column, again you see that current standing has 40 percent. The subgroup proficiency has 10, and then you have a lower weight on the growth measures. Again, you know, you have these empty columns on the right because we're going to want your feedback here on what you think ideal weight should be.
I'm going to show you some graphs that show how the two options come out, but before we kind of dive into that, any questions on this? What do you think about the number of schools that are falling into each of the tiers according to this?
COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Wow.
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I know.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Proficiency is very elitist in elementary school. It is quite elitist. We have one school --
MS. BOAST: Yes.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: -- that's tier 1.
But maybe that's the way it's supposed to be. Is it a bell curve?
MS. BOAST: No, because we're looking only at charter schools, and much of this is based on that statewide comparison. So it feels as though there could be more -- you also only have two elementary schools that received an overall A-through-F grade. The intention here is to include more considerations, so it could be that you feel this needs to be more inclusive in that tier 1.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Option 2 puts more schools in tier 4 also.
MS. BOAST: Yes.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But what I don't know yet is whether I think that's a good thing or a bad thing. That could be a -- rigor is what we're after.
MS. BOAST: Right. So for that, an interesting school to look at is number 23 on the K-8 page. So if you look at school 23, it received a D grade, and if you scroll across, you see there are quite a few greens. Their top 75 percent of students in subgroups are actually doing well above the state average. That's what gives them a tier 3 in option 1. Right? But because option 2 is more focused on proficiency, they wind up in tier 4.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And their bottom 25 percent are not being nearly as successful as the top 75 percent.
MS. BOAST: Exactly. It's a balancing act; right? That's why we want you to know, this is more important to us than this, or -- all right.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 106</th>
<th>Page 108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now, not to throw more at you --</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: But.</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And if you look at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BOAST: Don't look at the screen if</td>
<td>the F schools, in options 1 and 2, those percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that seems confusing. But similarly to when we were</td>
<td>simply flip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looking at the subgroup, whether you're looking at</td>
<td>MS. BOAST: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>option 1 or option 2 or the high schools, many of</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And so if you have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the tiers ratings are pretty well correlated with</td>
<td>F schools, if you have 14 percent in tier 3, does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the overall grade that they received on the state.</td>
<td>that give us more opportunity to do corrective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So many of them. Where it gets interesting is where</td>
<td>action before we go to revocation, whereas with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they don't. You know, again, that's what tests --</td>
<td>option B, with 14 percent in tier 1 and only 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like, how much additional information is this</td>
<td>percent are our indicators that year before, or do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing you? Right? So you don't have any A</td>
<td>we have some kind of a precursor to, &quot;Huh-oh&quot;? I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools in tier 4 or F schools in tier 1. But what</td>
<td>mean, if you only have 7 percent in tier 3, and then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you do have are these additional measures that are</td>
<td>it jumps to 14? And knowing nothing about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making, for example, a D school a tier 2 in some --</td>
<td>statistics, I have no idea. That's my gut speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so you're usually only seeing a shift of one up or</td>
<td>I don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down, but that's where I really want your feedback.</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I had a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Can you say that</td>
<td>question. So when we're looking at these grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one more time, please, so I can read this chart?</td>
<td>that you looked at, the A-through-F thing, that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BOAST: What this chart is attempting</td>
<td>includes all of those categories, right, on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to answer is how much are tier results aligned with</td>
<td>report card that schools get; is that correct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the A-through-F. So this shows you, if you look</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Overall grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here, these are A schools on the A through F that</td>
<td>MS. BOAST: For this rough look, it's just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wound up in each of the tiers. Okay? So with</td>
<td>the overall, which is not actually proposed to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>option 1, you have pretty strong almost complete</td>
<td>part of your framework right now, just the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 107</th>
<th>Page 109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alignment that all your A schools are in tier 1, all</td>
<td>disaggregated. But we want to look to see, what is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your B schools are in tier 2, and here you have a</td>
<td>this giving you when compared to just looking at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little more -- some of your A schools that are</td>
<td>overall grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actually getting pulled down a little bit in tier 2.</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: The reason I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What may be more interesting to you all is what's</td>
<td>said that is, this is just an opinion that I have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happening to the F schools and the D schools,</td>
<td>When you ask a traditional public school child's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I think that's where your concern is, are</td>
<td>parents, &quot;How do you think this school -- do you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they being evaluated, you know, are they really --</td>
<td>feel safe? Do you like the teachers?&quot; I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is their subgroup success not being considered if</td>
<td>what all those ten questions are. I think the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they are being successful? So here, you can see</td>
<td>information you get is a lot more varied and comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that a number of your F schools actually are winding</td>
<td>from the fact that you don't have a choice of where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up in tier 3, which I think is what you want to be</td>
<td>you're going, pretty much, in many places. You need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>able to see; right? Is this truly a failing school,</td>
<td>the school, we have one, you go there. Do you like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or are there other things that we need?</td>
<td>it? Yes, no, no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Are they making</td>
<td>But when you're talking about schools that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress?</td>
<td>you choose to go to, just when I have been looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BOAST: Yes. Right.</td>
<td>at some of these scores, they get much higher scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And this can</td>
<td>on that one indicator on the survey question, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potentially change to some degree because we don't</td>
<td>that would make sense because if you're choosing to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have the school-specific goals in there if --</td>
<td>send your child to Patty's school, well, if I hated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BOAST: Yes.</td>
<td>you, why would I send you there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. POULOS: Right now we're saying they</td>
<td>So to me, it skews the grading a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all meet those. We're assuming they all meet their</td>
<td>bit. And I'm not sure where I'm going with this. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals rather than dividing them into exceeding,</td>
<td>just wanted to make that statement because sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting, not meeting, or falling far below.</td>
<td>it can make you have a higher score, higher letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thing so you understand how these were run, because

MS. BOAST: All right. We'll shift it. I want to make sure -- I want to cover just one other
time we come back.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: It depends on
whether, how we rate it.

MS. BOAST: Right. We've gone over the
noon time. Are we okay to take a couple more minutes
to set you up for --

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: It depends on
what time we come back.

MS. BOAST: All right. We'll shift it. I want to make sure -- I want to cover just one other
ting. But it's fairly low -- it has a fairly
low weight right now.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I may have
just -- but it can make a significant difference on
your final score number, if you got 10 points or --
whatever, how we rate it.
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COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. And for me, it's just a little -- this starts everything for me, you know. And everything else just falls into place because these are the expectations, so that everything played off the performance framework.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Starting at the end and moving to the beginning.

MS. BOAST: That's just one other set of graphs I want to show you and then break for lunch.

And this is a correlation with poverty. And we had -- so you have a series of three charts and I want to explain them, and then again, you can look at them and we can talk a little bit more after lunch. The first one is showing schools' grades on the A-through-F system so across the bottom you have schools earning an A through an F. Up the left-hand side is the percentage of FRL enrollment, okay, so the higher-poverty schools are in the top of the group, the lower at the bottom. And so in the A column, each dot is an individual school, and you can see, you know, they all earned As and you can see that while there are more of them, towards the low poverty, there are schools, you know, that are high-poverty earning As.

B is a little more well distributed. Unfortunately, F, you do have more of the high-poverty schools earning an F, and I think this is one of the big concerns toward adding additional.

The next two charts just show each of the two options. So option 1, tier rating, again, we see a nice spread on the tier 1. Tier 4, though, is predominantly high-poverty schools, and it's good to dig in here again and see what you're seeing. And option 2 also has sort of almost a better distribution on tier 2 and 3, but not so much on tier 4.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Looks like they have significantly more.

MS. BOAST: Now, one thing that could address this is the weighting on your subgroup measures, okay? Because I think the higher weighting that you have on that subgroup measures I think you'll see a little bit more. And deciding on what you want, we can rerun these and provide those to you, hopefully as quickly as possible. But now that we have this nice spreadsheet that puts all this in and spits it out, after lunch what I would like to do is really look at that weighting, but we can then rerun these so that you see the ultimate weighting that you decide on, how does that read out.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: This chart solidifies or shows me visually what my suspicions were just by looking at the percentage of students in charter school and how well they were doing and then looking at all the other charter schools that were doing according to the A, B, and C doing very bad, but I knew that they had the high, high percentage of students. And those charter schools are not going to get balance, because of where they're at, and they're going to attract a high percentage of poverty.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Of course, that's our case. What they're saying they can do. They can help those students more. I have one question. Did we lose a school down here? There's five schools on option 2 and six on option 1. Did one --
think she had a successful education.
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: She did.
COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: But she's considered a dropout and in these numbers, guess what, she wouldn't count; whereas my middle son, who is severely disabled, he graduated, but he has the mind of about a five-or-six-year-old. He couldn't add five and five together. But yet he graduated.
So that's why I'm saying graduation rate is not necessarily meaning that you're career or college-ready, that you're actually learning the full scope. You may have attained the potential of yourself, but you're not independent at that time. And that's why, to me, having it as a measure is fine. I just wouldn't give it that high of a weight.
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COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think for the most part for most of our schools, I don't know whether that's necessary, but I think that's something maybe that would be a good option for those alternative schools that are servicing, you know, other populations that I think that's maybe some way where we could say, look, this is what we'll do to also help, is break out.

MS. BOAST: That could be their school-specific goal.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I would like to see us consider right now if you complete your GED, you're classified as a dropout, even though the State collects that data and knows the names of all those students who complete the GED. As charter schools, maybe we could explore the option of completed GEDs for some of those alternative schools, counting into the graduation rate as positive and I think we could handle those numbers and it would be validated. But I think it would behoove us to do that because it might jump that up some.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You're right. That could help. That could be one of those areas where,

you know, the schools that are servicing those challenging populations that they don't fit into this box, we can say, "We'll also include the GED."

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And it would free those schools up to guide some of those older students into that program so that at some point -- because what you have to do to take the GED is, you have to literally drop out of high school.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But if we could count that back in and there could be tutoring towards that direction when it became appropriate, and we'd have a lot more graduates, valid graduates, don't you think?

COMMISSIONER CRONE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And we'd save a whole lot of money because we wouldn't have 25-year-olds in the school.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: The problem is, I know with Las Cruces, if you want to work for the City of Las Cruces you cannot work --

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I looked it up, Patty, and --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Well, the City councilors have told us that. You can't work if you have a GED. The application won't be accepted.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: If you go to the website and you look at the application, and you look at the job, the posting, it says, "High school diploma or GED."

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But you will not get an interview.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Then that is discrimination, because --

MS. BOAST: Okay. We're going to focus you here now. It's time to do some math. Okay. So if you all could take this, and there are three columns on the far right. The first is just to confirm that this indicator, you agree, should be included in the framework. We're assuming that, you know, these are ones that have been suggested that have been tested, but we just want confirmation there. Then what would be the weight for the K-8 and then the high schools?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I have a question about these because we spent some time as a group weighting, and are these the numbers that we did?

MS. BOAST: In August what we did was to take that, and there was quite a bit of range in those, and that's really how we developed this option 1 and option 2.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So my question is, my feedback is, do I have to indicate an option or -- because when it --

MS. BOAST: No, if you wouldn't mind actually putting a number there, and then an actual number.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Okay. I'm still confused. I understand the number for weights. But am I doing option 1 or option 2? Am I basing my numbers on option 1 or option 2?

MS. BOAST: Depends on which one you prefer.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So I have to tell you which one?

MS. BOAST: No, if you just put a number.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: You could be in between.

MS. POULOS: Column 1 is: Do you want this measure included? Column 2 is for elementary school. You can look at option 1 and option 2, and if you don't like either of those, you could put your own numbers. If you like one of those, you
MS. BOAST: If it adds up to 126 --
25
may be easy. Just divide them all in half.
24
MS. POULOS: Make it add up to 200, that
23
may be easy. Just divide them all in half.
22
MS. BOAST: If it adds up to 126 --
21
MS. BOAST: You would put 20.
20
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And that
19
question that Patty and Daniel were talking about,
18
the GED thing, that's not -- I know. But it's not
17
an option to give -- I mean, we can't give it to
16
charter schools without giving it to all schools.
15
Isn't that true or not?
14
MS. POULOS: You're creating your own
13
performance framework. You may want to consider the
12
fact that you are creating a different system that
11
could be seen inequitable, and that might contribute
10
to a negative conversation about charter schools.
9
So you want to be thoughtful about that as you make
8
your decision.
7
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And that's why
6
I'm asking you, we could do it, but there would be
5
consequences.
4
MS. POULOS: You have to think through
3
what that narrative is in public.
2
MS. BOAST: I think, though, a very valid
1
bullet is, you only have one or two. Some of the

had. If you had all three, each of them would get
6.66, or you could preserve it so that each of those
subgroups is getting a certain percentage and if the
others are missing, you're not sort of assigning
that weight to other subgroups, if that makes sense.
The rationale or the thinking that you
would have behind this would be, subgroup growth is
important to us and we want to value that, you know,
a certain percentage of our framework regardless of
how many subgroups are there.
So thoughts? And I will say that
generally is the approach that is taken, that you
have decided we're prioritizing subgroup performance
this percentage. But we can easily also say, No,
you're going to -- if they're missing --
COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: The way I
understand it, the way you're saying is that if I
have a charter school and I understand that if I
have no poverty kids, I'm still going to get those
20 points, so I'm going to make everything possible
to have no --
MS. BOAST: No, no, you wouldn't get the
credit. What you're suggesting is if you had no
subgroups, and that's our second bullet. The first
bullet is, you only have one or two. Some of the
subgroups are not present in the school; right? So do you want to still say, "We're going to give 20 percent of the weight of the results on whatever students we have that are in these subgroups"? If they're all in FRL, that's fine; that's who we're focusing on. If they're all missing, the school doesn't get credit, and we'll discuss that in the second one. But it's whether you want to have that focus on subgroup students regardless of which group they're in.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: How many schools do we have who have none of one of those three groups?

MS. BOAST: They all have reported results. So this is where you can look at the blank spaces, you know, in this subgroup. So actually, you do have -- if you look at subgroup proficiency, schools 8, 20, and 25 have none. They're not going to get credit for this, so don't worry about that. But you do have a lot of white spaces in the subgroup growth, so these are the schools that, you know, are you going to --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Is this not -- won't some of this be filled in because only some of that information was suppressed?

MS. BOAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Sometimes they don't rank them.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: -- in any of these.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Sometimes they don't rank them.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's conceivable.

But a lot of this white will go away because that information won't be suppressed.

MS. BOAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Sometimes they don't rank them.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's conceivable.

But a lot of this white will go away because that information won't be suppressed.

MS. BOAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So how many schools would we be talking about that would have few to none of those subgroups? Probably very few.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And that's where I think if you just redistribute within that indicator, because there's the three groupings, just put it to the other ones in the same proportion. I think that's fine.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Because there's not going to be that many schools, once these other ones get filled in.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And if it ended up that somehow they were penalized -- and I can't see it happening -- we can revisit that, you know, but --


So the second question, this isn't so much a question but something that you'll need to consider is that you could have an entire indicator missing. So for example, you can conceivably have a school that has no students in any subgroups, or you could have a school where -- or you could have a school whose school-specific goals can't be evaluated. You may have some situations where an entire indicator is missing.

Generally, the approach that's taken there is that is just taken out of the calculation, you know. They don't get points for having it missing, but if that was a third of it, suppose you had three indicators that were all equally weighted, a third,
and say, maybe they need to be changed, so that we can -- so that there's not" -- because you know, I'm concerned that something -- not going to be, you know -- the school -- this school wasn't able to do this, so they're not -- I know they're not getting the points for it, but still, they're not -- you know, that's not being looked at.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I'm really concerned with the scenario that it would be kicked out and there would be -- you're out of the system.

That really concerns me.

MS. BOAST: So that sounds like not nothing. Okay. That's good to know that. That's what I assumed, but I wanted to check with you.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think if that happened that someone was kicked out, I think we would immediately need to know that so we could say why. But I can't -- no. That scenario.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Probably the positive about New Mexico.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: The whole notion of school-specific goals, I think that the shortcoming of not being able to evaluate a school-specific goal is not the school. It's the

evaluators. It's on our side.

MS. POULOS: I'm sorry, just let me jump in on that.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: No, you jump in when I'm finished.

MS. POULOS: Sir --

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Jump in when I'm finished.

MS. POULOS: No, no, no.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Jump in when I'm finished.

MS. POULOS: I do have a problem with you saying there's a problem with --

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Again, you can have a problem all you want, but please wait until I'm finished.

So this is where I'm at, is that either a school is doing it or not doing it. How good it is doing it is a different question. But if this body accepted a charter that said we are going to be about this, and accepted it and chartered it, that means that we felt that it was something that was going to be good and it could have been evaluated somehow, or we could put some value to it.

Is there value by saying we want to do this? We want to set up a school for all sports.

We want to set up a school for all dance. But is the school doing it? Is the school that's advocating dance as a way to propel the students into greatness -- are they doing dance? And if the answer is yes, well, they're doing it. If we want to evaluate how good they are, it's a different question, and we kind of went through it.

Is the school that's advocating sports to get things done and propel students to greatness, and they're no good without it, before coming into a school, then if they're doing it, they're doing it. They have met that.

MS. BOAST: I think the problem -- so I think that that's a valid point and it assumes, though, that you have a good way to evaluate. And I think we're trying to get you to a place to have a good way to evaluate the mission, but unfortunately, even -- hopefully we can get to that place, right, but until then, you are bound by what was specified in the contract.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: So we accepted it. This is my dilemma. We accepted it as a valid thing to do, and now they're getting penalized because we don't know how to deal with it. And so I would say they get the credit until we know how to better evaluate it and evaluate them down.

MS. BOAST: But what about a situation where they did actually say, "We will provide these data," and they don't provide them?

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Well, either they provide it or don't provide it. I mean, it's one -- yes or no. The question is yes or no. They should do the dance? The answer is yes. This is how much dance we did. Are we looking at the grades? We kind of question the dance did propel the students into greatness, or you know, whatever. But if they say we're going to do dance and not anything in dance happened, then it's a yes or no.

MS. BOAST: In the short-term, you know, right now, given that you have to deal with what was laid out, if it is not possible to evaluate that question, is it successful, should the school get credit, get falls far below, or get missing? This is my question.

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

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Don't we even

now until they come to renewal and it can be fixed?

of the old contracts, so that we can deal with them
forward, the schools understand that through
whatever negotiations occur from now until whenever,
that it will look different. And it should be
measurable. We're going to hit big bumps in the
road with some schools like an Amy Biehl and like
some others that it's, like, holy cow, what was
anyone thinking, you know. And that's going to
happen. So the question is, what do you do with
those schools that are still back in the dark ages
of the old contracts, so that we can deal with them
now until they come to renewal and it can be fixed?
And they shouldn't be penalized for it.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Don't we even
have schools saying that their students -- some

language like this -- will be prepared for post
secondary whatever, and so to measure that, you have
to do, like, an academic kind of thing? How would
you measure that? Or how would you measure --
didn't we just approve two great schools who were
wanting to make sure that these kids were
college-ready, and it's a K-5.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And we expressed
that concern.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I agree. We
didn't have an answer.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.

MS. POULOS: I think this is getting away
from the question at hand, although it's an
important conversation of: Do we actually require
any goals to be written? Do we require goals to be
written? Do we say, you must have a school-specific
goal that's related to your mission or not? That's
a very different conversation than this one. And we
may want to do this one just so we can move forward.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I think if we put
down a weight for the school-specific goals, and
they don't want to do that, then that weight just
gets spread to the other ones. If we go with number
one, then they would just go with graduation,
career-ready, and opportunity. They just get bumped
up.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: If it can't be
measured, then you split it out.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Or if they say, "We
choose not to set a goal in that area," they're
given the option to set goals which have to be
specific and measurable, but if they choose not to,
that ten points goes somewhere else. Just like we
were saying, if they don't have a subgroup, the
points assigned and the weighting would go to the
other things in that category.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And there's a piece
of me that has a real hard time saying we're not
going to measure their mission, because their
mission is why they were created. So that if
there's nothing in that contract that measures how
they are carrying out that mission, then there's
nothing to stop them from mission drift, because
ey're not being held accountable anywhere. So I
can give you this lofty plan --

MS. BOAST: This is a really important
question that I don't think we're going to solve
here, but it's going to need to be resolved by the
time you adopt your framework, because we have in

the past talked about two components -- or the law
says schools have to have the option to have
additional assessments. Right? It does not say
they have to have a mission-specific goal. But
there's strong feeling on some of your body that
that should be required. So I don't think we're
going to resolve that today.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I think the law
does include that it has to be a school that has a
mission, has a --

MS. BOAST: But in the accountability,
like the rules, in the accountability, performance
framework.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Right, because
we're following the same performance framework as
the public schools, but --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: No. Public schools
don't have performance frameworks.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Well, I read that
the general law that -- before everything else
underneath -- and well, it was somewhat lofty, but
they talked about putting schools that had a mission
and can start new ways of teaching kids, trying new
things, so that the public schools can copy them and
be successful, also, and so I always thought that if
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But tier 3 is more
25
tiers and there's five grades.
24
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: But tier 3 is more
23
of the intervention tier, so if you have -- and
22
you're right, it's unlikely, but things happen. So
21
I can't see -- because tier 2, to me, is just a kind
20
of passing e-mail or letter that's saying, "Hi, just
19
be aware that," and that F grade should trigger a
18
little bit more than that. So I have a hard time
17
with them being above a tier 3.
16
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: They're going to
15
need some sort of intervention if they have an
14
overall F. There has to be something.
13
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.
12
MS. BOAST: And what about D grades?
11
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I would put D and F
10
in the same category, that they can't go above a
9
tier 3. Because you know, in all likelihood they
8
have been bouncing, you know.
7
MS. BOAST: Okay, terrific. So I'm making
6
notes. Again, this is all going to come back to you
5
as a proposed section. So is everybody ready?
4
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I need to ask a
3
question, because we just made a decision. And are
2
we correct, Katie, if we have an overall grade of F,
1
there needs to be some intervention? It seems to me
an intervention. Is that realistic?
1
MS. POULOS: I think that's going to be up
1
to you as a Commission. I don't think you would
1
want a D or F to be a tier 2.
1
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Okay. I wanted to
1
confirm, because I'm wondering how much we're
1
messing with statistical implication with what we're
1
doing around the table, and making decisions on
1
deleting things out and putting things in.
1
MS. BOAST: This will actually be a
1
safeguard, this trigger thing, that a D or an F
1
could not be a 1 or a 2 tier. It is very unlikely,
1
given the run, you know, the trials that we've done
1
that that would ever happen. But things happen.
1
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.
1
COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And not weighting
1
some, making the decision that we're going to
1
redistribute things to other areas, or if something
1
can't be evaluated, then we just don't evaluate it,
1
and that goes away. And to me, that has somewhat --
1
but the statistical work that you all have done with
1
this leads me to think that it's very small, but I
1
want to be sure.
1
MS. BOAST: Yes. And the other thing,
1
just to reassure you, is that, again, no decisions
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Do not pass go.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I mean, in reality, so could an academic, and we're getting to that point where it could be, but that's why we want to dig into those other subareas so that we're not just putting the hatchet down because you got an F on that school grade, because there are other mitigating factors.

MS. BOAST: Okay. So Katie has up here -- because I can't put my computer -- these are the results of the weights that you all put down. So you have got the elementary. So there are six of you who gave feedback, so they're the elementary in columns B through G, and then high school in H through M.

So if we start with the easiest ones, it looks as though you all sort of agree on a subgroup performance of 10 percent is a good weight. So that's an easy one. We can start there.

And then let's see, I think there was another -- likewise, the Q rows 7 and 8 that have the Q1 and the Q3, that seems to be consensus for elementary to be -- we've got four of you for 5, one 2.5, one 7.5. And likewise for the high school, I see that as being sort of a consensus around 5. Any of you who either put 2.5 or 7.5, would you be comfortable with that at 5?

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: That's fine.

MS. BOAST: Okay. Great. So other easy ones. Well, let's look at school growth, which is row 6. We've got two 10s, three 15s, and one 20. That seems to land us at a mode of 15, so those of you who either put 2.5 or 7.5, would you be comfortable with that at 15?

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: You're talking about at the K-8?

MS. BOAST: At the K-8, yes, on the K-8 side.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yes.

MS. BOAST: Okay. Good. And then for the
high school, we've actually got an even split
between 10 and 5. And so I would throw starting
with the 7.5. So we're on line 6, school growth.
Again, this is the school -- the whole school level
growth. Any concerns with a 7.5 there? That's just
evenly sort of splitting the difference.
Okay. Then I think another one that might
be -- let's go to row 13, which is opportunities to
learn. We've got a lot of range here. We lost two
people.

MS. POULOS: They want zero. Two people
said zero.

MS. BOAST: Okay. So when I had to scan
this --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I don't care if they
learn.

MS. POULOS: They have an opportunity to
learn clearly if they're learning.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I took it completely
away.

MS. BOAST: You took it completely away.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I did.

MS. BOAST: So for elementary, I had put
down in sort of a drafting, a 5, because you know,
we've got folks, but does anybody want to advocate
either for --

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Tell me all this
is an opportunity to learn in an elementary.

MS. POULOS: It's attendance, and we look
at attendance rate, we're hoping it 95 percent.
They can get a few extra points if they go -- they
can get a few extra points if they go above the 95
percent attendance rate, and then it's the
opportunity-to-learn surveys, which are administered
with the assessment. So it's administered with the
PARCC assessment, the ten questions. Does my
teacher know when I'm upset? Does my teacher make
sure I understand? And the goal out of a 50 point
survey is 45 points. If they get more than 45
points, they can get extra beyond the points that
they -- like the maximum number points, so they can
actually get over the maximum of points.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And this is just
my opinion. I actually thought the questions were
very good that they're asking kids. I'm just not
sure kids' answers to that as good an indicator as
the questions are, because I do believe that that is
what a good teacher does. You make sure that the
kids understand it, and if they don't, you go over
it. Now, do I think they every teacher needs to
care about what I did at home or -- you know, you
have people with 150 kids and, no, I don't know that
they can -- I don't know. So I just don't think
that that's valid to me.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And that's part of
the reason why on the elementary level, in
particular, I took it away because I just thought
that it's significantly harder for an elementary
school child to answer that question.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: She didn't like
me, though, this morning, so it's over.

MS. POULOS: Teachers don't like them,
honestly, or teachers don't like these surveys.
That being said, we are working on developing a new
survey. So you could always come back to this
question in two years when we make revisions under
ESSA and see if you like those surveys better. But
then the other kids, for case 2, it's not even a
student. It's the parents. And how much do they
know? And then the last one is --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And most of them
like their elementary school.

MS. BOAST: And all your schools are
getting As or Bs on this.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's almost a
give-away, and it's almost a point of hope because
you know you'll do well on college and career, and
you know you'll do well on opportunities to learn,
and maybe that will give you some points that will
carry you over.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I left it on the
high school because I had 5 points. So I put it
there.

MS. BOAST: Are you comfortable with 5
points here? Or do you want to consider taking it
out?

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I'm good for 5. I
went with 10 only because -- I'm the 10 -- only
because I feel that attendance is so important,
truancy is such a huge problem. And again, you're
penalizing a school grade for something that the
parents have control over in the elementary school.
But I think it's indicative of letting the parents
know, "Your kids need to be in school. You're going
to get better credit. That school is going to get a
rating."

So you're really telling the parents --
because truancy is a huge problem in school. If we
don't measure it, if we don't put a weight on it,
it's going to continue.
COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I guess my problem is, it's because the survey's attached with it. If the survey -- if it was just attendance, I'd have less of an issue with it.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I think attendance is what people look at.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I'm willing to go with a 5, but let's keep it -- I don't want to drop it off.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I don't want to drop it, either, because I kept looking at the six, seven, and eight, and I was trying to remember my six, seven, and eight, and I was completely ignored in the sixth grade. Completely. I was very fortunate that at the seventh and eighth, the teachers decided to do an experiment, and things changed dramatically.

It was a dramatic shift. Whatever I learned in seventh and eighth, it was the same BS at eighth and ninth in high school. So it was accelerated learning. There was a grand experiment, and nobody picked up. But I value what the kids would say at six, seven, and eight. I don't know about the younger kids, but if a student is sitting there -- and I had all As, but I was still ignored,

because I was very bad-behaved. I was still ignored and maybe that's why I decided -- I don't know.

MS. BOAST: Do you feel comfortable with 5?

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I'm comfortable with 5.

MS. BOAST: Or there's enough of a sense --

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So I hear what David is saying, and I am with you, actually, on the attendance. My gut thing is, I don't like the surveys and I don't know how to do that because we can't -- again, going back to what Katie was saying before, you can't say it's not going to count for charter schools, but it's going to count for traditional public schools. So you know, that's where you are; right? That's what you would say to me.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: It's not a Waterloo point for me.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's just that I don't want them to get more points.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'd prefer it to be gone, but it doesn't --

MS. BOAST: Okay, so 7.5. Let's talk about college and career readiness. There was almost total agreement at 15, but one 20.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I have a question about opportunities to learn for the high school. Because I'm the 15-pointer there, because of just what you said, because it's truancy. And if you don't hold schools accountable for attendance, particularly in the high school, if it's not valuable -- and truancy is what gets kids in high school. It's what everybody fights with. And I think to make that less important is letting the kids know you really don't have to be there. It's just 5 points now. Because it's not about the surveys. I agree with you, those surveys have been around 100 years, but that attendance --

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: But your 20 is in college career and readiness.

MS. BOAST: She's got 15.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Opportunity to learn. I haven't left opportunity to learn yet. I needed to say that about high school, because I was right with you.

MS. BOAST: One important thing to remember is that attendance is in your operational framework, so it's not being ignored. So essentially this has a very low weight because it's together with the survey.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But I still am concerned with 5 points for attendance in high school. But that's my concern.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I gave it less weight because it does appear in the operational. So I think it has the weight in the operational that isn't necessary here, because it's attached to the survey.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: We could go back and forth,

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So because --

MS. POULOS: I do think it's important for you to think about it, and you may still land in the same place. This is your academic performance framework. This is academic.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Attendance very much links to --

MS. POULOS: You can't learn if you're not in school; right? And we do have the organizational, where the organizational -- I think we have suggested putting something in about truancy rates, but we definitely have been looking at the school's process, but we could add an attendance
<table>
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<tr>
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</thead>
</table>
| rate into the academic -- or, sorry, to the organizational pretty easily where we're actually just saying we expect the school to have a 95 percent attendance rate, and if you're not meeting that, then to -- COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: What are you doing? COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Have a plan to address it. MS. POULOS: Right. So that is something for you to think about. Do you want it here or do you want it somewhere else? COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm fine with the 5. I just had to say that. MS. BOAST: Okay. So college and career readiness. All 15, but one 20. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I find that very interesting, because coming from a high school perspective, college and career readiness -- that's a dadgum giveaway. That 15 points, that is -- oh, I can count on that. That is mine. So to give it 15 points is saying, "That's all right, we'll do that for you, because that's an easy one." MS. BOAST: Why didn't you put it lower? COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Because I figured 15 points. Yeah, why not. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right. MS. BOAST: Anybody want to arbitrate for higher? Anybody advocate for higher? COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I would advocate for higher only because we're really not doing anything and I don't know what needs to be done. Earlier in the week, I was very privileged to look at that from people from out-of-state, and we're nowhere close to what other states are doing. MS. BOAST: In terms of what's considered in the -- COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Right. Right. And career readiness and jobs and jobs that pay good money. We're just lame in that. And I was puzzled. I thought that 15 was good enough, but I wasn't quite sure whether that was true or not. I felt like we needed to do something, but I wasn't sure whether 20, 25, or 15 would benefit. I'm at a loss. COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I'm right there with you, because from a sense, you're saying it's a giveaway because you take these classes, in that sense, so then it diminishes -- because we're talking about points now -- how much I think is important that the lowest quartile growth and the highest -- so if you're getting these I'll just call them gimme points, and I don't really mean that as negatively as it sounds, an opportunity to learn, which attendance -- I agree, it's important. But if you're going to be guaranteed that you're going to get this many points out of 100, or whatever, then these other things we're looking at is: Are students learning? You're giving them less importance. And so we're looking at a school that has an F grade or a D -- let's say they have a D -- or a C. Let's make it a C. And yet they're pretty low scores. They could have Ds or Fs in these things that I think are important, like learning. MS. BOAST: Well, you have two F schools that have Bs in college and career readiness. MS. POULOS: Just so that you understand, because I'm not sure -- maybe you all do understand how the college-and-career-readiness indicator works. And I think, Danielle, what you're referring to is, you can enroll students in dual credit study skills, and we're going to use that because that is the most egregious. It is literally not a course. There is no rigor. Every student will pass that course without any problem, and that will count as both participation and success for a student in dual credit, which then counts that student as a college-and-career-ready student. So that's what Danielle is referring to, which you have to understand what's behind there and whether it's actually getting at what you want it to get at; right, and why Danielle says, "It's kind of a gimme." So is that actually measuring the things you think are important, or Karyl Ann, to your point, is the outcome on the end-of-year assessment more important? (A discussion was held off the record.) MS. BOAST: You would feel more comfortable with a higher weight if you were more confident in the rigor of the indicator. COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: And my answer is yes, I would feel comfortable if it was rigorous and it was with substance. I would add a higher value, because we're just nowhere in career and college readiness. We're nowhere. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I agree, but to Katie's point, if you can give them a gimme class which qualifies them, we're giving them 15 or 20 points, and it doesn't mean anything. COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Right. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: So in that case,
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| 1. Based on how they meet that criteria, I say make it only 5 or 10 points --  
2. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes, you're right. 
3. I changed. 
4. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: -- if that's how we're measuring it, so it comes down to how do we evaluate that? Because if you go back and say 50 percent of the students graduating from high school still have to take remedial classes in college, then they're not ready. I don't care if they pass this class in high school. They're not ready. 
5. MS. POULOS: And I'm not saying everybody does that. But I am saying when you have a D and F school, I will tell you if you go look at their college-and-career-readiness indicator, it may be the COMPASS or ASVAB or whatever, but it is a very low rigor. 
6. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: You have to administer those. You are required. And it's not anything to do with the outcome. It's the fact that you simply offered the ASVAB, or you offered the COMPASS or you offered the dual credit. 
7. MS. POULOS: It's both. We give points for participation and we give points for success. Both of those are built into this indicator. 
8. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You're becoming mystified. And I understand the GED and I think -- 
9. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm one person. 
10. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: We home-schooled her two years and she passed her GED, went to T-VI, CNM now, for a year and transferred to Eastern, got an associate's degree and became an RN, making $26 an hour coming out of college. 
11. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And we're losing all those children, but what it does is, it forces schools into finding options for students who learn differently and to deal with graduation requirements creatively. And I fear if we take the emphasis off of -- well, it goes right into the dropout rate, the graduation rate, that's published across the state that everybody's talking about. I just don't feel like we can -- I can't back off, but if it's consensus, whatever we have to add. 
12. MS. BOAST: Do you advocate for 15? 
13. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Absolutely. 
14. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I was to 5, so -- 
15. COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I was the next one higher, only because -- 
16. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: For many of those other reasons that I, you know -- 
17. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I'm looking at... |
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| 1. MS. BOAST: 10? 
2. COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I'm still at a loss. 
3. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'm fine with 10, but I don't know at this point, you know, where do we feel the need to put the other 5? 
4. MS. BOAST: We're actually over on that column -- 
5. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Oh, okay. 
6. MS. BOAST: -- in terms of what I have. 
7. COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Danielle has 144. 
8. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Just go to the bottom and do a net sum on all the columns. 
9. MS. BOAST: We'll review this again, we'll type them up. 
10. So then for graduation rates, this one is a little tougher, because you have two 10s, two 15s, a 5 and an 8. So I would have you consider either a 10 or a 12.5 here, unless there's strong feelings for the higher or lower. 
11. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Graduation rate drives smaller high schools to keep kids in school and to look at options. There is the penalty and Dave said with his daughter, his daughter left high school as a sophomore and took her GED, she was considered a dropout. 
12. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: We home-schooled her two years and she passed her GED, went to T-VI, CNM now, for a year and transferred to Eastern, got an associate's degree and became an RN, making $26 an hour coming out of college. 
13. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And we're losing all those children, but what it does is, it forces schools into finding options for students who learn differently and to deal with graduation requirements creatively. And I fear if we take the emphasis off of -- well, it goes right into the dropout rate, the graduation rate, that's published across the state that everybody's talking about. I just don't feel like we can -- I can't back off, but if it's consensus, whatever we have to add. 
14. MS. BOAST: Do you advocate for 15? 
15. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Absolutely. 
16. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I was to 5, so -- 
17. COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I was the next one higher, only because -- 
18. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: For many of those other reasons that I, you know -- 
19. COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And I'm looking at... |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. purposefully or unintentionally push me right back out where I was, and it doesn't count against the school.</td>
<td>1. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We issued certificates of attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Well, in the larger metropolitan areas, looking at Albuquerque, maybe Las Cruces, Santa Fe, you have a lot of substance abuse by the parents. So you have a lot of students that drop out to either care for siblings or to care for themselves, and it contributes to that low graduation rate, but it's not a fault of the school or the student. It's economic or other socioeconomic reasons that are causing it, and it's not really a failure of the school. It's a failure of society or the community. But you're penalizing the school by lowering the grade if you do that. So that's why I only gave it 10. Graduation is a 10. Because graduation is important, but you know, you can graduate and not know anything. And worse, you can know a lot but you don't know how to think critically. So I think that's the danger of just saying we're going to give you a piece of sheepskin and say, &quot;Here, go on,&quot; and then you go and you get a job, because you have a certificate, and you get fired because you can't read the manual of how to operate the piece of equipment that they want you to operate. It's a disservice. COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I don't think I disagree with you. Now we're talking about New Mexico. I'm only talking here, that the majority of this state is low socioeconomic. It just is. Look at these schools. It's like a huge amount. So I see that they are at a disadvantage forever, and I absolutely agree with what you're saying. It's just that, to me, it's sort of like what we just said in the last conversation. If you don't put a lot of points on that this is really important, then it's saying, like, well, it's not that important. And yet, I totally agree with you. So I'm truly conflicted in what I'm saying, and I'll tell you in my perfect world, you would graduate from high school with an academic diploma if you passed the entrance into a college. I mean, I totally agree with you when I say that. I think you shouldn't graduate. If we have special ed. kids and they graduate, I think that's fine. And I don't think that they -- my high school had different kinds of diplomas. So if you had an academic diploma, then it meant that you actually could go to school and didn't do something.</td>
<td>2. Why don't we look next at proficiency. Current standing. The very top first one. So we had sort of a split. Let's see. Three for 20, two for 30, and one for 40, which lands us somewhere around 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MS. BOAST: Slightly more than half.</td>
<td>3. MS. BOAST: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MS. POULOS: Just a little piece of information there. You all probably know this. But in current standing, proficiency, we are actually considering both proficiency and growth. That is a dual measure, includes both proficiency and growth.</td>
<td>4. MS. BOAST: So the proficiency part, the true proficiency, straight, just what percentage of students is proficient will be half of whatever weight you put on this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MS. BOAST: Right. Value-added adjusted, yes, proficiency.</td>
<td>5. MS. POULOS: Slightly more than half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. MS. POULOS: Yes.</td>
<td>6. MS. BOAST: Slightly more than half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MS. POULOS: Yes.</td>
<td>8. MS. BOAST: Slightly more than half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MS. BOAST: So the proficiency part, the true proficiency, straight, just what percentage of students is proficient will be half of whatever weight you put on this.</td>
<td>9. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Proficiency and growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MS. POULOS: Slightly more than half.</td>
<td>10. MS. BOAST: But more proficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MS. POULOS: More proficiency than growth.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I thought the second option threw more schools, not necessarily appropriately, off skew a little bit.

MS. BOAST: Into that option 2.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: That's why I went with --

MS. BOAST: A lower --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.

MS. BOAST: Would you all be comfortable with 30? We're going to have to do a final adjustment because I think we're going to be a little off and have to look. But I'd rather that we look at each one and then have to say, okay, we're 10 off, or however much off, and come back. So are people comfortable with 30? That's pretty much the middle. Okay. Why don't we finalize 30.

And then for high schools, again, we had a range of from 20 to 40. Are you comfortable putting 30? We're going to have to make some adjustments here, but as a starting -- okay, let's go with that to 30.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Can I ask a question of you, Katie? So a school who has high proficiency may not have such a high growth. It's possible.

MS. POULOS: It is possible.

MS. BOAST: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So this particular measure would not penalize them for less growth, but high proficiency. They could have a 67 percent proficiency.

MS. POULOS: They could have really high proficiency and if they are not growing their students and their growth score is really low, they could have a low current standing score, and we do see that.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So this kind of gives them a little bit of both. People who have great growth and low proficiency, they could be doing well, too.

MS. POULOS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So it kind of is good for everybody, or not?

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And I think by balancing growth and proficiency, it's forcing schools to not ignore those who are doing well but could do better. You know, we have students that are taking algebra 2 but they're not taking an advanced algebra, not taking those advanced classes, but they're capable of it; so they're not encouraging them and directing them into those things where they could raise the proficiency score. They're just going along, getting along, type thing.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That's why I like that.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: In a way, we put a lot of focus on special ed. over the years, and you know, we get criticized because so much money goes into special ed., being D-level special ed.; right?

And we ignore the gifted, which is also special ed. And the thing is, if you ignore the gifted, you can still have proficiency, but you are not having a lot of growth by ignoring the gifted, and I think we need to be supporting those gifted.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So what I am saying is that I am happy that it's a score that kind of rewards both, as opposed to only one.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Right.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: We agree. Got it.

MS. BOAST: Okay. Great. Let's look at -- we have two more before we can come back to graduation and then do some adjustments overall. So line 9, which is the subgroup performance, growth, subgroup growth, for elementary school, four of the six we've got 30. So pretty high. But then we've also got a 15 and a 20. I would suggest that 25 here, unless the 15 feels really strongly about talking about something lower. 25 would be a quarter of the whole framework. It's clearly very important in terms of your priority and your focus. But 25 would be a significant statement that you'd be making.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: That's fine.

MS. BOAST: Okay. Again, we'll have to come back.

And then on the high school side, we've got -- it looks like we're landing at around 15 because we've got three at 10, two at 15, one at 20. So if we went with 15, does anybody feel that that's not enough or too much?

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Uh-huh.

MS. BOAST: Okay. So that takes us to the school-specific goals. What I would just propose, just looking again -- not trying to balance yet, but just looking at what we have there -- I would say 10 is definitely -- we have four 10s, a 15, and an 8.

So I would suggest 10 there and actually a 12.5 for high school. But --
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yeah.</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And that's fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BOAST: Okay. So that is going to leave us, then, with needing to adjust 5 points for elementary. Why don't we do that before we talk about graduation? That might be a little easier. So something in the elementary model needs to be reduced by 5. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Or two pieces by 2.5.</td>
<td>MS. BOAST: And 20 is still a very high, you know -- places a priority on that subgroup performance. COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And part of the lowest performer -- the highest performing group and the lowest performing is also part of that. MS. BOAST: Yes. Okay. So people are comfortable with this? And again, this is not finalizing, but this would be what would be taken to schools, and you get feedback on it, and probably there would likely be some final tweaks that you may make. Okay. So we are 10 points over on the high school, but we still haven't really resolved where you want to be for graduation rates. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: That's without graduation rate. It's 10 points. MS. POULOS: That is cutting 10 points. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: We're 10 points over with 10 points in graduation. MS. POULOS: Just take graduation rate out. I'm kidding. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: You could take the 5 that I wanted and get yourself 5 points there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| went that direction. If you wanted to maintain a higher on growth, then you could either bring current standing to 25 or... COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Take out a loan for 5 more points? COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Well, we could either reduce the 30 to 25, or we could reduce the 30 to 27.5 and maybe the subgroup performance growth to 22.5, and shave 2.5 points from those two larger numbers. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: The subgroup is included in the current standing proficiency; right? Because it's all the students. MS. BOAST: Yes, exactly. Yes. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And it's going to be included in that growth figure also. MS. BOAST: Yes. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And growth is also in part of the proficiency. COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Right. But the subperformance growth is in the top one as well as in the next one down. I mean, I would feel better by lowering the subgroup to 20 and leaving the proficiency growth at 30, since we're in essence counting growth twice. | COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I guess I'm the one who's always the one about the school-specific goals. And maybe I'm just looking at this incorrectly, but to me, the goal, period, is the kids can do math, reading, and writing. And the specific reason the school was established, for want of a better word, is because they think by doing this or adding this, that that will help students who are not -- don't like or not doing well, whatever, in a traditional public school, and that's why they have this goal. That's why we're going to do dance, that's why we're going to do music, or hands-on, or whatever. So to me, it's less important, not to the point where if they say they're doing expositionary learning and they're doing project-based learning, that's a way different thing. But to me, it's less important than the other ones are. So that's just my stand on it. That's why I think I gave it a low score. COMMISSIONER GIPSON: And I'm the opposite, because I think the mission -- and if the school has -- can -- and I think if there's an area where there's going to be major pushback from the schools, it's going to be in lessening the
COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Drop that to 25.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: If they're doing really well at whatever they're doing, then --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So are many at the local school. But they said that they wanted to do this. So therefore, if they're not doing that, then why do they exist?

Patty, do you feel it's more important -- the school-specific goals at elementary have 10 points. At high school they have 12 and a half.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Is it more important to have school-specific goals at the high school?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I have a question.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That's right.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And that's where I'm coming from, because I think that's what they should be focusing on.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: So are many at the local school? Because --

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Isn't that 2.5 points?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That should maybe be 10 instead of 12.

MS. BOAST: Because if you make an adjustment of that, it probably should be the same on both of them. Right? Okay.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So they would take that 2.5 points.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Your mission is your mission regardless of what grade level you're serving.

MS. BOAST: One other thing to consider here for the high school is that generally in high school, you're adding graduation and college and career readiness, so you're having to take away from proficiency and growth. We have the exact same proficiency here for the K-8 and the high school.

So you might consider bringing those down only because the expectation is you're reducing -- you're taking some of the weight of both proficiency and growth to include graduation and college and career readiness. So --

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: Drop that to 25.

And then if we took school growth to 5, that puts us at 100.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think it can be, because on the agenda for tomorrow is an agenda item relative to all the other numbers. If it's higher in that area, it's going to have the same emphasis to the school within the context of that 100 percent. I agree with you, the more points you put in there, the relative importance increases and it gives them some options. I'm fine.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So we're not at 140 anymore.

MS. BOAST: We're at 100 on both.

So thank you. We actually accomplished the goals for today that -- what I will do is send an updated table with the tier based on these weights, so that you can see that. And then, of course, this is just the draft framework, which will get feedback.

So my question for you is, Patty, this may be a question for you. We had on the agenda -- it's 3:00. We are a little behind. That took a long amount of time. One other topic was starting to discuss a timeline for implementing. Is that something you want to take the next half hour for?

Is that a topic for tomorrow?

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I think it can be, because on the agenda for tomorrow is an agenda item relative to all the other numbers. If it's higher in that area, it's going to have the same emphasis to the school within the context of that 100 percent. I agree with you, the more points you put in there, the relative importance increases and it gives them some options. I'm fine.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So we're not at 140 anymore.

MS. BOAST: We're at 100 on both.

So thank you. We actually accomplished the goals for today that -- what I will do is send an updated table with the tier based on these weights, so that you can see that. And then, of course, this is just the draft framework, which will get feedback.

So my question for you is, Patty, this may be a question for you. We had on the agenda -- it's 3:00. We are a little behind. That took a long amount of time. One other topic was starting to discuss a timeline for implementing. Is that something you want to take the next half hour for?

Is that a topic for tomorrow?
COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Yes, yes. A lot of the states are getting tuned into this whole idea of starting to prepare young men and women in middle school so that by the eighth and ninth grade they're choosing their path. And it has worked out very, very well in some states where graduations rates have now skyrocketed because these students understand that school matters in terms of their future, and I think that we have to do that at some point.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think that's statewide. I don't disagree with you. I think it's a real state -- sort of, like, should we have early childhood education, even though all the data shows that it works and we don't have it. So I would agree with you that opportunities to see careers and know about careers, and I think it's -- I don't think I could name 20 careers right now.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Can it be done within the charter schools? Can charter schools -- can we do stuff different than the public schools? And the answer is, to a large extent, we can.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Someone could have that as their mission.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: A charter school can do something different. We don't have the authority to require something different of the charters in the sense that we're going to create this whole completely different standard for college and-career-readiness assessment than the, quote, unquote, traditional public schools. But if the school wants to come to us and say, "Hey, I have got this bang-up idea about doing this for college and career readiness," they can take that on and then show it as a model to the rest of the schools.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And wouldn't that fall under the school-specific goals?

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: Yes, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: They could include that if that's their specific goals. When I was in sixth grade, I remember -- boy, it's a long time ago -- I had to write six -- pick six occupations and write at least one page on the occupation, what it was, and what I could possibly earn. It was sixth grade.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: That's different.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: And I picked a policeman, a doctor, a lawyer, a fireman, a builder -- which my father was -- and an accountant.

Well, guess what I am. I'm not really an accountant. I'm a finance, a numbers person. I don't have a degree in accounting. I do have a degree in economics and finance.

MS. BOAST: It worked.

COMMISSIONER ROBBINS: I kind of went in one direction. But without even thinking about that later on, I was kind of setting a course of where I was going without even realizing it.

COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think it would really be interesting to see a charter say, I want to do six, seven, and eight, and I'm going to concentrate on career readiness.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: If you look at PAPA, that's what they started with as a middle school, fine arts. Public Academy for Performing Arts.

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: The healths science that we closed, that was their goal, was to get kids on the path for -- and we've got a magnet school in Cruces that does health sciences.

MS. BOAST: Thank you so much. I won't see you in December. My colleague Tim will be there for the coalition meeting. But please feel free if something occurs to you tomorrow or next week about the waiting or the rollup or any questions, please.
COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: How is that working on the 8th and 9th? We are attending --

COMMISSIONER GIPSON: I'll do that tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: It's on your agenda.

MS. BOAST: Okay.

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