1	STATE OF FLORIDA
2	DEFACINENT OF EDUCATION
3	AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH
4	FLORIDA'S RACE TO THE TOP
5	STUDENT GROWTH IMPLEMENTATION
6	COMMITTEE MEETING
7	
8	University of Central Florida
9	Teaching Academy Building
10	Orlando, Florida
11	
12	Thursday, May 19, 2011
13	Volume 2
14	
15	
16	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION:
17	JUAN COPA, Director, Research & Analysis
18	AIR MEMBERS PRESENT:
19	HAROLD DORAN, Ed.D., AIR, Principal Research Scientist CHRISTY HOVANETZ
20	MARY ANN LEMKE
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

	200		202
1	(Whereupon, this is an uninterrupted	1	that difference can be expressed in terms of
2	continuation from Volume 1, to-wit: )	2	differences relative to a standard expected
3	* * * * *	3	student growth. We're comparing the bar to what
4	MR. FOERSTER: I'm hoping I can walk	4	the expected growth would be statewide using the
5	through a couple of assumptions to make sure I	5	aggression analysis and let's say a school
6	understand this right. The variance that you're	6	effect is minus 5 and we've got another school
7	showing for school effect in the bar graph that	7	that's plus 5. Well, when we go to recalculate
8	was up there before. I think the argument was	8	the teacher effect then if I'm understanding
à	that there is significant variance and we should	å	this right we're moving the har now Instead
10	contemplate what that means Is that right?	10	of calculating teacher effect relative to the
10	DP DOPAN: That's exactly right that	10	student level expectation that has been fine
11	there are their schools seem to differ and it	12	statewide, we're doing it relative to the school
12	there are then schools seen to differ and it	12	
13	whather or not you include school effects in	13	DR DORANI. That's exactly right You're
14	whether of hot you include school effects is	14	doing rolative to how that school deviates from
15	MD EOEDSTED: I want to talk through that	15	that line
10	MR. FOERSTER. I want to tak through that	10	MD EOEDSTED, Dight So when we do that
17	for a minute. So if all schools have the same	17	MR. FOERSTER: Right. So when we do that,
18	average teacher enect, that variance would be	18	there are a couple of 1 think things that happen
19	Zero; is that right?	19	consequentially that may or may not be
20	DR. DURAN: If all schools have the same	20	significant. One of them is the variance and
21	average teacher effect, that variance would be	21	teacher effect get smaller. That makes sense
22	Zero?	22	because you're comparing it to an average that
23	MR. FOERSTER: I mean, essentially by	23	you ve already calculated to be a function of
24	snowing that we have variance in the school	24	that school. So the teacher effect variance
25	enect, are we not just saying that some schools	25	decreases as a consequence of calculating it
	American Court Reporting		
	850.421.0058		000.421.0000
	201		203
	201		203
1	201 are better than other schools.	1	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me
1 2	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let	1 2	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm
1 2 3	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you	1 2 3	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument
1 2 3 4	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see	1 2 3 4	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right.
1 2 3 4 5	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that	1 2 3 4 5	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is
1 2 3 4 5 6	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other.	1 2 3 4 5 6	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth. MP. FOERSTER: Okay, so that there is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always have a negative teacher offect
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, so that there is variance indicates that schools vary from one	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 920	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always have a negative teacher effect. DR. DORAN: Relative to the school average
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 24	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, so that there is variance indicates that schools vary from one another: that's the conclusion?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 24	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always have a negative teacher effect. DR. DORAN: Relative to the school average.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, so that there is variance indicates that schools vary from one another; that's the conclusion?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always have a negative teacher effect. DR. DORAN: Relative to the school average. MR. FOERSTER: Wow. I mean, what that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, so that there is variance indicates that schools vary from one another; that's the conclusion? DR. DORAN: That's right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. If we acknowledge	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always have a negative teacher effect. DR. DORAN: Relative to the school average. MR. FOERSTER: Wow. I mean, what that means is you could have a school whose tide is riging_right2. You've got a principal that's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 24	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, so that there is variance indicates that schools vary from one another; that's the conclusion? DR. DORAN: That's right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. If we acknowledge that our schools vary from one another and that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always have a negative teacher effect. DR. DORAN: Relative to the school average. MR. FOERSTER: Wow. I mean, what that means is you could have a school whose tide is rising, right? You've got a principal that's working like crazy. you've got teachers that are
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, so that there is variance indicates that schools vary from one another; that's the conclusion? DR. DORAN: That's right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. If we acknowledge that our schools vary from one another, and that variance can be I'm using the word "variance"	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always have a negative teacher effect. DR. DORAN: Relative to the school average. MR. FOERSTER: Wow. I mean, what that means is you could have a school whose tide is rising, right? You've got a principal that's working like crazy, you've got teachers that are on hoard, they're moving that average up, the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 3 4 5 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, so that there is variance indicates that schools vary from one another; that's the conclusion? DR. DORAN: That's right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. If we acknowledge that our schools vary from one another, and that variance can be I'm using the word "variance" American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always have a negative teacher effect. DR. DORAN: Relative to the school average. MR. FOERSTER: Wow. I mean, what that means is you could have a school whose tide is rising, right? You've got a principal that's working like crazy, you've got teachers that are on board, they're moving that average up, the American Court Beporting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	201 are better than other schools. DR. DORAN: What we're saying here let me answer your question this way. That what you just said is right. The fact that we see variability in the school effects means that schools differ from each other. MR. FOERSTER: In terms of average teacher effect? DR. DORAN: In terms of average school effects, the kids MR. FOERSTER: Okay, average student growth? DR. DORAN: Yes, average student growth. MR. FOERSTER: And there are differences from school to school? DR. DORAN: In terms of one way to phrase it would be schools differ in terms of their ability to impact student growth. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, so that there is variance indicates that schools vary from one another; that's the conclusion? DR. DORAN: That's right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. If we acknowledge that our schools vary from one another, and that variance can be I'm using the word "variance" American Court Reporting 850 421 0058	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	203 relative to the school average doesn't to me seem surprising or even really meaningful. I'm making this argument DR. DORAN: You're right. DR. COHEN: Your argument so forth is exactly right. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So if that's the case then you said something sort of in a drive-by that made me go uh. You've had the school, you've now taken the bar from something that's calculated statewide to something that is very specific to the school; that's our standard of comparison. And by definition now, teacher effects if we completely attribute school effect to school and the residual then to the teacher, half the teachers in that school will always have a positive teacher effect and half the teachers in that school will always have a negative teacher effect. DR. DORAN: Relative to the school average. MR. FOERSTER: Wow. I mean, what that means is you could have a school whose tide is rising, right? You've got a principal that's working like crazy, you've got teachers that are on board, they're moving that average up, the American Court Reporting 850 421 0058

	204		206
1	school is performing better than it ever has;	1	itself.
2	but because we have completely apportioned	2	MR. FOERSTER: Right.
3	school effect and teacher effect, half the	3	MS. BROWN: So the final teacher score is
4	teachers in that school by definition always	4	really the teacher's score, but we're saving
5	will have a negative effect.	5	there's a portion of that that might need to be
6	DR DORAN: Now remember you still have	6	attributed to the school because the way you
7	to go under the classifications Let's suppose	7	said it made almost sound like okay, we're no
2 2	that there is a school or a group of schools who	, 8	longer using any standard. It's all based on
0	are doing school offects particularly high. And	0	the school and everybody will be here or here
9 10	are using school effects particularly high. And	3	has a the school and that's not necessarily
10	you're right, the teachers are going to be	10	based on the school and that's not necessarily
11	centered around that school effect. Depending	11	true. There's still going to be your individual
12	on now you define your classification rules for	12	teacher effect and a portion of the school is in
13	teachers, we're not necessarily saying that for	13	there.
14	any school half of the teachers in that school	14	DR. COHEN: You have it exactly right.
15	are going to have low value-added and half are	15	Part of the problem is the language that we're
16	going to be bad. That's not what we're saying.	16	using. Let's for a minute not talk about
17	What we're saying is the teacher effects will be	17	effects. Let's say we have this bar
18	centered on that school effect.	18	represents the common component of student
19	The classification rules that we have to	19	learning and this affects the unique teacher
20	come up with later are what are used to set	20	component of student learning. If we estimate
21	where that bar is in order to say whether a	21	them both together, we can say how much of that
22	teacher is good or bad. So you could come up	22	common component is due to teachers and so we
23	with classification rules where there are some	23	can add it back in. If we would just take the
24	teachers who are lower relative to the school	24	unique teacher component of student learning
25	effect, but given your rules for classified	25	then, Sam, you're exactly right; the average
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	205		207
1	205 teachers may still have high value added.  This	1	207 would be average in every school whether the
1 2	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to	1 2	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above
1 2 3	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate.	1 2 3	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average.
1 2 3 4	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the	1 2 3 4	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at
1 2 3 4 5	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think	1 2 3 4 5	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the
1 2 3 4 5 6	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school	1 2 3 4 5 6	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 6 17 18	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's effect rests solely on the school effect it's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component. MR. LETELLIER: You know, we've spent a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's effect rests solely on the school effect, it's that the school effect becomes a portion of that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 920	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component. MR. LeTELLIER: You know, we've spent a long time just on this and from what I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's effect rests solely on the school effect, it's that the school effect becomes a portion of that teacher effect calculation because if we chose	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 17 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 11 11	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component. MR. LETELLIER: You know, we've spent a long time just on this and from what I understand and just listening and what I'm
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's effect rests solely on the school effect, it's that the school effect becomes a portion of that teacher effect calculation because if we chose to use the school effect we're saving there are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component. MR. LeTELLIER: You know, we've spent a long time just on this and from what I understand and just listening and what I'm thinking myself, that's hard to grasp. Here's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's effect rests solely on the school effect, it's that the school effect becomes a portion of that teacher effect calculation because if we chose to use the school effect we're saying there are things within the school that attribute to that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 22 23	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component. MR. LeTELLIER: You know, we've spent a long time just on this and from what I understand and just listening and what I'm thinking myself, that's hard to grasp. Here's the scenario and I think this would wrap it up
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's effect rests solely on the school effect, it's that the school effect becomes a portion of that teacher effect calculation because if we chose to use the school effect we're saying there are things within the school that attribute to that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component. MR. LeTELLIER: You know, we've spent a long time just on this and from what I understand and just listening and what I'm thinking myself, that's hard to grasp. Here's the scenario and I think this would wrap it up. If I'm working just as hard at one school
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 55 56 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's effect rests solely on the school effect, it's that the school effect becomes a portion of that teacher effect calculation because if we chose to use the school effect we're saying there are things within the school that attribute to that student's learning. Therefore, a portion of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component. MR. LeTELLIER: You know, we've spent a long time just on this and from what I understand and just listening and what I'm thinking myself, that's hard to grasp. Here's the scenario and I think this would wrap it up. If I'm working just as hard at one school
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's effect rests solely on the school effect, it's that the school effect becomes a portion of that teacher effect calculation because if we chose to use the school effect we're saying there are things within the school that attribute to that student's learning. Therefore, a portion of that student's growth is related to the school	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component. MR. LETELLIER: You know, we've spent a long time just on this and from what I understand and just listening and what I'm thinking myself, that's hard to grasp. Here's the scenario and I think this would wrap it up. If I'm working just as hard at one school and just as hard at another school, could the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	205 teachers may still have high value added. This is a complicated process where we still have to navigate. MR. FOERSTER: But in so doing with the classification rule, to borrow the term I think you've used, you've un-spooled the school effect, unwound it. I mean, you've gone right back to, okay, well, then that teacher effect is actually in terms of student growth accomplished by this teacher would be this number and that's what we want to look at. MS. BROWN: But let me clarify because now I'm getting a little confused and I want to make sure I'm right. The final teacher effect is a combination of the student residuals attached to that teacher and whatever proportion of school effect if we decided to include it come in there. So it's not that the final teacher's effect rests solely on the school effect, it's that the school effect becomes a portion of that teacher effect calculation because if we chose to use the school effect we're saying there are things within the school that attribute to that student's learning. Therefore, a portion of that student's growth is related to the school American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 21 22 23 24 25	207 would be average in every school whether the teachers in that school or average, above average, or below; the average would be average. So this common component should probably at least partially or maybe fully attributed to the teachers in the school to move them. So it's kind of a sliding scale. You can take some or all of the common component, plus all the teacher component and use that to calculate your teacher effect. Then when we think about it that way, I think it becomes MS. BROWN: My teacher effect based on students' growth that are attributed to me and a little bit partially based on the overall scale that also helped contribute to my DR. COHEN: Yeah, yeah, as a teacher me and my colleagues are contributing to this common component. MR. LETELLIER: You know, we've spent a long time just on this and from what I understand and just listening and what I'm thinking myself, that's hard to grasp. Here's the scenario and I think this would wrap it up. If I'm working just as hard at one school and just as hard at another school, could the American Court Reporting

	208		210
1	school effect actually make it so that I would	1	give you two examples of world views, two
2	not have as high a value-added model at one	2	different belief systems. Suppose I believe
3	school versus another even though I was working	3	that school leadership is of primary importance.
4	iust as hard at each school?	4	So anything that any of that component is due
5	DR. COHEN: That is exactly the question	5	entirely to the principal, all right. Then
6	that you want answered, and the answer to that	6	under that situation and let's say you go
7	is that it depends on what you believe moves	7	from a school with a great principal to a school
8	student achievement That's not something we	8	with a lousy principal right? Under that
a	can give you a statistical answer for . It	q	scenario if the whole common component is due
10	depends this is really if I knew what	10	to the principal then you want to completely
11	caused student achievement I'd write a book and	11	separate the unique teacher contribution from
12	retire and all that	12	the common component, and that's a situation
12	MP_LoTELLIEP: Okay but with what you	12	under which you doing the same thing with the
13	have with these models, as you increase the	13	came group of kids is going to get you the same
14	school offect you decrossed to use a word you	14	value added score. That's one world view that
15	used before in another graph the spread of the	15	the school leadership is causing that common
10	used before in another graph the spread of the	10	
17		17	component.
10	ds, correct?	18	All right. Now let's go to a completely
19	DR. COHEN: Well, you go Dack to the out	19	unreferit world view, and my apologies to any
20	anguage. No, as i recognize the common	20	desen't matter at all. Suppose that the only
21	component within school of student learning, I	21	thing that affects student learning is teachers
22	acknowledge that there is less of a unique	22	thing that affects student learning is teachers,
23	teacher component to it. However that common	23	right, and maybe some principals are better at
24	the decision thatit's going to depend on	24	selecting teachers. Maybe some schools are
25	American Court Departing	25	American Court Departing
	850.421.0058		030.421.0038
	200		011
4	209	4	211
1	209 what we believe to be true.	1	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers
1 2	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same togshor goes	1 2 3	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if
1 2 3	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out	1 2 3	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy
1 2 3 4	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out	1 2 3 4	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues right and I'm there so the common
1 2 3 4 5 6	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B: they	1 2 3 4 5	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to as all right. For the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS_BROWN: Only if they have the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average: and then I go to a school I'm sorry
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things_like increased levels of parent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement highly involved PTA Lawrence's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MB. LETELLIER: Yeah. I'm saving doing what	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school materials etc. those are things we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, I'm saying doing what you need to be doing as a teacher and what we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school, materials, etc., those are things we can't measure. But let's just say that's part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, I'm saying doing what you need to be doing as a teacher and what we're basing this on is we're saying take the kids	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school, materials, etc., those are things we can't measure. But let's just say that's part of if someone believes that that's part of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, I'm saying doing what you need to be doing as a teacher and what we're basing this on is we're saying take the kids that are all scoring 96's. we'll just say 96 out	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school, materials, etc., those are things we can't measure. But let's just say that's part of if someone believes that that's part of that common component, so then what we're saving
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, I'm saying doing what you need to be doing as a teacher and what we're basing this on is we're saying take the kids that are all scoring 96's, we'll just say 96 out of 100. Once you get up to that point, it's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school, materials, etc., those are things we can't measure. But let's just say that's part of if someone believes that that's part of that common component, so then what we're saying is that same teacher, similar effort, but if we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, I'm saying doing what you need to be doing as a teacher and what we're basing this on is we're saying take the kids that are all scoring 96's, we'll just say 96 out of 100. Once you get up to that point, it's yery hard to move a kid. So that's obviously a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 9 20 21 22	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school, materials, etc., those are things we can't measure. But let's just say that's part of if someone believes that that's part of that common component, so then what we're saying is that same teacher, similar effort, but if we say that common component makes a difference
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, I'm saying doing what you need to be doing as a teacher and what we're basing this on is we're saying take the kids that are all scoring 96's, we'll just say 96 out of 100. Once you get up to that point, it's very hard to move a kid. So that's obviously a student teacher level.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school, materials, etc., those are things we can't measure. But let's just say that's part of if someone believes that that's part of that common component, so then what we're saying is that same teacher, similar effort, but if we say that common component makes a difference then that common component needs to be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, I'm saying doing what you need to be doing as a teacher and what we're basing this on is we're saying take the kids that are all scoring 96's, we'll just say 96 out of 100. Once you get up to that point, it's very hard to move a kid. So that's obviously a student teacher level. DR. COHEN: I understand what you're saving	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school, materials, etc., those are things we can't measure. But let's just say that's part of if someone believes that that's part of that common component, so then what we're saying is that same teacher, similar effort, but if we say that common component makes a difference then that common component needs to be considered.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, I'm saying doing what you need to be doing as a teacher and what we're basing this on is we're saying take the kids that are all scoring 96's, we'll just say 96 out of 100. Once you get up to that point, it's very hard to move a kid. So that's obviously a student teacher level. DR. COHEN: I understand what you're saying and I understand your frustration. So let me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 6 7 8 9 20 21 22 3 24 25	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school, materials, etc., those are things we can't measure. But let's just say that's part of if someone believes that that's part of that common component, so then what we're saying is that same teacher, similar effort, but if we say that common component makes a difference then that common component needs to be considered. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	209 what we believe to be true. MR. LeTELLIER: So does that consequently from school A to school B, same teacher goes from the same school, if this was working out totally equally, that same teacher that was working hard in school A goes to school B; they should get the same value-added model effect, but MS. BROWN: Only if they have the same population of students and the same demographic and MS. EDGECOMB: That's the key. PANEL MEMBER: Right. MS. BROWN: Because working hard is relative to your belief system of level of effort and MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, I'm saying doing what you need to be doing as a teacher and what we're basing this on is we're saying take the kids that are all scoring 96's, we'll just say 96 out of 100. Once you get up to that point, it's very hard to move a kid. So that's obviously a student teacher level. DR. COHEN: I understand what you're saying and I understand your frustration. So let me American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	211 whatever reason you have some better teachers concentrated in some schools. In that world, if I go from a school with let me try to get this right. I've got a school with lousy colleagues, right, and I'm there so the common component is going to all right. For the common component, it would be a low score but I'm a great teacher and I come out about average; and then I go to a school I'm sorry, I confused myself. MS. BROWN: What if you take a totally different view and what if you say that you believe that the common pieces are a combination of things, like increased levels of parent involvement, highly involved PTA. Lawrence's point last time, level of resources available in the school, materials, etc., those are things we can't measure. But let's just say that's part of if someone believes that that's part of that common component, so then what we're saying is that same teacher, similar effort, but if we say that common component makes a difference then that common component needs to be considered. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) American Court Reporting

	212		214
1	MS. BOURN: (Inaudible) outside the	1	just not going to make it with this one. So I
2	teacher's control.	2	have a choice either to keep the one that I
3	DR. HOVANET7: I think this is.	3	did there with minimal results or since I know
4	Where you're trying to go you lost the	4	that my kids need more become even more
5	train of thought here, but same exact teacher	5	effective work even harder
6	hypothetically duplicated in two different	6	Does that have any impact on the scores?
7	schools one with the high school effect and one	7	DR COHEN: It doesn't measure equitably
8	with a low school effect, what's the implication	8	and as Harold likes to point out sometimes some
9	on that value-added score?	9	teachers do have harder jobs than others. To
10	MS BROWN: Ves	10	aet the same result they've got to work harder
11	MD ECEDSTED Vec	11	MS GINN: Well that's my question to the
12	DR COHEN: So if there are school level	12	principals too that have been do you see
12	things that are causing the common component	12	that? Do teachers have to not just speaking
13	then you need to differentiate it and attribute	14	for myself do teachers need to at this
14	it zero to the topchers and that's how you'll	14	school school M a high lovel of gifted
10	act equal if there are no school lovel things	10	children; so I may be offective but it will be
10	get equal, if there are no school level things	10	implicated by my population. Over here I'm
17	component really only reflects the average of	17	already a real good toacher, but over here I've
10	the teachers in the school then the way you get	10	and a hunch of sweet hears if you will that I'm
19	your fair score is to apply the entire common	19	got a build of sweat hogs if you will that I in
20	component to each individual teacher. You go to	20	BANEL MEMBER: You don't need to
21	and of these models instead of one of these	21	PANEL MEMBER: Wait a minuto
22	MS_REQUIN: But you're still not	22	MS GINN: and this is said
23	PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking)	23	affectionately, then I'm going to have to do
24	DR COHEN: Hold on The answer is it	24	something extra but now I don't then that means
23	American Court Reporting	23	American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	213		215
	depends There are two different scenarios. If	4	itie the tession offerst weave them shudents
1			It's the teacher effect more than students.
1 2	there are independent factors that influence the	2	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to
1 2 3	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal	2	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in
1 2 3 4	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this	2 3 4	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory
1 2 3 4 5	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component	2 3 4 5	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how
1 2 3 4 5 6	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in	2 3 4 5 6	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within	2 3 4 5 6 7	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted. DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted. DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school effects only reflect the average of the teachers
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted. DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school effects only reflect the average of the teachers at the school, the average teacher okay?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted. DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school effects only reflect the average of the teachers at the school, the average teacher okay? MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to</li> <li>something real quickly. We're delving in</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory</li> <li>about how</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all</li> <li>right.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My</li> <li>world view is school effects we don't believe</li> <li>that school effect is impacted.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school</li> <li>effects only reflect the average of the teachers</li> <li>at the school, the average teacher okay?</li> <li>MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can hear you? Thank you so much.</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to</li> <li>something real quickly. We're delving in</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory</li> <li>about how</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all</li> <li>right.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back</li> <li>to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My</li> <li>world view is school effects we don't believe</li> <li>that school effect is impacted.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school</li> <li>effects only reflect the average of the teachers</li> <li>at the school, the average teacher okay?</li> <li>MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can</li> <li>hear you? Thank you so much.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all you guys that are principals, let's take a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted. DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school effects only reflect the average of the teachers at the school, the average teacher okay? MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can hear you? Thank you so much. DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about that could be don't yell at me if I get it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all you guys that are principals, let's take a teacher. I'm in a school where I'm teaching	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted. DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school effects only reflect the average of the teachers at the school, the average teacher okay? MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can hear you? Thank you so much. DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about that could be don't yell at me if I get it wrong all the student learning that occurs in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all you guys that are principals, let's take a teacher. I'm in a school where I'm teaching gifted kids. I'm telling you my scores are way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to</li> <li>something real quickly. We're delving in</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory</li> <li>about how</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all</li> <li>right.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back</li> <li>to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My</li> <li>world view is school effects we don't believe</li> <li>that school effect is impacted.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school</li> <li>effects only reflect the average of the teachers</li> <li>at the school, the average teacher okay?</li> <li>MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can</li> <li>hear you? Thank you so much.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about</li> <li>that could be don't yell at me if I get it</li> <li>wrong all the student learning that occurs in</li> <li>that school is the result only of the efforts of</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all you guys that are principals, let's take a teacher. I'm in a school where I'm teaching gifted kids. I'm telling you my scores are way up there; it's easy for me because the kids are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted. DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school effects only reflect the average of the teachers at the school, the average teacher okay? MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can hear you? Thank you so much. DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about that could be don't yell at me if I get it wrong all the student learning that occurs in that school is the result only of the efforts of all of the teachers in the school. That's one.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all you guys that are principals, let's take a teacher. I'm in a school where I'm teaching gifted kids. I'm telling you my scores are way up there; it's easy for me because the kids are already there. If I move to a school wherein	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted. DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school effects only reflect the average of the teachers at the school, the average teacher okay? MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can hear you? Thank you so much. DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about that could be don't yell at me if I get it wrong all the student learning that occurs in that school is the result only of the efforts of all of the teachers in the school. That's one. So what we want to know is do you believe that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all you guys that are principals, let's take a teacher. I'm in a school where I'm teaching gifted kids. I'm telling you my scores are way up there; it's easy for me because the kids are already there. If I move to a school wherein let's say the school effect is little to none,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to</li> <li>something real quickly. We're delving in</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory</li> <li>about how</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all</li> <li>right.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My</li> <li>world view is school effects we don't believe</li> <li>that school effect is impacted.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school</li> <li>effects only reflect the average of the teachers</li> <li>at the school, the average teacher okay?</li> <li>MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can</li> <li>hear you? Thank you so much.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about</li> <li>that could be don't yell at me if I get it</li> <li>wrong all the student learning that occurs in</li> <li>that school is the result only of the efforts of</li> <li>all of the teachers in the school. That's one.</li> <li>So what we want to know is do you believe that</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all you guys that are principals, let's take a teacher. I'm in a school where I'm teaching gifted kids. I'm telling you my scores are way up there; it's easy for me because the kids are already there. If I move to a school wherein let's say the school effect is little to none, but now I'm moving to a school wherein I have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to</li> <li>something real quickly. We're delving in</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory</li> <li>about how</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all</li> <li>right.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My</li> <li>world view is school effects we don't believe</li> <li>that school effect is impacted.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school</li> <li>effects only reflect the average of the teachers</li> <li>at the school, the average teacher okay?</li> <li>MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can</li> <li>hear you? Thank you so much.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about</li> <li>that could be don't yell at me if I get it</li> <li>wrong all the student learning that occurs in</li> <li>that school is the result only of the efforts of</li> <li>all of the teachers in the school. That's one.</li> <li>So what we want to know is do you believe that</li> <li>or we believe that</li> <li>PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all you guys that are principals, let's take a teacher. I'm in a school where I'm teaching gifted kids. I'm telling you my scores are way up there; it's easy for me because the kids are already there. If I move to a school wherein let's say the school effect is little to none, but now I'm moving to a school wherein I have a group of kids that what I did in that school is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right. DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted. DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school effects only reflect the average of the teachers at the school, the average teacher okay? MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can hear you? Thank you so much. DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about that could be don't yell at me if I get it wrong all the student learning that occurs in that school is the result only of the efforts of all of the teachers in the school. That's one. So what we want to know is do you believe that or we believe that PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Okay, okay.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	there are independent factors that influence the common component of the schools, then equal effort will get you an equal score under this model attributing zero of the common component to you. If there are no independent factors in the world causing the common component within the school then you're better off not attributing any of then you're better off attributing all the common component to each teacher. So it depends on what you believe. I can't tell you you'll get the right answer if you use this model because it depends on how the world really works. Arlene? MS. GINN: My question really, this is just for me and it may be that the gentleman and all you guys that are principals, let's take a teacher. I'm in a school where I'm teaching gifted kids. I'm telling you my scores are way up there; it's easy for me because the kids are already there. If I move to a school wherein let's say the school effect is little to none, but now I'm moving to a school wherein I have a group of kids that what I did in that school is American Court Reporting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	<ul> <li>It's the teacher effect more than students.</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Let me try to get us back to something real quickly. We're delving in</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Can I we we have a theory about how</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Okay, okay, all right, all right.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: So hand the microphone back to Jon. This is going to be a staged thing. My world view is school effects we don't believe that school effect is impacted.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: So in your real world, school effects only reflect the average of the teachers at the school, the average teacher okay?</li> <li>MS. GINN: Would you please stand so we can hear you? Thank you so much.</li> <li>DR. HOVANETZ: Another way to think about that could be don't yell at me if I get it wrong all the student learning that occurs in that school is the result only of the efforts of all of the teachers in the school. That's one.</li> <li>So what we want to know is do you believe that or we believe that PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)</li> <li>DR. COHEN: Okay, okay.</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> </ul>

	216		218
1	All right. There's only one fair thing to	1	teacher who believes that there are a lot of
2	do and that is attribute all the common effects	2	forces out there including principals and
3	to each teacher.	3	families and everything else that cause school
4	DR. HOVANETZ: It's Jon's guestion and I'm	4	effects.
5	trying to rectify this, too, but we keep talking	5	Christy, you believe you live in a world
6	around this issue and it won't give us the	6	where the only thing that affects student
7	actual implication of if my world view is that	7	learning is you and your colleagues. Okay.
8	all of the teachers everything that happens	8	And John, you want to know for Christy and
9	in the school is an aggregate effect of what the	9	Mary Ann which model would cause them to have
10	teachers are doing, and Jon is one school that's	10	the same individual rating, the same individual
11	got high effects, one school that's got low	11	ranking, whether regardless of what school
12	effects. What is the implication for that	12	they're at; is that right?
13	teacher's effect? That's my world view.	13	DR. HOVANETZ: Under my world view, what do
14	DR. DORAN: We're getting lost in a couple	14	I look at? A high performing school or a low
15	of things. Let me try and bring us back to	15	performing school? In Mary Ann's world view,
16	something. We're delving into hypotheticals of	16	what does she look like in a high performing
17	what would happen if this happened and this	17	versus a low performing school?
18	happened, and this is going to be a conversation	18	MS. BROWN: What would be the range of
19	that's going to be circular, and it's going to	19	teacher effects within each world view?
20	be very difficult to move beyond this.	20	DR. COHEN: Okay. Christy, you're the only
21	Let me try and answer the question. I	21	thing that matters. If you wind up in a school
22	actually did answer this a little bit earlier.	22	surrounded by well, there's another dimension
23	Let me try and state this a little bit	23	here. The dimension is model, right? So under
24	differently to try and move this forward.	24	which model, right? So let's say we attribute
25	If you're in school A, in order to be	25	the common component to the school, right? We
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	217		210
	211		215
1	and school effects are included or school	1	contribute 100% of the common component to the
1 2	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in	1 2	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to
1 2 3	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added	1 2 3	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is
1 2 3 4	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires	1 2 3 4	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school.
1 2 3 4 5	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B	1 2 3 4 5	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions	1 2 3 4 5 6	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school;
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a loval of abstraction that's really.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while Like the question	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher the common component is entirely.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher: that's where she gets
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 112 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 112 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 112 3 112 112 112 112 112 112 112 112 1	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and that is what she believes about the world is in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular. We can explore various consequences of the if's and and's, but let me bring us back to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and that is what she believes about the world is in exactly the opposite situation. This will give
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular. We can explore various consequences of the if's and and's, but let me bring us back to where we need to be in terms of the policy. Do	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and that is what she believes about the world is in exactly the opposite situation. This will give her a biased effect because as she finds herself
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular. We can explore various consequences of the if's and and's, but let me bring us back to where we need to be in terms of the policy. Do schools matter?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and that is what she believes about the world is in exactly the opposite situation. This will give her a biased effect because as she finds herself in a school with a rotten principal that's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular. We can explore various consequences of the if's and and's, but let me bring us back to where we need to be in terms of the policy. Do schools matter? DR. COHEN: Harold, I think you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and that is what she believes about the world is in exactly the opposite situation. This will give her a biased effect because as she finds herself in a school with a rotten principal that's driving learning down, her score is going to be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular. We can explore various consequences of the if's and and's, but let me bring us back to where we need to be in terms of the policy. Do schools matter? DR. COHEN: Harold, I think you over-stepped it. I think actually, let me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and that is what she believes about the world is in exactly the opposite situation. This will give her a biased effect because as she finds herself in a school with a rotten principal that's driving learning down, her score is going to be driven down whereas over here it gets subtracted
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular. We can explore various consequences of the if's and and's, but let me bring us back to where we need to be in terms of the policy. Do schools matter? DR. COHEN: Harold, I think you over-stepped it. I think actually, let me try to hijack your example, okay? You two are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and that is what she believes about the world is in exactly the opposite situation. This will give her a biased effect because as she finds herself in a school with a rotten principal that's driving learning down, her score is going to be driven down whereas over here it gets subtracted off. So it really is a choice between world
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 9 20 21 22 3 24 25	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular. We can explore various consequences of the if's and and's, but let me bring us back to where we need to be in terms of the policy. Do schools matter? DR. COHEN: Harold, I think you over-stepped it. I think actually, let me try to hijack your example, okay? You two are teachers; please stand up, Mary Ann. You are a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and that is what she believes about the world is in exactly the opposite situation. This will give her a biased effect because as she finds herself in a school with a rotten principal that's driving learning down, her score is going to be driven down whereas over here it gets subtracted off. So it really is a choice between world views, but they're dichotomous. It's a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 24 25	and school effects are included or school effects are not included what you do in school A in order to have a high value-added effect will be different than what it requires to have a high value-added effect in school B with or without school effects. Conditions change, teaching conditions change, student populations change. When we use terms like if I do the same thing here that I did here, it's kind of a level of abstraction that's really hard for us to attach real meaning to and give you an answer to. So while I like the question and I want to be able to give you an answer, it's only we've spent the last hour on this question and we're going to continue to spend the next hour on this question because it is circular. We can explore various consequences of the if's and and's, but let me bring us back to where we need to be in terms of the policy. Do schools matter? DR. COHEN: Harold, I think you over-stepped it. I think actually, let me try to hijack your example, okay? You two are teachers; please stand up, Mary Ann. You are a American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	contribute 100% of the common component to the school leadership; we're not attributing any to the teacher. You find yourself so this is this model attributing everything to the school. The only thing that matters is this teacher. You find yourself in a high achieving school; we're going to under-rate you. We assume you're both great teachers. We're going to under-rate you. You're going to get a lower rating than if you were in a low achieving school, right? Now Mary Ann, you get exactly the opposite answer. So Christy would prefer to be here where all effects are attributed all and only to the teacher, the common component is entirely attributed to the teacher; that's where she gets the same rating at either one of those schools. Mary Ann differs in only one respect and that is what she believes about the world is in exactly the opposite situation. This will give her a biased effect because as she finds herself in a school with a rotten principal that's driving learning down, her score is going to be driven down whereas over here it gets subtracted off. So it really is a choice between world views, but they're dichotomous. It's a American Court Reporting

	220		222
1	continuum. You can choose anywhere in between	1	long time.
2	the two of them.	2	MS. KRISHNAIYER: I just want to say one
3	MS. NOYA: At this point, I'm going around	3	thing. I think apart from the confusion, I
4	in circles. Maybe I'm incorrect but this is	4	think we need a level of comfort that it's going
5	what I want to say. Having done this for so	5	to be fair, what we're doing, the school
6	many years of my lifetime. I know principals'	6	effects lon said if you go to a low performing
7	evaluations and administrators are also going to	7	school and your teacher is graded higher your
8	he revamped by districts or whatever: teachers'	8	teacher effect We're looking for something
à	evaluations are being revembed as well	å	that will equalize it: I mean I'm not using the
10	I don't believe that anything is just	10	right words, but for me in my mind I need a
11	without school effects. It does impact it from	11	level of comfort that we're being fair to
12	the top down, bettom up; I don't care how you	12	teachers in both kinds of schools, and
12	nut it I've been in low performing schools	12	DP COHEN: Nothing's going to be perfect
13	I've been in high performing schools. Who you	14	but we don't want to drive away all the teachers
45	are still will be there of course. Leadership	14	from high performing schools, either
15	makes a difference. I truly believe to support	15	MS_KDISHNAIVED, And what can hole us make
10	the percents and everything else. But I guess at	10	MS. KRISHNAITER. And what can help us make
17	the parents and everything else. But I guess at	17	that a little more level playing field.
18	this point everybody's going to have to pitch in	18	DR. COHEN: Christy said you can provide
19	decinistratory of the second sec	19	Some data for that?
20	administrators' evaluations are being revamped	20	DR. HOVANEIZ: On, I can't do that but
21	and is going to affect them as well.	21	
22	So, you know, it's just the luck of the	22	MR. FOERSTER: I'm not so sure we need data
23	draw. We've been doing this for 38 years.	23	as much as hypothetical examples. I mean, just
24	I rying to make it perfect, it's not going to be	24	concrete, simple, here's what this would look
25	perfect and there's always going to be flaws.	25	like, and the thing that I ve noticed is missing
	650.421.0056		850.421.0058
4	ZZI But I think we've been going around in circles		in the conversation. I think is twing it back
1	But I think we've been going around in circles	1	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth
1 2 2	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward	1 2 2	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth.
1 2 3	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start	1 2 3	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right.
1 2 3 4	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too.	1 2 3 4	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around
1 2 3 4 5	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can	1 2 3 4 5	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will leak like	1 2 3 4 5 6	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it bac all
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 2	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals who are top performing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals run the schools. So it is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals who are top performing assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 10	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we should roll on? I mean, all of us have taken	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a certain amount of student growth, right? I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals who are top performing assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we should roll on? I mean, all of us have taken really big swings at this and I think we at	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a certain amount of student growth, right? I think that's what people are saying when they
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we should roll on? I mean, all of us have taken really big swings at this and I think we at least have consensus about what we're confused	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a certain amount of student growth, right? I think that's what people are saying when they say I work just as hard. I generate the same
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 20	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals who are top performing assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we should roll on? I mean, all of us have taken really big swings at this and I think we at least have consensus about what we're confused about. We have a lot of other stuff to go	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21	in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a certain amount of student growth, right? I think that's what people are saying when they say I work just as hard. I generate the same amount of growth. What does it imply if I have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we should roll on? I mean, all of us have taken really big swings at this and I think we at least have consensus about what we're confused about. We have a lot of other stuff to go through. Is it okay with everybody if we just	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a certain amount of student growth, right? I think that's what people are saying when they say I work just as hard. I generate the same amount of growth. What does it imply if I have a model that assumes everything is the teacher, and what does that imply if I have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals who are top performing assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we should roll on? I mean, all of us have taken really big swings at this and I think we at least have consensus about what we're confused about. We have a lot of other stuff to go through. Is it okay with everybody if we just keep moving? We'll come back to this; we have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a certain amount of student growth, right? I think that's what people are saying when they say I work just as hard. I generate the same amount of growth. What does it imply if I have a model that assumes everything is the teacher, and what does that imply if I assume that there
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals who are top performing assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we should roll on? I mean, all of us have taken really big swings at this and I think we at least have consensus about what we're confused about. We have a lot of other stuff to go through. Is it okay with everybody if we just keep moving? We'll come back to this; we have to.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 24 25	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a certain amount of student growth, right? I think that's what people are saying when they say I work just as hard. I generate the same amount of growth. What does it imply if I have a model that assumes everything is the teacher, and what does that imply if I assume that there is a school effect and a teacher effect?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals who are top performing assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we should roll on? I mean, all of us have taken really big swings at this and I think we at least have consensus about what we're confused about. We have a lot of other stuff to go through. Is it okay with everybody if we just keep moving? We'll come back to this; we have to. MS. GINN: She had her hand up for such a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a certain amount of student growth, right? I think that's what people are saying when they say I work just as hard. I generate the same amount of growth. What does it imply if I have a model that assumes everything is the teacher, and what does that imply if I assume that there is a school effect and a teacher effect? And I think where Anna was going I don't American Court Departing
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	But I think we've been going around in circles for an hour and have not been moving forward because the impacts we won't know until we start all this, too. DR. HOVANETZ: But you will know. We can model that. I mean, we can tell you what I the teacher will look like MS. NOYA: We need to see that. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. NOYA: You might have a poor principal, but then you have a great administrator who drives the school. Principals some principals don't run their schools, some assistant principals who are top performing assistant principals run the schools. So it is a lot of variables involved. MR. FOERSTER: Is it fair to say that we should roll on? I mean, all of us have taken really big swings at this and I think we at least have consensus about what we're confused about. We have a lot of other stuff to go through. Is it okay with everybody if we just keep moving? We'll come back to this; we have to. MS. GINN: She had her hand up for such a American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	223 in the conversation, I think, is tying it back to actual student growth. MS. NOYA: Right. MR. FOERSTER: I mean, we've tossed around a few different terms to describe that there's this common component, the teacher component, and there's a school effect and a teacher effect. What gets muddled, I think, is that actual student growth as measured from the progression line of expectation and it has all these variables built in you either believe it is all a consequence of the teacher or it is a combination, a vector sum, of the school and the teacher. Those are your two world views. What is confusing, I think, at this point is what that implies in a few different scenarios where you have a teacher that generates a certain amount of student growth, right? I think that's what people are saying when they say I work just as hard. I generate the same amount of growth. What does it imply if I have a model that assumes everything is the teacher, and what does that imply if I assume that there is a school effect and a teacher effect? And I think where Anna was going I don't American Court Reporting

	224		226
1	think that our points of view were in	1	MS. BROWN: We want to see examples on the
2	contradiction actually; I think assuming that	2	continuum so we can understand the continuum so
3	you can break out the school effect completely	3	we can decide whether we exclude this or go
4	such that you're net sum at any school is the	4	here.
5	school average and you've got half of your	5	DR. COHEN: No, I understand it but in
6	teachers with positive effects and half with	6	order to apportion it, you have to know what the
7	negative, I see that as enormously problematic.	7	two pieces you're apportioning are. So in order
8	On the other hand, I think ignoring that	8	you've got to estimate one of these models
9	there is a school effect is equally problematic.	9	MS. BROWN: Right.
10	So where we're going to end up is deciding how	10	DR. COHEN: and then figure out how to
11	we apportion the school effect, and before we	11	combine it.
12	can make a reasonable decision about how to do	12	MS. BROWN: We need examples that show the
13	that I think some hypotheticals would be	13	apportionment and no school effects, so that we
14	helpful.	14	can compare and see what would the implications
15	PANEL MEMBER: Yes.	15	be.
16	MS. BOURN: What does the same amount of	16	DR. HOVANETZ: Jon, why don't we when we
17	student growth look like as it's impacted by a	17	take a break at 4:00 the four of us, you, Mary
18	school effect in a high performing school and a	18	Ann, Harold, and I, sit down and propose
19	low performing school? And how does that affect	19	something for the committee to
20	my score?	20	MS. NOYA: Yeah.
21	MR. FOERSTER: Yes.	21	MR. FOERSTER: Try it.
22	MS. NOYA: Exactly.	22	DR. DORAN: Sam, I'm going to take your
23	MR. FOERSTER: So can we leave it that	23	advice and move to the next slide. We're going
24	we'll get some hypothetical examples and pick	24	to move to the next one called Model Parsimony.
25	that up tomorrow at some point when it's	25	Parsimony is another one of the criteria by
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
		1	
	225	_	227
1	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move	1	227 which we're going to evaluate the models.
1 2	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever.	1 2	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we
1 2 3	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want	1 2 3	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about
1 2 3 4	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and	1 2 3 4	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models?
1 2 3 4 5	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see	1 2 3 4 5	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without
1 2 3 4 5 6	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going	1 2 3 4 5 6	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportion aversion. So if there is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, wo're over here: we have the apportioning	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 20 of these
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that you've already decided that your world view is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those covariates.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that you've already decided that your world view is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those covariates. So essentially what we're looking at here is it the model only as complex as it needs to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that you've already decided that your world view is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 920	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those covariates. So essentially what we're looking at here is, is the model only as complex as it needs to be? Simple elegant accounting for things that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that you've already decided that your world view is  DR. COHEN: The world view is that it is part of this.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those covariates. So essentially what we're looking at here is, is the model only as complex as it needs to be? Simple, elegant, accounting for things that are important but not overly complicated to the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that you've already decided that your world view is  DR. COHEN: The world view is that it is part of this. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS_BROWN: Okay, bold up because I think	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those covariates. So essentially what we're looking at here is, is the model only as complex as it needs to be? Simple, elegant, accounting for things that are important but not overly complicated to the extent that it becomes difficult to explain
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that you've already decided that your world view is  DR. COHEN: The world view is that it is part of this. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. BROWN: Okay, hold up because I think what really he's saying is what you said last	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those covariates. So essentially what we're looking at here is, is the model only as complex as it needs to be? Simple, elegant, accounting for things that are important but not overly complicated to the extent that it becomes difficult to explain, less transparent and so forth right? That's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that you've already decided that your world view is  DR. COHEN: The world view is that it is part of this. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. BROWN: Okay, hold up because I think what really he's saying is what you said last was it's not dichotomous. It's a continuum	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those covariates. So essentially what we're looking at here is, is the model only as complex as it needs to be? Simple, elegant, accounting for things that are important but not overly complicated to the extent that it becomes difficult to explain, less transparent, and so forth, right? That's the question.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that you've already decided that your world view is  DR. COHEN: The world view is that it is part of this. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. BROWN: Okay, hold up because I think what really he's saying is what you said last was it's not dichotomous. It's a continuum. MS. NOYA: Right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those covariates. So essentially what we're looking at here is, is the model only as complex as it needs to be? Simple, elegant, accounting for things that are important but not overly complicated to the extent that it becomes difficult to explain, less transparent, and so forth, right? That's the question. Is there a statistic we can look at that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	225 appropriate, and then we can roll, we can move on to slide number whatever. DR. COHEN: Let me just point out, you want to know what the right apportion is and MR. FOERSTER: No, we would like to see examples. I think we all agree that it's going to have to be apportioned. What does that mean? DR. COHEN: Okay, that in and of itself is a huge amount of progress because if you estimate a model like Model 1, you don't know what the school effect is in order to apportion it. You have to estimate this model and then go to the apportioning exercise. So if there is consensus on that you could at least say, okay, we're over here; we have the apportioning. MS. FEILD: Well, then you're saying that you've already decided that your world view is  DR. COHEN: The world view is that it is part of this. PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MS. BROWN: Okay, hold up because I think what really he's saying is what you said last was it's not dichotomous. It's a continuum. MS. NOYA: Right. American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	227 which we're going to evaluate the models. Now, what is parsimony? What are we looking for here? What do we want to know about models? Does the model control variables without being overly complicated? We could take 30 covariates and dump all those covariates into the regression model, but do you need to? Does that buy you anything statistically in terms of doing a better job in estimating teacher effects? That's kind of the question that we're looking at. Could you only include five covariates and do a job that is equally as good at predicting teacher effects than using all 30 of those covariates. So essentially what we're looking at here is, is the model only as complex as it needs to be? Simple, elegant, accounting for things that are important but not overly complicated to the extent that it becomes difficult to explain, less transparent, and so forth, right? That's the question. Is there a statistic we can look at that American Court Reporting

	228		230
1	helps us understand? Yes, there is a statistic.	1	didn't you include this and this and this and
2	We're going to look at the percent of current	2	this and this? I know there's kids that and
3	year test score variance accounted for by	3	you say, we thought about that, we looked at
4	control variables in the models. Statistically,	4	some of those things and we found that people
5	we call this an R-Square or a proportion of	5	often, even statisticians, want to throw a lot
6	variances. We look at Model 1 from the fixed	6	of things into a regression model. It's not
7	effects of Model 1. How much variation do we	7	always valuable in doing that. As you're
8	account for in student differences with those	8	talking about this model in the state, suppose
9	control variables? And then we compare that to	9	you're in a conversation where you had to say
10	the different models that have different control	10	well we control for disabilities, we control
11	variables There's a statistic that we're going	11	for homogeneity, we control for class size, we
11		12	control for this that that and that and
12	Is there competing we're looking for in	12	control for this, that, that, and that, and
13	Is there something we're looking for in	13	people are going to start to look at you cross
14	that statistic? The answer is yes; there's	14	ways. If you don't buy anything statistically,
15	actually a couple of things.	15	why are you including all of those things when
16	One, we want a high portion of variance.	16	It makes it harder for you to explain the model?
17	So if we had two models and two models only, and	17	Now people want to control the model
18	let's just say Model 1 accounted for 20% of the	18	because it makes us feel good about whether
19	variance and Model 2 accounted for 60% of the	19	we're leveling the playing field, but they may
20	variance, we would prefer the model that	20	not buy it. That's what we're about to look at
21	accounted for more variance relative to the one	21	and that's why we care.
22	less variance. That's what we're looking	22	MS. MARSALA: Can I ask this question? I
23	for, a higher proportion of variance. But	23	know that all the statistics are done in the
24	there's a point of diminishing returns. Suppose	24	state, based on all the data; is it the same
25	I now have three models. One of the models	25	statistically looking at a single teacher's data
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	229		231
1	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2	1	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and
1 2	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just	1 2	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you
1 2 3	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model	1 2 3	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference
1 2 3 4	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of	1 2 3 4	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale?
1 2 3 4 5	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch	1 2 3 4 5	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education
1 2 3 4 5 6	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much	1 2 3 4 5 6	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3%	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing returns.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher effects on all of these models and they're all
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing returns. Why should we care about this? The model	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher effects on all of these models and they're all very highly correlated. I wish we had shown you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing returns. Why should we care about this? The model doesn't need to be needlessly complex. When you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher effects on all of these models and they're all very highly correlated. I wish we had shown you this graph but I can't show it don't - have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing returns. Why should we care about this? The model doesn't need to be needlessly complex. When you go out into the state and across the state and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher effects on all of these models and they're all very highly correlated. I wish we had shown you this graph but I can't show it don't - have it here.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing returns. Why should we care about this? The model doesn't need to be needlessly complex. When you go out into the state and across the state and you're ambassadors for the model and people say,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher effects on all of these models and they're all very highly correlated. I wish we had shown you this graph but I can't show it don't - have it here. So in terms of whether it switches the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing returns. Why should we care about this? The model doesn't need to be needlessly complex. When you go out into the state and across the state and you're ambassadors for the model and people say, well, how do you control for differences between	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher effects on all of these models and they're all very highly correlated. I wish we had shown you this graph but I can't show it don't - have it here. So in terms of whether it switches the classification, the answer is no. Does it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing returns. Why should we care about this? The model doesn't need to be needlessly complex. When you go out into the state and across the state and you're ambassadors for the model and people say, well, how do you control for differences between schools? You say, well, there are covariates	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher effects on all of these models and they're all very highly correlated. I wish we had shown you this graph but I can't show it don't - have it here. So in terms of whether it switches the classification, the answer is no. Does it matter about the teacher level when you include
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing returns. Why should we care about this? The model doesn't need to be needlessly complex. When you go out into the state and across the state and you're ambassadors for the model and people say, well, how do you control for differences between schools? You say, well, there are covariates for 1, 2, 3, and 4; and the teacher says why	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher effects on all of these models and they're all very highly correlated. I wish we had shown you this graph but I can't show it don't - have it here. So in terms of whether it switches the classification, the answer is no. Does it matter about the teacher level when you include something or not include something? Not a whole
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	229 accounts for 20% of the variance, Model 2 accounts for 60% of the variance, and let's just say Model 2 has five covariates in it; and Model 3 has 25 covariates and it accounts for 62% of the variance, right? You've got a whole bunch of additional covariates that don't buy you much when you look at that proportion. They buy you 2% more. So there's no number that says is a 3% difference good enough, is a 5%? That's not what we're looking for here. We're not looking for a particular number; we're looking for a human judgment. Do I really care? Is the difference between 60% and 62% enough that I would want to include all 25 covariates relative to including just 5? It's kind of what we're looking for here. So there's a point of diminishing returns. Why should we care about this? The model doesn't need to be needlessly complex. When you go out into the state and across the state and you're ambassadors for the model and people say, well, how do you control for differences between schools? You say, well, there are covariates for 1, 2, 3, and 4; and the teacher says why American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	231 versus we're now looking at a huge scale and they're all coming up about the same, but if you look at one teacher is there then a difference versus the big scale? MS. FRAKES: Especially a special education teacher whose students are all ESE or double retainees because age becomes one of those variables. Are the statistics the same for that teacher as they are across the state? DR. DORAN: Well, objectively, the statistic had a teacher component, but the question is would that cause there to be any differences in the estimates of the teacher effects when you include a decline. In some very small instances, it might. Whether or not it does, we know it has a small impact because we looked at the correlation between teacher effects on all of these models and they're all very highly correlated. I wish we had shown you this graph but I can't show it don't - have it here. So in terms of whether it switches the classification, the answer is no. Does it matter about the teacher level when you include something or not include something? Not a whole American Court Reporting

	232		234
1	lot.	1	differences in the models in terms of how much
2	MS. KEARSCHNER: You're saying that	2	variation in student scores are accounted for
3	statistically there's not a whole lot of	3	when you include more covariates than when you
4	difference whether or not these particular	4	include less. So, for example, Model 3C the
5	factors are in there, or that there is not that	5	model that has the most covariates in it is
6	much of a variant.	6	comparable to Model 1 that has the fewest
7	DR. DORAN: Let me actually present the	7	covariates in it. In other words, another way
8	data before because I made that judgment.	8	of saying this is we don't form necessarily
9	Yeah.	9	better predictions in the model with the most
10	MS. KEARSCHNER: Okay, but let me just say	10	covariates than we do with the fewest. Now if
11	something. You made a statement, and we talked	11	we saw, for example, that this model only
12	about this last time, that there is a reason for	12	accounted for 20% of the variation and this
13	these things to be in there or not be in there,	13	model over here accounted for 60%, we might say
14	two different reasons. One would be for showing	14	that seems to me a huge difference is.
15	the differences statistically or seeing their	15	Essentially, what we're seeing in these results
16	impact, and the other reason is more political.	16	is the models are comparable in terms of how
17	It's to say we looked at these and there is no	17	much variation in the students scores they
18	difference. Could that not also be the reason	18	account for. Similar predictions.
19	for keeping them in? So we have to say yes.	19	MS. MARSALA: But this is based on the
20	we've considered these they're here we could	20	State data not if you're looking at teachers
21	say, and it gives that level of confidence in	21	to get back those scores are they going to get
22	the model and is transparent. I think that's	22	sent back the summer' is it possible at that
23	something that we had looked at last time and	23	point that it would make a difference to the
24	the reason why we might want to include it	24	individual teachers based on who they're
25	DR DORAN: One of the things that we are	25	teaching? The actual covariates?
25	American Court Reporting	23	American Court Reporting
	850 421 0058		850 421 0058
		-	
	233		235
1	233 going to show you is whether or not there are	1	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be
1	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as	1	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, ves, there are some
1 2 3	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going	1 2 3	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen.
1 2 3 4	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that	1 2 3 4	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be
1 2 3 4 5	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if	1 2 3 4 5	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I
1 2 3 4 5 6	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data.	1 2 3 4 5 6	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of total variance. This is the one that has the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because it's plausible that some teachers will
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of total variance. This is the one that has the most covariates in it: this one has fewer.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because it's plausible that some teachers will experience this perhaps as a result of this.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of total variance. This is the one that has the most covariates in it; this one has fewer. Remember when I said there's a point of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because it's plausible that some teachers will experience this perhaps as a result of this, perhaps as a result of other things, which is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of total variance. This is the one that has the most covariates in it; this one has fewer. Remember when I said there's a point of diminishing in fact, they only differ in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because it's plausible that some teachers will experience this perhaps as a result of this, perhaps as a result of other things, which is similar to the conversation we're having we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of total variance. This is the one that has the most covariates in it; this one has fewer. Remember when I said there's a point of diminishing in fact, they only differ in the third decimal place. It's only because of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because it's plausible that some teachers will experience this perhaps as a result of this, perhaps as a result of other things, which is similar to the conversation we're having we need to be cautious on whether we tell you. yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of total variance. This is the one that has the most covariates in it; this one has fewer. Remember when I said there's a point of diminishing in fact, they only differ in the third decimal place. It's only because of the way they're plotted that they appear to be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because it's plausible that some teachers will experience this perhaps as a result of this, perhaps as a result of other things, which is similar to the conversation we're having we need to be cautious on whether we tell you, yes, things will be different because of I don't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of total variance. This is the one that has the most covariates in it; this one has fewer. Remember when I said there's a point of diminishing in fact, they only differ in the third decimal place. It's only because of the way they're plotted that they appear to be different there.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because it's plausible that some teachers will experience this perhaps as a result of this, perhaps as a result of other things, which is similar to the conversation we're having we need to be cautious on whether we tell you, yes, things will be different because of I don't know whether I should tell you this is the right
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of total variance. This is the one that has the most covariates in it; this one has fewer. Remember when I said there's a point of diminishing in fact, they only differ in the third decimal place. It's only because of the way they're plotted that they appear to be different there. But look here; we see relatively similar	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because it's plausible that some teachers will experience this perhaps as a result of this, perhaps as a result of other things, which is similar to the conversation we're having we need to be cautious on whether we tell you, yes, things will be different because of I don't know whether I should tell you this is the right model or this is the right model. that's your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	233 going to show you is whether or not there are different expectations for and using that as criteria is your decision, right? You're going to have the data by which you can make that judgment. It doesn't matter in your view if we're going to show you the data. Why don't I actually show you the data, okay. All right. The first statistic we're looking at is for reading. This is the R-Square. This is the amount of variation in students' scores that the fixed effects account for. Remember, refer back to your sheet so you know which models are which because remember some of the models include more covariates than others, and we know that in fact, these two models account for the largest proportion of total variance. This is the one that has the most covariates in it; this one has fewer. Remember when I said there's a point of diminishing in fact, they only differ in the third decimal place. It's only because of the way they're plotted that they appear to be different there. But look here; we see relatively similar American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	235 DR. DORAN: One of the things I want to be really careful of is, yes, there are some plausible explanations why things could happen. If I could say to you that, yes, things would be different if you would include this here, then I would know the right answer. I would be able to tell you, yes, include this because but think about this. Let's suppose that a teacher classification does change because you include one covariate versus another. Which model is right? We don't know, right? So I want to let you entertain the question about whether that covariate matters to you when you make a judgment about your model. I don't want to hypothesize about which particular model I think I should advocate for, nor do I want to tell you that, yes, they will change because it's plausible that some teachers will experience this perhaps as a result of this, perhaps as a result of other things, which is similar to the conversation we're having we need to be cautious on whether we tell you, yes, things will be different because of I don't know whether I should tell you this is the right model or this is the right model, that's your American Court Reporting

<ul> <li>Judgment.</li> <li>Three will be differences in the estimates</li> <li>of the teachers, but they are highly correlated.</li> <li>MS. BOURN: If you look at the one with no</li> <li>control variables, the two with no control</li> <li>control variables, and the difference</li> <li>between 3A and 3A1 is just one year or two</li> <li>years, so in't it the number of years that</li> <li>not make to difference 3</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Ronda, you're a step shead</li> <li>control variables, the tub six theor or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely. it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely. it doesn't add up or</li> <li>the characterisc. But three something else</li> <li>characterisc. But three something lese</li> <li>characterisc. But three something lese</li> <li>characterisc. But three something lese</li> <li>characterisc. But three something hese</li> <li>conset with sis the debate in the value-added American Court Reporting 360.421.0058</li> <li>zoors? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole scouse for any adding that's difference trans.</li> <li>titeratures; do covariates matter at allog.</li> <li>thera the something that's difference trans.</li> <li>titeratures; do covariates matter at adiage.</li> <li>the adiagenet criterion.</li> <li>gongarable when you have one or two lags. they're</li> <li>sores by conditionig on or by using pre-test</li> <li>store by conting ing on adiagenet criterion.</li> <li>thereat use is abistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>they have</li></ul>		236		238
2         There will be differences in the estimates of the teachers, but twy are highly correlated.         2         the variables, and because like you or the variables, the two with no control           4         MS. BOURN: If you look at the one with no 5         solid we're going to look across this whole 4         array, but this is telling us that it makes no 4           4         wariables, Jak is virtually the same as the other 7 ones with all the variables, and the difference 7         in any make a difference same 4         in clunding one veckuling when you're looking at 8           10         between 3A and 3A is just on eyaer or two 9         years, so sin't it the number of years that 10         in clunding one veckuling when you're looking at 9         accounting for variance.           11         DR. DORAN: Ronda, you're a step ahead 11         in terms of the lags that tells us whether or 12         in terms of the lags that tells us whether or 13         in terms of proportion of total 14         in terms of proportion of total 14         in terms of proportion of total 14           15         ontaracteristic. But there's something else 16         the state solid else we're looking at we're looking at 16         the state solid else we're looking at 16           16         hots, between somewhere else on this 16         the state solid else we're looking at 16         theste solid else we're looking at 16         th	1	judgment.	1	this, is that right now we're only looking at
<ul> <li>a of the teachers, but they are highly correlated.</li> <li>MS. BOURN: If you look at the one with no control</li> <li>control variables, the two with no control</li> <li>control variables, and the difference</li> <li>between 3A and 3A1 is just one year or two</li> <li>years, so in't it the number of years is so notker the difference?</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Ronda you're a step ahead</li> <li>the ot, but you are right. We're looking at in onc, including more ikely it doesh't add up or</li> <li>tho t, but you are right. We're looking at is consecting so ing this series of the</li> <li>tho the different criterion.</li> <li>the different criterion.</li> <li>the number of years is one thing a given criterion but only</li> <li>boking at any given criterion but only</li> <li>boking at any given criterion but only</li> <li>boking at any given criterion.</li> <li>the different criterion.</li> <li>there might be adifferent criterion.</li> <li>the number of years is going on here</li> <li>wow one of the things that's going on here</li> <li>scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>sto doking at any given criterion.</li> <li>the doals at number a wide in grant and a score the difference, it doesn't</li> <li>decision with respect to controlling for the</li> <li>accounting on the waitability in pror</li> <li>scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>tor of the warability in student scores because</li> <li>the prote the algo given any. (Here made it any in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>account for a</li></ul>	2	There will be differences in the estimates	2	the variance in the models, and because like you
<ul> <li>MS. BOURN: If you look at the one with no ontrol</li> <li>control variables, and the difference at the variables, and the difference at the variables, and the difference?</li> <li>ones with all the variables, and the difference?</li> <li>between 3 and 3A is just one year or two</li> <li>geers, so isn't it he number of years that</li> <li>descense we're going to look at another criterion</li> <li>including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>not it follows here or somewhere else on this</li> <li>tharacteristic. But there's something else</li> <li>that's different about the somedies, right?</li> <li>Different lags, it does matter.</li> <li>Now one of the things that's going on here</li> <li>you capture enough of the variability in prior</li> <li>scores? Vre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>tord the variability on prior</li> <li>scores? Yre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>tord the variability in prior</li> <li>scores? Yre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>tord the variability in prior</li> <li>scores? Yre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>tord the variability in prior</li> <li>scores? Yre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>tord the conversation that while in the enoils. Could reporting</li> <li>But when you have onor two lags, they're</li> <li>gergage these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>the orly the coversation that while in the early in the conversation that while in the early in the stores the different for an individual</li> <li>teacher, they may differ. Say you have thats</li> <li>the orly the coversalid across the different for an individual</li> <li>teacher, they may differ. Say you have that or an individual</li> <li>teacher, they may differ. Say you have that on an individual</li> <li>teacher, they ma</li></ul>	3	of the teachers, but they are highly correlated.	3	said we're going to look across this whole
<ul> <li>s control variables, the two with no control</li> <li>variables, 3A is virtually the same as the other ones with all the variables, and the difference</li> <li>between 3A and 3A1 is just one year or two years, so in't it the number of years that</li> <li>seems to make the difference?</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Ronda, you're a step ahead</li> <li>in terms of the lags that tells us whether or 1 not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>is on that tells us whether or 1 not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</li> <li>is ont, but you are right. We're looking at</li> <li>characterist. But there's something else</li> <li>that's different criterion.</li> <li>Different lags, it does matter.</li> <li>That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the 2 you capture enough of the variability in prior 3 scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test 3 cores seem to astatter and diags, these matter.</li> <li>They have the lags only, either one or two lags, the 2 comparable when you have enor two lags, the 3 cores is pre-test scores seem to astatter we day 3 scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test 3 cores by conditioning on or by using pre-test 3 cores and these models are doing.</li> <li>They have the lags only, either one or two lags, the 3 cores is pre-test scores seem to capture a whole 3 core stat these models are doing.</li> <li>They have the lags only, either one or two lags, the 3 different models account for.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge 3 the point John made - 1 think John made : 1 3 coreal cours the different 3 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very 3 highly coreal and an the different 3 more cavarates? Do we?</li> <li>They have the overail fit or an individual 3 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that or an individual 3 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that or 3 whole lot of other things. So do those other 3 highly corealad. But for an individual 3 teacher, they may differ. Say you ha</li></ul>	4	MS. BOURN: If you look at the one with no	4	array, but this is telling us that it makes no
<ul> <li>a variables; 3A is virtually the same as the other ones with all the variables, and the difference?</li> <li>o seems to make the difference?</li> <li>b seems to make the difference?</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Ronda, you're a step ahead</li> <li>b course we're going to look at another criterion</li> <li>in terms of the lags that tells us whether or not it follows here or somewhere dees on this</li> <li>not, including more likely it doessn't add up or not it follows here or somewhere dees on this</li> <li>not, on up oar eright. We're looking at</li> <li>that's why we wouldn't make judgments about the 20 models looking at any given criterion but only</li> <li>That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the</li> <li>models looking at any given criterion but only</li> <li>aberizent cours the different criterion.</li> <li>Different lags, it does matter.</li> <li>Now one of the things that's going on here</li> <li>vand this is the debate in the value-added American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test</li> <li>scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>bot of the variability in student scores because</li> <li>whole lot of other things. So do these other</li> <li>but when you have only one or two lags, they're</li> <li>comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>the point both made : 1 think John made : 1</li> <li>adright the standifter for</li> <li>adright the standing at State data.</li> <li>the point both made it the rain indicit agrit the state fifters.</li> <li>the different adrage: The variability or these models account for.</li> <li>Sone taber.</li> <li>the orenelated across the different fifters.</li> <li>the othe overalitit the standia char you capture and bill with these models are doing.</li> <li>the point both made it any in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>dapergate these statistis, the teacher</li></ul>	5	control variables, the two with no control	5	difference as far as accounting for the
7       ones with all the variables, and the difference?       7       else. Therefore, it's no harm, no foul         8       between 3A and 3A1 is just one year or two       9       including or excluding when you're looking at         10       seems to make the difference?       10       DR.DORAN: Ronda, you're a step ahead         11       DR.DORAN: This is accounting for variance.       11       encuring for variance.         12       because we're going to look at another criterion       12       variables. The control variables add a whole         13       not, including orne likely it doess me to matter whether or       10       to more ithers of proportion of total         14       ont, including orne likely it doess me to matter whether or       10       to more ithers of proportion of total         15       not, but you are right. We're looking at       16       consequences? Yes. And remember, that's why         16       that's different criterion.       20       That's why we woulden't make judgments about the        10       and if there's the potential that at one teacher         24       They have the taigs only, either one or two lags, it does matter.       230       14       MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in         25       -rand this student scores because       24       mount of variance.       236         26       11	6	variables, 3A is virtually the same as the other	6	variance; it may make a difference somewhere
<ul> <li>a between 3A and 3A1 is just one year or two servers, so isn't it the number of years that</li> <li>a seems to make the difference?</li> <li>DR. DORAN: Ronda, you're a step ahead</li> <li>because we're going to look at another criterion</li> <li>in terms of the lags that tells us whether or</li> <li>not, but you are right. We're looking at</li> <li>ont, but you are right. We're looking at</li> <li>ont are interword. These models, right?</li> <li>ond if there's the potential that at one teacher?</li> <li>level there might be a difference, it doesn't</li> <li>the point lags, it does matter.</li> <li>Now one of the things that's going on here</li> <li>you capture enough of the variability in prior</li> <li>you capture enough of the variability in prior</li> <li>you capture enough of the variability or these</li> <li>remember that's what these models are doing,</li> <li>they have the lags only, either one or two lags, they're</li> <li>gorgathe these staties, are doing.</li> <li>they are that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>they are that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>they have the lags only, either one or two lag</li></ul>	7	ones with all the variables, and the difference	7	else. Therefore, it's no harm, no foul
<ul> <li>9 years, so isn't it he number of years that seems to make the difference?</li> <li>10 DR, DORAN: Ronda, you're a step ahead</li> <li>11 effects. I'm talking about the control variables. The control variables add a whole</li> <li>12 because we're going to look at another criterion in terms of the lags stat tells us whether or not, including more likely it doesn't add up or not, but you are right. We're looking at scorestic. But there's something else</li> <li>13 that's different about these models, right?</li> <li>14 that's different about these models, right?</li> <li>15 that's different about these models, right?</li> <li>16 that's different tags, it does matter.</li> <li>17 that's why we wouldn't make judgments about the models looking at any given criterion but only</li> <li>18 Different lags, it does matter.</li> <li>19 box one of the things that's going on here  and this is the debate in the value-added American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>10 to fit we vanability in student scores because</li> <li>10 to fit we vanability in student scores because</li> <li>10 the vanability in student scores because</li> <li>10 the vanability in student scores because</li> <li>11 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>11 eachy in the conversation that while in the 3 agrogate these statists, the teacher effects</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Haroid, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 eachy in the conversation that while in the 3 agregate these statists, the teacher effects</li> <li>15 is looking at State data.</li> <li>16 that the aster at all? DD</li> <li>20 DRAN: I's agross the state.</li> <li>31 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>32 adecising at State data.</li> <li>33 dif attendance my our class, 34 and if attendance matters then while in may 34 adif attendance matters then while in may 35 acreable way, it may make it different for 35 agregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>35 tate data, obviously there's</li></ul>	8	between 3A and 3A1 is just one year or two	8	including or excluding when you're looking at
10       seems to make the difference?       10       DR. DCRAN: This is accounting for by fixed         11       DR. DCRAN: This is accounting for by fixed       11         12       DR. DCRAN: This is accounting for by fixed         13       in terms of the lags that tells us whether or         14       not, including more likely it doesn't add up or         15       not, but you are right. We're looking at         16       something that does seem to matter whether or         17       not in follows here or somewhere else on this         18       characteristic. But there's something else         19       that's different carterian.         20       loking at any given criterion but only         21       loking at any given criterion but only         22       loking at any given criterion but only         23       Different lags, it does matter.         24       Now one of the things that's going on here         25       and this is the debate in the value-added         360.421.0058       237         1       Itteratures; do covariates matter at all? Do         2       you capture enough of the variability in prior         3       scores? Pre-test cores seem to capture a whole         4       onts of the wariability in student scores because <th>9</th> <th>years, so isn't it the number of years that</th> <th>9</th> <th>accounting for variance.</th>	9	years, so isn't it the number of years that	9	accounting for variance.
11       DR. DORAN: Ronda, you're a step ahead       11       effects. I'm talking about the control         12       because we're going to look at another criterion       12       variables. The control variables add a whole         13       in terms of the lags that tells us whether or       13       in tomos in terms of proportion of total         14       not, including more likely it doesn't add up or       14       variables. The control variables add a whole         15       not, including more likely it doesn't add up or       14       variables. The control variables add a whole         16       not, including more likely it doesn't add up or       14       variables. The control variables add a whole         16       not, including more likely it doesn't add up or       14       variables. The control variables add a whole         17       not t follows here or somewhere else on this       14       variables. The control variables add a whole         18       Chartswhy we wouldht make judgments about the       15       onse add there's the potential that at one teacher         21       looking act any given criterion but only       20       anount of variance.         22       14       level there might be a difference, it doesn't         24       asount a count for any hole to the final       23 decision with respect to controlling for the         25       <	10	seems to make the difference?	10	DR. DORAN: This is accounting for by fixed
12       because we're going to look at another criterion       13         13       in terms of the lags that tells us whether or       13         14       not, including more likely it desen't add up or       14         15       not, but you are right. We're looking at       15         15       not, but you are right. We're looking at       15         16       more in terms of proportion of total         17       not, infferent about these models, right?         18       characteristic. But there's something else         19       that's different about these models, right?         10       models looking at any given criterion.         12       lotfferent lags, it does matter.         14       No one of the things that's going on here         15       orsores by conditioning on or by using pretest         16       scores? Pre-test scores beart to acpture a whole         16       veraibles. The control variablity or these         16       unt either wariable attor.         17       Itteratures; do covariates matter at all? Do         18       that's different criteria.         19       teacher, that's what these models are doing.         10       oto fthe variability in student scores because         11       teratures; do covariates matter	11	DR. DORAN: Ronda, you're a step ahead	11	effects. I'm talking about the control
13       in terms of the lags that tells us whether or       13       lot more in terms of proportion of total         14       not, including more likely it doesn't add up or       14       variance, but are there other possible         15       not, including more likely it doesn't add up or       14       variance, but are there other possible         15       not, including more likely it doesn't add up or       14       variance, but are there other possible         16       something that does seem to matter whether or       16       consequences? Yes. And remember, that's why         16       that's different about these models, right?       16       MS. BROWN: So if, in fact, no harm/no foul         17       That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the       16       MS. BROWN: So if, in fact, no harm/no foul         16       That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the       16       MS. BROWN: So if, in fact, no harm/no foul         12       loking at any given criterion but only       12       loking at any given criterion but only         12       loking at any given criterion.       13       at merican Court Reporting         14       not set hedsate in the value-added       23       25         17       thereat costs do covariates matter at all? Do       24       MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in         12       you	12	because we're going to look at another criterion	12	variables. The control variables add a whole
14       not, including more likely it doesn't add up or         15       not, but you are right. We're looking at         15       not, but you are right. We're looking at         16       something that does seem to matter whether or         17       not it follows here or somewhere else on this         18       characteristic. But there's something else         19       that's different about these models, right?         20       That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the         21       looking at any given criterion but only         23       Different lags, it does matter.         24       Now one of the things that's going on here         27       Now one of the things that's going on here         28       American Court Reporting         29       Iteratures; do covariates matter at all? Do       American Court Reporting         3       scores? Pre-test scores seam to capture a whole       1         3       scores? Pre-test scores because       1         6       remmeker that's what these models are doing.       1         7       They have the lags only, either one or two lags.       2         8       but when you have one or two lags.       1         9       Sores by conditioning on or by using the they attabality. We see comparable estimates in	13	in terms of the lags that tells us whether or	13	lot more in terms of proportion of total
15       not, but you'rer right. We're looking at mometar whether or not it follows here or somewhere else on this something that does seem to matter whether or not it follows here or somewhere else on this that's different cater.       15       consequences? Yes. And remember, that's why we're presenting along this series of the 11         10       that's different cate.       16       we're presenting along this series of the 11         11       that's different cate.       18       MS. BROWN: So i, in fact, no harm/no foul 14         11       that's different cate.       18       MS. BROWN: So i, in fact, no harm/no foul 14         12       that's different cate.       18       MS. BROWN: So i, in fact, no harm/no foul 14         12       the aggregate the big scale level then 13       adifferent cate.         13       Different lags, it does matter.       20       and if there's the potential that at one teacher 24         24       Now one of the things that's going on here 3-       23       DR. DORAN: I just switched a moment ago to American Court Reporting 850.421.0058         25       you capture enough of the variability in prior 3       scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test 3       accounts for very little variability while 5         26       remember that's what these models are doing.       7       They have the lags only, either one or two lags, flus.       7         27       They have the lags only, either one or two lags. </th <th>14</th> <th>not, including more likely it doesn't add up or</th> <th>14</th> <th>variance, but are there other possible</th>	14	not, including more likely it doesn't add up or	14	variance, but are there other possible
16       something that does seem to matter whether or       17       not it follows here or somewhere else on this         17       not it follows here or somewhere else on this       16       we're presenting along this series of the         19       that's different about these models, right?       10       MS. BROWN: So if, in fact, no harm/no foul         20       That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the       10       at the aggregate the big scale level then         21       looking across the different criterion.       20       and if there's the potential that at one teacher         22       looking across the different criterion.       21       level there might be a difference, it deesn't         22       Now one of the things that's going on here       21       amount of variance.         23       and this is the debate in the value-added       American Court Reporting       230         3       237       239       1         1       iteratures; do covariates matter at all? Do       1       MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in         2       you capture enough of the variability in prior       3       accounts for very little variability while         5       lot of the variability in student scores because       6       rems of how much variance in scores the         8       but when you have one or two lags pl	15	not, but you are right. We're looking at	15	consequences? Yes. And remember, that's why
17       not it follows here or somewhere else on this       17       different criteria.         18       characteristic. But there's something else       18       MS. BROWN: So if, in fact, no harm/no foul         18       the aggregate the big scale level then         20       That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the         21       models looking at any given criterion.       20         22       lolfferent lags, it does matter.       21         24       Now one of the things that's going on here       23         25       and this is the debate in the value-added       American Court Reporting         8       Socres by conditioning on or by using pre-test       scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole         2       but of other things. So do those other       1         11       they ony anything?       2         21       they ony thom made it offerent       3         22       DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge       16         23       they ony thom set statistics, the teacher effects       16         24       early in the conversation that while in the       13         25       teactore the statistics, the teacher effects       16         26       teand to different statistics, the teacher effects       16       DR. DoRAN: I's a	16	something that does seem to matter whether or	16	we're presenting along this series of the
18       characteristic. But there's something else       18       MS. BROWN: So if, in fact, no harm/no foul         19       that's different about these models, right?       at the aggregate the big scale level then         20       That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the       and if there's the potential that at one teacher         21       looking across the different criterion.       and if there's the potential that at one teacher         21       looking across the different criterion.       but either way when we get to the final         22       looking across the different criterion.       but either way when we get to the final         23       Different lags, it does matter.       carount for separting decision with respect to corrolling for the         24       Now one of the things that's going on here       carount for separting decision with respect to corrolling for the         25       - and this is the debate in the value-added       American Court Reporting         350.421.0058       237       1         3       scores Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole       ones dort account for ithe variability while         4       scores Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole       ones dort account for ithe variability while         5       there thags only, either one or two lags, they're       9       So part of the question that we're looking         9       to	17	not it follows here or somewhere else on this	17	different criteria.
<ul> <li>that's different about these models, right?</li> <li>That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the models looking at any given criterion but only looking across the different criterion but only level there might be a difference, it doesn't level there might be a difference, it doesn't amount of variance.</li> <li>but we no eof the things that's going on here ascores to controlling for the amount of variance.</li> <li>but vertice nough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole for the variability in student scores because accounts for very little variability while for the variability in student scores because for emember that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>They have the lags only, either one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one two lags, they're scores? Pre-test scores of the duestion that we're looking for the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects for the due store atters then while it may and if attendance any our class, fall the point John made I think John made it and if attendance matters then while it may and if attendance any our class, fall the final date and and while it may and if attendance matters then while it may timprove the overall fit of the model in any and if attendance matters then while it may and if ath</li></ul>	18	characteristic. But there's something else	18	MS. BROWN: So if, in fact, no harm/no foul
<ul> <li>That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the models looking at any given criterion but only looking at any given criterion.</li> <li>Different lags, it does matter.</li> <li>Bout atters to covariates matter at all? Do gout account for very little variability on these</li> <li>scores Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole is to for the variability in student scores because</li> <li>Gremember that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>They have the lags only, either one or two lags, they're goompable when you have one or two lags, they're goompable when you have one or two lags plus at the point John made I think John made it agrye at these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>the point John made I think John made it agrye at these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>the do to be correlated across the different tor addie latendance myour class, and fif attendance myour class,</li></ul>	19	that's different about these models, right?	19	at the aggregate the big scale level then
<ul> <li>models looking at any given criterion but only</li> <li>looking across the different criterion.</li> <li>Different lags, it does matter.</li> <li>Now one of the things that's going on here</li> <li>- and this is the debate in the value-added American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>237</li> <li>literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do</li> <li>you capture enough of the variability in prior</li> <li>scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>lot of the variability in student scores because</li> <li>remember that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>They have the lags only, either one or two lags.</li> <li>But when you have only one or two lags.</li> <li>But when you have and or two lags.</li> <li>But whole lot of other things. So do those other</li> <li>things buy you anything?</li> <li>But whe courted across the different</li> <li>adjergeate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>kid whoh as terrible attendance in your class, would there the school, would there</li> <li>and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>and if attendance matters then while it fiferent for</li> <li>So BOWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking</li></ul>	20	That's why we wouldn't make judgments about the	20	and if there's the potential that at one teacher
<ul> <li>22 looking across the different criterion.</li> <li>23 Different lags, it does matter.</li> <li>24 Now one of the things that's going on here</li> <li>25 and this is the debate in the value-added American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>237</li> <li>237</li> <li>238</li> <li>239</li> <li>240</li> <li>250</li> <li>250</li> <li>260</li> <li>270</li> <li>271</li> <li>281</li> <li>282</li> <li>283</li> <li>293</li> <li>293</li> <li>203</li> <li>204</li> <li>205</li> <li>205</li> <li>205</li> <li>206</li> <li>206</li> <li>207</li> <li>208</li> <li>208</li> <li>208</li> <li>208</li> <li>208</li> <li>208</li> <li>209</li> <li>208</li> <li>209</li> <li>209</li> <li>209</li> <li>200</li> <li>200</li> <li>200</li> <li>200</li> <li>201</li> <li>201</li> <li>201</li> <li>201</li> <li>201</li> <li>201</li> <li>202</li> <li>203</li> <li>203</li> <li>203</li> <li>203</li> <li>203</li> <li>203</li> <li>203</li> <li>204</li> <li>206</li> <li>204</li> <li>204</li> <li>206</li> <li>204</li> <li>206</li> <li>204</li> <li>204</li> <li>206</li> &lt;</ul>	21	models looking at any given criterion but only	21	level there might be a difference, it doesn't
<ul> <li>23 Different lags, it does matter.</li> <li>24 Now one of the things that's going on here</li> <li>25 and this is the debate in the value-added American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>237</li> <li>1 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do</li> <li>24 you capture enough of the variability in prior</li> <li>25 scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test</li> <li>4 scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>5 lot of the variability in student scores because</li> <li>6 remember that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have score or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have score or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have score or two lags, the you have that one</li> <li>10 whole lot of other things. So do those other</li> <li>11 things buy you anything?</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 earler, in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 adgregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 thighly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>19 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,&lt;</li></ul>	22	looking across the different criterion.	22	hurt either way when we get to the final
<ul> <li>Now one of the things that's going on here</li> <li>- and this is the debate in the value-added American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>237</li> <li>1 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior</li> <li>3 scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test</li> <li>4 scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>5 lot of the variability in student scores because</li> <li>6 remember that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have only one or two lags, they're</li> <li>1 things buy you anything?</li> <li>1 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>1 they ni the conversation that while in the</li> <li>1 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>10 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>11 tand if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>12 more cho evanil fit of the model in any</li> <li>13 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>14 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>15 more cachers.</li> <li>26 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	23	Different lags, it does matter.	23	decision with respect to controlling for the
25 and this is the debate in the value-added American Court Reporting 850.421.005825DR. DORAN: I just switched a moment ago to American Court Reporting 850.421.0058271literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior 3 scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test 4 scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole 5 lot of the variability in student scores because 6 remember that's what these models are doing. 7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags. 8 But when you have only one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 10 whole lot of other things. So do those other 11 things buy you anything?10MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability while 5 these models account for.12DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge 13 the point John made I think John made it aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects 15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects 16 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class, and if attendance matters then while it may not 21 more vero all fit of the model in any 22 moreceable way, it may make it different for 23 morecable way. It may make it different for 24 some teachers.25DR. DORAN: I's across the state of the way and you have less students that you were looking at, you went down to the school level and then different you went down to the school level and then down 24 some teachers.25MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.00582626MS. BA21.0058SS0.421.0058	24	Now one of the things that's going on here	24	amount of variance.
American Court Reporting 850.421.0058American Court Reporting 850.421.00582371literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do 2 you capture enough of the variability in prior 3 scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test 4 scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole 5 lot of the variability in student scores because 6 remember that's what these models are doing. 7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags. 8 But when you have only one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 11 things buy you anything?MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model account for little variability offille variability. We see comparable estimates in 7 they have the lags only, either one or two lags. 8 But when you have one or two lags plus a 10 whole lot of other things. So do those other 11 things buy you anything? 12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge 13 the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the 14 early in the conversation that while in the 15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects 16 to be correlated across the different 17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very 18 highly correlated. But for an individual 19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class, 21 and if attendance matters then while it may not 22 improve the overall fit of the model in any 33 noticeable way, it may make it different for 23 moticeable way. It may make it different for 24 some teachers.American Court Reporting 850.421.005825 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058Mather is acros the se a lot greater? American Court Reporting 850.421.0058	25	and this is the debate in the value-added	25	DR. DORAN: I just switched a moment ago to
850.421.0058850.421.00582372391 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole 5 lot of the variability in student scores because 6 remember that's what these models are doing. 7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 Comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 Comparable when you anything? 11 things buy you anything? 12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge 13 the point John made I think John made it 14 early in the conversation that while in the 15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects 16 tend to be correlated across the different 17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very 18 highly correlated. But for an individual 19 highly correlated. But for an individual 19 inprove the overall fit of the model in any 20 noticeable way, it may make it different for 21 some teachers. 25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058850.421.0058850.421.005823 Miley 2421.0058MS. BACWIN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.005810 a grade level within the school, would there 20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class, and if attendance matters then while it may not 24 nootes10 a grade level within the school, would there 20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class, and if attendance matters then while it may not 24 merican Court Reporting 850.		American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
2372391literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior 3 scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test 4 scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole 5 lot of the variability in student scores because 6 remember that's what these models are doing. 7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're 9 comparable when you have one or two lags plus a 10 whole lot of other things. So do those other 11 things buy you anything? 12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge 13 the point John made I think John made it 14 early in the conversation that while in the 15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects 16 tend to be correlated across the different 17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very 18 highly correlated. But for an individual 19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that ome 20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class, 21 and if attendance matters then while it may not 22 improve the overall fit of the model in any 		850.421.0058		850.421.0058
1literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole for the variability in student scores because for the variability. We see comparable estimates in for the model score two lags, they're going to the lass for the nodel in any indicable way, it may make it different for and if attendance matters then while it may not improve the overall fit of the model in any noticeable way, it may make it different for some teachers.1MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in accounts for very little variability or these ones doin't account for a whole lot of terms of how much variance so a grade level within the school level and then if you went down to the school level and then if you went down to the school level and then if you went down to the school, would there to a grade leve				
<ul> <li>2 you capture enough of the variability in prior</li> <li>3 scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test</li> <li>4 scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>5 lot of the variability in student scores because</li> <li>6 remember that's what these models are doing,</li> <li>7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags,</li> <li>8 But when you have only one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags plus a</li> <li>10 whole lot of other things. So do those other</li> <li>11 things buy you anything?</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>10 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>11 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>21 moticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>23 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul> <ul> <li>24 MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model</li> <li>25 additional different models account for a whole lot of</li> <li>26 additional different models in any</li> <li>27 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>		237		239
<ul> <li>3 scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test</li> <li>4 scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>5 lot of the variability in student scores because</li> <li>6 remember that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags.</li> <li>8 But when you have only one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags plus a</li> <li>10 whole lot of other things. So do those other</li> <li>11 things buy you anything?</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>10 ind if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>11 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>21 moticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>23 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do	1	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in
<ul> <li>4 scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole</li> <li>5 lot of the variability in student scores because</li> <li>6 remember that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags.</li> <li>8 But when you have only one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags plus a</li> <li>10 whole lot of other things. So do those other</li> <li>11 things buy you anything?</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>10 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>11 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> <li>4 ones don't account for little variability while</li> <li>5 these models account for a whole lot of</li> <li>6 variability. We see comparable estimates in</li> <li>7 they have the lags only, either one or two lags, and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>24 ones don't account for little variability while</li> <li>8 back 21.0058</li> <li>4 ones don't account for a whole lot of</li> <li>9 variance because on these be a lot greater?</li> <li>9 American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior	1 2	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model
<ul> <li>5 lot of the variability in student scores because</li> <li>6 remember that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags.</li> <li>8 But when you have only one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags plus a</li> <li>10 whole lot of other things. So do those other</li> <li>11 things buy you anything?</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>10 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> <li>5 these models account for a whole lot of</li> <li>6 variability. We see comparable estimates in</li> <li>7 terms of how much variance in scores the</li> <li>8 different models account for.</li> <li>9 So part of the question that we're looking</li> <li>10 at here is, in terms of accounting for variance</li> <li>11 test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in</li> <li>12 more covariates? Do we?</li> <li>13 PANEL MEMBERS: No.</li> <li>14 MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This</li> <li>15 is looking at State data.</li> <li>16 DR. DORAN: It's across the state.</li> <li>17 MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at</li> <li>18 State data, obviously there's going to be less</li> <li>19 variance because you have such a great number.</li> <li>20 As you go down to the district level and then down</li> <li>21 you went down each step of the way and you</li> <li>22 to a grade level within the school, would there</li> <li>23 be as you went down each step of the way and you</li> <li></li></ul>	1 2 3	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test	1 2 3	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these
<ul> <li>6 remember that's what these models are doing.</li> <li>7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags.</li> <li>8 But when you have only one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>11 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>14 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>15 is looking at State data.</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated attendance in your class,</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if</li></ul>	1 2 3 4	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole	1 2 3 4	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while
<ul> <li>7 They have the lags only, either one or two lags.</li> <li>8 But when you have only one or two lags, they're</li> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags plus a</li> <li>10 whole lot of other things. So do those other</li> <li>11 things buy you anything?</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 mS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> <li>7 terms of how much variance in scores the</li> <li>8 different models account for.</li> <li>9 So part of the question that we're looking at</li> <li>10 the conversation that while in the</li> <li>11 test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in</li> <li>12 more covariates? Do we?</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at</li> <li>18 State data, obviously there's going to be less</li> <li>19 variance because you have such a great number.</li> <li>20 As you go down to the district level and then if</li> <li>21 you went down to the school level and then down</li> <li>22 more covariates?</li> <li>23 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because	1 2 3 4 5	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of
<ul> <li>But when you have only one or two lags, they're</li> <li>comparable when you have one or two lags plus a</li> <li>whole lot of other things. So do those other</li> <li>things buy you anything?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>agregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>So part of the question that we're looking at</li> <li>teachers.</li> <li>MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing.	1 2 3 4 5 6	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in
<ul> <li>9 comparable when you have one or two lags plus a</li> <li>10 whole lot of other things. So do those other</li> <li>11 things buy you anything?</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> <li>9 So part of the question that we're looking</li> <li>9 at here is, in terms of accounting for variance</li> <li>9 at here is, in terms of accounting for variance</li> <li>10 at here is, in terms of accounting for variance</li> <li>11 test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in</li> <li>12 more covariates? Do we?</li> <li>13 PANEL MEMBERS: No.</li> <li>14 MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This</li> <li>15 is looking at State data.</li> <li>16 DR. DORAN: It's across the state.</li> <li>17 MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at</li> <li>18 State data, obviously there's going to be less</li> <li>19 variance because you have such a great number.</li> <li>20 As you go down to the district level and then down</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the
10whole lot of other things. So do those other10at here is, in terms of accounting for variance11things buy you anything?11test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in12DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge11test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in13the point John made I think John made it12more covariates? Do we?14early in the conversation that while in the13PANEL MEMBERS: No.15aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects16DR. DORAN: It's across the state.16teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one18State data, obviously there's going to be less19teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one19variance because you have such a great number.20kid who has terrible attendance in your class,10agrade level within the school level and then if21noticeable way, it may make it different for23be as you went down to the school level and then down23MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from24some teachers.25MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking fromAmerican Court Reporting850.421.00583650.421.0058850.421.0058850.421.0058850.421.0058	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for.
<ul> <li>11 things buy you anything?</li> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul> <ul> <li>11 test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in</li> <li>more covariates? Do we?</li> <li>13 more covariates? Do we?</li> <li>14 more covariates? Do we?</li> <li>13 PANEL MEMBERS: No.</li> <li>14 MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking
<ul> <li>12 DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge</li> <li>13 the point John made I think John made it</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance
<ul> <li>13 The point John Made I think John Made It</li> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the</li> <li>15 aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> <li>21 And if Attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in
<ul> <li>14 early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>15 is looking at State data.</li> <li>16 DR. DORAN: It's across the state.</li> <li>17 MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data.</li> <li>18 DR. DORAN: It's across the state.</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not improve the overall fit of the model in any noticeable way, it may make it different for some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>14 MR. LETELLIER: Question about that. This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we?
<ul> <li>15 adgregate these statistics, the teacher effects</li> <li>16 tend to be correlated across the different</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>26 American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No.
<ul> <li>16 DR. DORAN: It's across the state.</li> <li>17 models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> <li>16 DR. DORAN: It's across the state.</li> <li>17 MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at</li> <li>18 State data, obviously there's going to be less</li> <li>19 variance because you have such a great number.</li> <li>20 As you go down to the district level and then if</li> <li>21 you went down to the school level and then down</li> <li>22 to a grade level within the school, would there</li> <li>23 be as you went down each step of the way and you</li> <li>24 have less students that you were looking at,</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This
<ul> <li>17 Inddels like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They revery</li> <li>18 highly correlated. But for an individual</li> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>26 ABROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>27 American Court Reporting</li> <li>28 50.421.0058</li> <li>29 As you go down to the district level and then if</li> <li>20 As you go down to the school level and then if</li> <li>21 you went down to the school level and then down</li> <li>22 to a grade level within the school, would there</li> <li>23 be as you went down each step of the way and you</li> <li>24 have less students that you were looking at,</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>26 As you go down to the variances on these be a lot greater?</li> <li>27 American Court Reporting</li> <li>28 50.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data.
<ul> <li>19 teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one</li> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	237 literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.0, 0.01, 0.02, They're yony	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state.
<ul> <li>20 kid who has terrible attendance in your class,</li> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very highly correlated. But for an individual	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state. MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at State data. obviously there's going to be loss
<ul> <li>and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>some teachers.</li> <li>MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from</li> <li>American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very highly correlated. But for an individual teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state. MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at State data, obviously there's going to be less variance because you have such a great number
<ul> <li>21 and if attendance matters then while it may not</li> <li>22 improve the overall fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>21 you went down to the school level and then down</li> <li>22 to a grade level within the school, would there</li> <li>23 be as you went down each step of the way and you</li> <li>24 have less students that you were looking at,</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very highly correlated. But for an individual teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 90	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state. MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at State data, obviously there's going to be less variance because you have such a great number.
<ul> <li>22 Infprove the overal fit of the model in any</li> <li>23 noticeable way, it may make it different for</li> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> <li>22 to a grade level within the school, would there</li> <li>23 be as you went down each step of the way and you</li> <li>24 have less students that you were looking at,</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting</li> <li>850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very highly correlated. But for an individual teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class, and if attendance matters thon while it may not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state. MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at State data, obviously there's going to be less variance because you have such a great number. As you go down to the district level and then if
<ul> <li>24 some teachers.</li> <li>25 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>26 MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> <li>27 De as you went down each step of the way and you were looking at, 25 would the variances on these be a lot greater? American Court Reporting 850.421.0058</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very highly correlated. But for an individual teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class, and if attendance matters then while it may not improve the overall fit of the model in any	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state. MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at State data, obviously there's going to be less variance because you have such a great number. As you go down to the district level and then if you went down to the school level and then down to a grade level within the school would there
25       MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting 850.421.0058       24       Have less students that you were looking at, 25         would the variances on these be a lot greater? American Court Reporting 850.421.0058       25       would the variances on these be a lot greater? 850.421.0058	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very highly correlated. But for an individual teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class, and if attendance matters then while it may not improve the overall fit of the model in any noticeable way, it may make it different for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state. MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at State data, obviously there's going to be less variance because you have such a great number. As you go down to the district level and then if you went down to the school level and then down to a grade level within the school, would there be as you went down each step of the way and you
American Court Reporting 850.421.0058	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23 24	literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very highly correlated. But for an individual teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class, and if attendance matters then while it may not improve the overall fit of the model in any noticeable way, it may make it different for some teachers	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 24	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state. MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at State data, obviously there's going to be less variance because you have such a great number. As you go down to the district level and then if you went down to the school level and then down to a grade level within the school, would there be as you went down each step of the way and you have less students that you were looking at
850.421.0058 850.421.0058	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very highly correlated. But for an individual teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class, and if attendance matters then while it may not improve the overall fit of the model in any noticeable way, it may make it different for some teachers.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 24 25	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state. MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at State data, obviously there's going to be less variance because you have such a great number. As you go down to the district level and then if you went down to the school level and then down to a grade level within the school, would there be as you went down each step of the way and you have less students that you were looking at, would the variances on these be a lot greater?
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	literatures; do covariates matter at all? Do you capture enough of the variability in prior scores by conditioning on or by using pre-test scores? Pre-test scores seem to capture a whole lot of the variability in student scores because remember that's what these models are doing. They have the lags only, either one or two lags. But when you have only one or two lags, they're comparable when you have one or two lags plus a whole lot of other things. So do those other things buy you anything? DR. COHEN: Harold, we should acknowledge the point John made I think John made it early in the conversation that while in the aggregate these statistics, the teacher effects tend to be correlated across the different models like 0.9, 0.91, 0.92. They're very highly correlated. But for an individual teacher, they may differ. Say you have that one kid who has terrible attendance in your class, and if attendance matters then while it may not improve the overall fit of the model in any noticeable way, it may make it different for some teachers. MS. BROWN: This is what I'm taking from American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	239 MAB (ph). You see a very similar thing here in MAB. By similar, we don't see that this model accounts for very little variability or these ones don't account for little variability while these models account for a whole lot of variability. We see comparable estimates in terms of how much variance in scores the different models account for. So part of the question that we're looking at here is, in terms of accounting for variance test scores, do you buy a lot when you add in more covariates? Do we? PANEL MEMBERS: No. MR. LeTELLIER: Question about that. This is looking at State data. DR. DORAN: It's across the state. MR. LeTELLIER: So as you're looking at State data, obviously there's going to be less variance because you have such a great number. As you go down to the district level and then if you went down to the school level and then down to a grade level within the school, would there be as you went down each step of the way and you have less students that you were looking at, would the variances on these be a lot greater? American Court Reporting

	240		242
1	DR. DORAN: No idea.	1	variance here, the total variance is the
2	DR. COHEN: I can answer part of that. To	2	statewide variance of all students who were in
3	the extent you start to truncate the variance in	3	any math class. So if you start truncating that
4	student achievement, you're going to change the	4	variance by choosing, say, only Algebra 1
5	proportion of variance accounted for, but the	5	students in the 7th grade
6	models should hold pretty well through	6	MS. BROWN: I know, but what I was saving
7	everything. All this is grade level specific;	7	was let's hypothesize that what we're looking at
8	it's not a cross grade. So the grade	8	is Algebra 1. So we're not truncating, we're
9	district is going to look pretty much like the	9	just saying; I'm just trying to do that as a
10	State. So while you might have small	10	very simplistic example. I mean, the point here
11	differences within the model, you wouldn't	11	is the models react similarly to the inclusion
12	expect to see big differences.	12	of the covariate in how they control for the
13	MR. LeTELLIER: Then as you finally went	13	variance in test scores, correct?
14	let's say you're using 7th grade, correct?	14	DR. COHEN: That's right.
15	DR. COHEN: Yes.	15	MS. BROWN: Let me ask it another way. If
16	MR. LeTELLIER: So you're using 7th grade	16	you were to plot this graph 67 times one per
17	just in one school, say there's five 7th grade	17	district, would it look identical?
18	classrooms, and looking at just those five	18	DR. DORAN: Okay. There's an answer to
19	compared to each other.	19	that question. This is on the statement. This
20	DR. COHEN: You would when we say	20	is population. To the degree that districts are
21	variance, the variance is explained by the	21	a representative sample of the state at large,
22	control variables in the current score, in your	22	they would look exactly the same, but they're
23	test scores. Your FCAT score this year, right?	23	not.
24	Your most recent FCAT score.	24	MS. BROWN: That's what I'm saying.
25	If you were to go to, say, a trigonometry	25	They're not.
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	241		243
1	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the	1	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by
1 2	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years,	1 2	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this?
1 2 3	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that	1 2 3	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No.
1 2 3 4	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this	1 2 3 4	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ?
1 2 3 4 5	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that	1 2 3 4 5	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration
1 2 3 4 5 6	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to	1 2 3 4 5 6	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the State level and we're saying that it accounts	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable. MS. BROWN: That's what I wanted you to say
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the State level and we're saying that it accounts for approximately 70% of the variance, would it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable. MS. BROWN: That's what I wanted you to say because that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 0	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the State level and we're saying that it accounts for approximately 70% of the variance, would it then hold true that let's say if we got to a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable. MS. BROWN: That's what I wanted you to say because that MR. MOREHOUSE: That's precisely the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the State level and we're saying that it accounts for approximately 70% of the variance, would it then hold true that let's say if we got to a district level or a school level for the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable. MS. BROWN: That's what I wanted you to say because that MR. MOREHOUSE: That's precisely the problem. Instead of a known impact on those
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 20	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the State level and we're saying that it accounts for approximately 70% of the variance, would it then hold true that let's say if we got to a district level or a school level for the same exact course, even though the level of variance might he different, but would there all he	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 20 21	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable. MS. BROWN: That's what I wanted you to say because that MR. MOREHOUSE: That's precisely the problem. Instead of a known impact on those teachers, they may end up losing their job.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the State level and we're saying that it accounts for approximately 70% of the variance, would it then hold true that let's say if we got to a district level or a school level for the same exact course, even though the level of variance might be different, but would they all be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 20 21 22	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable. MS. BROWN: That's what I wanted you to say because that MR. MOREHOUSE: That's precisely the problem. Instead of a known impact on those teachers, they may end up losing their job. That number could be much more significant than
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the State level and we're saying that it accounts for approximately 70% of the variance, would it then hold true that let's say if we got to a district level or a school level for the same exact course, even though the level of variance might be different, but would they all be consistently the same? Is that your theory that wou're talking about?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 22 23 24	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable. MS. BROWN: That's what I wanted you to say because that MR. MOREHOUSE: That's precisely the problem. Instead of a known impact on those teachers, they may end up losing their job. That number could be much more significant than we realize. I mean, it's one thing to try to achieve parameters.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the State level and we're saying that it accounts for approximately 70% of the variance, would it then hold true that let's say if we got to a district level or a school level for the same exact course, even though the level of variance might be different, but would they all be consistently the same? Is that your theory that you're talking about?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable. MS. BROWN: That's what I wanted you to say because that MR. MOREHOUSE: That's precisely the problem. Instead of a known impact on those teachers, they may end up losing their job. That number could be much more significant than we realize. I mean, it's one thing to try to achieve parsimony, but there's a human element that's involved here
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	241 class in 7th grade where you have only the brightest students, I mean, that's a few years, then you would have very little variance in that dependent variable, so as a proportion this model would be explaining very little of that because there's very little variance there to explain. So it's not exactly it's not always the right question to ask, but when the best fitting lines don't fit the same, odds are you can probably also find where it was. Did that help? MS. BROWN: I think what John's trying to say is, if this was all 7th grade Algebra 1, just say that, that way you're not changing levels of courses, you're not changing abilities; this is what it is. If this is the State level and we're saying that it accounts for approximately 70% of the variance, would it then hold true that let's say if we got to a district level or a school level for the same exact course, even though the level of variance might be different, but would they all be consistently the same? Is that your theory that you're talking about? DR. COHEN: I'm not sure I see, the American Court Penorting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	243 DR. DORAN: So if we did this district by district, would it look exactly like this? MS. BROWN: No. DR. DORAN: No. But how would it differ? It's unknown. It depends on the concentration of students and how those students perform differentially within that. It's an unanswerable question we don't know. To the degree that the districts are a representative sample of the State, the model would hold and would look exactly like this. To the degree that districts systematically differ from the State in terms of their student characteristics in the population, it will be different. We cannot give you an answer in terms of would it be high or would it be low? It is unanswerable. MS. BROWN: That's what I wanted you to say because that MR. MOREHOUSE: That's precisely the problem. Instead of a known impact on those teachers, they may end up losing their job. That number could be much more significant than we realize. I mean, it's one thing to try to achieve parsimony, but there's a human element that's involved here.

	244		246
1	DR. DORAN: There is a human element. I'm	1	that because we see no variance here; but yet if
2	going to go back to this. We should have shown	2	I use that model versus the five variable one in
3	this graph. Suppose we take a model that has no	3	Miami-Dade then I'm going to have a better
4	covariates and a model that has a whole lot of	4	analysis than maybe as a state organization we
5	covariates and on the scatter plot, the	5	decide we're going to go with the complex model
6	correlation between those models was really	6	because that's going to balance out the
7	close to zero then we would be able to say this	7	differentiated students level at Miami-Dade
8	matters a lot to teacher classifications, but it	8	versus a school that's very different. So to me
9	doesn't We should show you that the	9	it's an issue of going with a very simple model
10	correlation between the teacher effects under	10	hecause it's easier to explain or with a complex
11	the different models is so highly correlated	11	model that will belo us pick up all the
12	the different models is so flightly correlated	12	differentiation from the diversity
12	Now why I don't know it's going to change for	12	DP DOPAN: Now before L ap over to you
13	a number of teachers, but in large part it does	13	just and second Lat's be clear. We're not
14	a number of teachers, but in large part it does	14	Just one second. Let's be clean. We're not
15	MP Letell IEP. Con you - I know port of	15	medal ever another because it's easier to
10	MR. LETELLIER: Call you I know part of	10	
17	the thing is, you know, last time we asked you	1/	explain.
18	to run certain things and all that, and I have	18	MS. FEILD: No, no, I understand. I
19	no idea now nard it is to run stuff, so I m	19	understand.
20	asking can you run sometning numbers for	20	DR. DORAN: Whether these control variables
21	three different counties or two different	21	do a better job in predicting where students
22	counties that are completely different to see?	22	should be and this statistic is showing whether
23	Because one of the things is if you're saying	23	or not including the variables does a better job
24	the average county the average is here, but	24	in forming those predictions, and this model
25	we could have counties, let's say that there's	25	here, for example, doesn't do a substantially
			American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	045		0.47
	245		247
1	245 four or five counties that fall well below these	1	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does
1 2 2	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for these counties, for these schools	1 2 2	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does
1 2 3	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a bugg impact. I think in that	1 2 3	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to evaluate
1 2 3 4	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that	1 2 3 4	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you apything statistically to do
1 2 3 4 5	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we	1 2 3 4 5	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized what	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative: I could be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its operational status? So that would be my	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative; I could be wrong and I think where John was going was it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its operational status? So that would be my question	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative; I could be wrong and I think where John was going was it seems like a pretty as well, it's easy for us
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its operational status? So that would be my question.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 920	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative; I could be wrong and I think where John was going was it seems like a pretty well, it's easy for us because we don't have to run it. Let me preface
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its operational status? So that would be my question. MS. FEILD: No, but I was going to say you're right, but the issue is going back to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative; I could be wrong and I think where John was going was it seems like a pretty well, it's easy for us because we don't have to run it. Let me preface it by that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its operational status? So that would be my question. MS. FEILD: No, but I was going to say you're right, but the issue is going back to Anna's comment or someone else, if we choose not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative; I could be wrong and I think where John was going was it seems like a pretty well, it's easy for us because we don't have to run it. Let me preface it by that. But it's something we could rule out. If
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 22 23	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its operational status? So that would be my question. MS. FEILD: No, but I was going to say you're right, but the issue is going back to Anna's comment or someone else, if we choose not to include the complex model that had 20	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative; I could be wrong and I think where John was going was it seems like a pretty well, it's easy for us because we don't have to run it. Let me preface it by that. But it's something we could rule out. If we took a Miami-Dade and a Madison County and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its operational status? So that would be my question. MS. FEILD: No, but I was going to say you're right, but the issue is going back to Anna's comment or someone else, if we choose not to include the complex model that had 20 variables because we don't want to say to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative; I could be wrong and I think where John was going was it seems like a pretty well, it's easy for us because we don't have to run it. Let me preface it by that. But it's something we could rule out. If we took a Miami-Dade and a Madison County and three or four others that run the spectrum of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 6 7 8 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its operational status? So that would be my question. MS. FEILD: No, but I was going to say you're right, but the issue is going back to Anna's comment or someone else, if we choose not to include the complex model that had 20 variables because we don't want to say to teachers, yeah, we included this this this or	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative; I could be wrong and I think where John was going was it seems like a pretty well, it's easy for us because we don't have to run it. Let me preface it by that. But it's something we could rule out. If we took a Miami-Dade and a Madison County and three or four others that run the spectrum of demographics, run them again and we see this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	245 four or five counties that fall well below these averages, and that by not including the variables for those counties, for those schools, it would make a huge impact. I think in that case that's what we're looking at because we on the statewide level, fine, they all look the same, but DR. DORAN: I want Juan to weigh in on this in just a moment here. One of the things that I understand, this is a statewide model, but supposing we run this on different districts and we see differences. The models won't be run district by district. So I'm not sure it while it might be interesting to look at in terms of the policy, in terms of how this model becomes implemented and operationalized, what would the question be that would impact its operational status? So that would be my question. MS. FEILD: No, but I was going to say you're right, but the issue is going back to Anna's comment or someone else, if we choose not to include the complex model that had 20 variables because we don't want to say to teachers, yeah, we included this, this, this, or American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	247 better job in forming student predictions for all students in the state than this model does here. So the criteria by which we evaluate this is not in terms of its transparency to explain, but does it buy you anything statistically to do a better job in forming student predictions, and not for one district, but for every key of the state. MR. FOERSTER: Harold, I think the point is. That because this analysis has only been done at the State level, we may come to a conclusion based on a false sense of security that these variables don't matter ever, and they may not matter ever. I actually am in the camp that likely most districts are going to be pretty statistically representative; I could be wrong and I think where John was going was it seems like a pretty well, it's easy for us because we don't have to run it. Let me preface it by that. But it's something we could rule out. If we took a Miami-Dade and a Madison County and three or four others that run the spectrum of demographics, run them again and we see this American Court Reporting

	248		250
1	again very even distribution in terms of	1	And the R-Square itself is a function of the
2	accountability of variance; then I think	2	formula, so the comparison of R-Squares across
3	everybody would be comfortable in buying the	3	districts is probably not a direction we want to
4	argument that parsimony matters and we'd take	4	go. I think one direction back to I think
5	the simple model. If we find out that there are	5	Gisela's point or Sam's point that you add a
6	significant variances across the districts then	6	control variable for ELL for example and it
7	if I took Anna's point there's reason to believe	7	might not add much explanatory power of the
8	that accepting the more complicated model	8	formula but it's statistically significant and
q	matters for some people, even though if you look	q	controlling for ELL may make a huge difference
10	at it at the State level, you can argue that it	10	in Miami-Dade County where you have a lot of FLL
11	doesn't: individual districts you can argue that	11	students and not make a difference in Liberty
12	it does: and there	12	County where there's very few FLL very few
12	MS_BROWN: There have been truncates all	12	students at all No offense to Liberty County
13	the way down to individual teachers	13	So maybe back to some of the other points
14	DANEL MEMPERS: (Over speaking)	14	so maybe back to some of the other points
15	MR EOEDSTED: Which is whore Lawrence has	15	about mustilations on similar types of
10	MR. I OLKSTER. Which is where Lawrence has	10	cerciers, what would their value and score be
17	duese the question I'm accuming the committee	17	across different models, something doing those
10	guess the question I in assuming the commutee	10	results; I think young down this road of
19	these kinds of coloulations. Is it possible?	19	I dep't think that's really a viable read to ge
20	COULTNL I would expect it a probably	20	I don't think that's really a viable road to go
21	DR. COHEN: I would expect it's probably	21	down to since we will not eventually be
22	possible to do a comparison for two or three	22	estimating 67 different formulas. I mean, it's
23	D. Causes New if the variance in student	23	one statewide formula applied across the 67
24	R-Square. Now II the variance in student	24	counties. So it's really a question of now
25	American Court Poperting	25	Amorican Court Reporting
	850 421 0058		850 421 0058
	249		251
1	249 variance in student achievement is different	1	251 counties.
1	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at,	1	counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what
1 2 3	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact	1 2 3	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said.
1 2 3 4	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance,	1 2 3 4	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to
1 2 3 4 5	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained	1 2 3 4 5	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this
1 2 3 4 5 6	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do	1 2 3 4 5 6	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact. Let me just draw this real quickly.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide that we almost took out. I think it's next.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact. Let me just draw this real quickly. MR. FOERSTER: Are you going the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide that we almost took out. I think it's next. There we go. So we looked at the effect of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact. Let me just draw this real quickly. MR. FOERSTER: Are you going the same place?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide that we almost took out. I think it's next. There we go. So we looked at the effect of the different of all the different control
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact. Let me just draw this real quickly. MR. FOERSTER: Are you going the same place? MS. BROWN: I don't know.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide that we almost took out. I think it's next. There we go. So we looked at the effect of the different of all the different control variables that you guys wanted to take a look at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact. Let me just draw this real quickly. MR. FOERSTER: Are you going the same place? MS. BROWN: I don't know. MR. COPA: Let me try something. Back to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide that we almost took out. I think it's next. There we go. So we looked at the effect of the different of all the different control variables that you guys wanted to take a look at and we so there are some things that we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact. Let me just draw this real quickly. MR. FOERSTER: Are you going the same place? MS. BROWN: I don't know. MR. COPA: Let me try something. Back to I think Harold mentioned it, we're developing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide that we almost took out. I think it's next. There we go. So we looked at the effect of the different of all the different control variables that you guys wanted to take a look at and we so there are some things that we control for that are not on this slide. This
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact. Let me just draw this real quickly. MR. FOERSTER: Are you going the same place? MS. BROWN: I don't know. MR. COPA: Let me try something. Back to I think Harold mentioned it, we're developing a State formula, so we're not going to be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide that we almost took out. I think it's next. There we go. So we looked at the effect of the different of all the different control variables that you guys wanted to take a look at and we so there are some things that we control for that are not on this slide. This slide does not show you the co-efficiencies
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact. Let me just draw this real quickly. MR. FOERSTER: Are you going the same place? MS. BROWN: I don't know. MR. COPA: Let me try something. Back to I think Harold mentioned it, we're developing a State formula, so we're not going to be calculating 67 different formulas, for example.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide that we almost took out. I think it's next. There we go. So we looked at the effect of the different of all the different control variables that you guys wanted to take a look at and we so there are some things that we control for that are not on this slide. This slide does not show you the co-efficiencies associated with prior achievement score.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	249 variance in student achievement is different across the different counties that we look at, you will see differences and that's just a fact of life. The more you truncate the variance, the lower the proportion of variance explained is going to be. Also, so if we're going to do that, we'd like to do it with and if that's a statistic you want to look at, we should probably do with districts that have a lot of variation in student achievement paralleling the State. You also get if you truncate the current score variance, like the FCAT variance by choosing say very low performing districts, you'll also change all of the co-efficients in the model, not because the world operates different there but from a statistical artifact. Let me just draw this real quickly. MR. FOERSTER: Are you going the same place? MS. BROWN: I don't know. MR. COPA: Let me try something. Back to I think Harold mentioned it, we're developing a State formula, so we're not going to be calculating 67 different formulas, for example. American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	251 counties. MS. FEILD: Exactly. That's exactly what we're talking about. Very well said. MS. STEWART: And to kind of go to something that Anna said at the start of this conversation, is there a downside? Is there a harm to including more variables? DR. COHEN: There's not harm. Parsimony says fewer is better, it's less data you have to worry about cleaning up. The harm only comes in when you start adding variables that are very highly correlated with one another. So two variables are very much the same, you don't want to include both of them to make everything less precise. But you don't have that problem with any of the stuff we've considered so far. But actually let me move on to the slide that we almost took out. I think it's next. There we go. So we looked at the effect of the different of all the different control variables that you guys wanted to take a look at and we so there are some things that we control for that are not on this slide. This slide does not show you the co-efficiencies associated with prior achievement score. American Court Reporting

	252		254
1	They're huge, they're significant, they make a	1	MS. WESTPHAL: Is your effect not your
2	big difference. There's a bunch of indicator	2	effect, your the yellow one, is that based on
3	variables that we have to include for technical	3	incidents, high numbers because your numbers are
4	reasons, all kinds of stuff that goes in there	4	not lining up for me? Like, look at dual
5	for technical reasons that I can talk about if	5	sensory is that not significant because
6	you want. These are the substantive variables	6	there's only there's such a low independent
7	that you guys wanted included and that will be	7	nonulation?
8	looked at and the vellow highlight tells you	8	DR COHEN. It may be if it's very rare to
9	which ones were statistically significant	9	quite a few cases then
10	Remember we had the variances explained across	10	MS WESTPHAL: It seems like that's the
11	these three models were not very different but	11	correlation then
12	you do see some things that show up as	12	DR COHEN: Certainly the fewer kids you
13	statistically significant and we can then walk	13	have the less likely you are to see a
14	through these and think about whether you want	14	statistically significant effect
15	to keep them in the model	15	MS_WESTPHAL: Okay, but wouldn't it be
16	So language impaired these are all SWD	16	significant to the teacher who only teachers
17	variables all the different SWD variables. The	17	dual sensory impaired?
10	more things you include the fewer of them are	10	DP COHEN: This model save we don't know:
10	statistically significant. That's what I was	10	we can't distinguish it from what would happen
20	soving about introducing things that are	20	by chance. All right Let's look at these
20	correlated with one another. But in general	20	The difference from the model ago if you're one
21	many of the SWD variables are statistically	21	voar behind, one voar behind, se essentially
22	significant. You might want to loave them in	22	year bernind, one year bernind, so essentially
23	there. You may want to go through and cay lot's	23	you're likely to have been retained by one year
24	keep these and let's get rid of these all the	24	you're likely to have been retained by one year,
25	Amorican Court Poporting	25	Amorican Court Ponorting
	850 421 0058		
	050.421:0000		000.421.0000
	/6.4		766
1	203	1	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large
1	253 ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to	1	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect
1 2 3	253 ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there	1 2 3	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect.
1 2 3	253 ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there.	1 2 3	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids
1 2 3 4 5	253 ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect	1 2 3 4 5	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think
1 2 3 4 5 6	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small pegative effect meaning that	1 2 3 4 5 6	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance Attendance has a significant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient also. So we measured attendance
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present. not days absent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class. I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think And if it is statistically	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and in order to make it fit on the slide, we put it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high but now we're into the range that you actually
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and in order to make it fit on the slide, we put it on one thing.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high but now we're into the range that you actually see a bunch of that, would be a 4 point
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and in order to make it fit on the slide, we put it on one thing. Homogeneity in classes. Oddly, in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high but now we're into the range that you actually see a bunch of that, would be a 4 point different. More attendance is better: kids
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and in order to make it fit on the slide, we put it on one thing. Homogeneity in classes. Oddly, in the first class it's not significant: in the second	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high but now we're into the range that you actually see a bunch of that, would be a 4 point different. More attendance is better; kids learn more when they're in school. according to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and in order to make it fit on the slide, we put it on one thing. Homogeneity in classes. Oddly, in the first class it's not significant; in the second class it is, but it's a very small effect.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high but now we're into the range that you actually see a bunch of that, would be a 4 point different. More attendance is better; kids learn more when they're in school, according to this model.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 8 9 20 21 22 23	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and in order to make it fit on the slide, we put it on one thing. Homogeneity in classes. Oddly, in the first class it's not significant; in the second class it is, but it's a very small effect. That's probably where you deal with noise.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high but now we're into the range that you actually see a bunch of that, would be a 4 point different. More attendance is better; kids learn more when they're in school, according to this model. And in all of our models there's a big
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and in order to make it fit on the slide, we put it on one thing. Homogeneity in classes. Oddly, in the first class it's not significant; in the second class it is, but it's a very small effect. That's probably where you deal with noise. These are things that appear only in the kitchen	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high but now we're into the range that you actually see a bunch of that, would be a 4 point different. More attendance is better; kids learn more when they're in school, according to this model. And in all of our models there's a big effect, about a 28 point effect, under expected
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and in order to make it fit on the slide, we put it on one thing. Homogeneity in classes. Oddly, in the first class it's not significant; in the second class it is, but it's a very small effect. That's probably where you deal with noise. These are things that appear only in the kitchen sink model we call it, Model 3C.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high but now we're into the range that you actually see a bunch of that, would be a 4 point different. More attendance is better; kids learn more when they're in school, according to this model. And in all of our models there's a big effect, about a 28 point effect, under expected score of being ELL. This is after controlling
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	ones that aren't significant, but then you have to explain that to somebody so maybe you want to leave them all in there. Class size for the first class is statistically significant. It's a small effect and it's a small negative effect, meaning that teachers in smaller classes seem to have slightly higher value-added scores. If the typical teacher has a class of about 20 students then that's about four scaled score points. Adding it after 20 students would decrease your score by about four scale score points. So it's a small it's not going to a 40 person class, I don't think. And if it is statistically significant and it's there. We went up to six classes and in classes three through six nothing was significant. None of it was significant and in order to make it fit on the slide, we put it on one thing. Homogeneity in classes. Oddly, in the first class it's not significant; in the second class it is, but it's a very small effect. That's probably where you deal with noise. These are things that appear only in the kitchen sink model we call it, Model 3C. American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 24 25	255 expected for you. That's a reasonably large effect. Mobility. One transition is going to drop your expected score by five points. Some kids have three, four, five transitions. I think five is a lot. Attendance. Attendance has a significant effect in both models and a very similar co-efficient, also. So we measured attendance in terms of days present, not days absent because the different counties have different numbers of school days. Is that right? Yeah, okay. So let's say a huge difference, 100 day difference so I can do the math would be a 16 point difference; so a 50 day difference in attendance would be an 8 point difference; a 25 day difference in attendance would still be high but now we're into the range that you actually see a bunch of that, would be a 4 point different. More attendance is better; kids learn more when they're in school, according to this model. And in all of our models there's a big effect, about a 28 point effect, under expected score of being ELL. This is after controlling American Court Reporting

	256		258
1	for your prior scores. So some of these things,	1	you can take for all the SWD variables, you
2	even though it doesn't improve the fit of the	2	can take the difference and it's just a straight
3	model, it will make differences in expectations	3	point difference in what you expect their score
4	for individual teachers. So a teacher who's got	4	to be
5	a kid who's absent a lot if two or three kids	5	MS MARSALA: How come SWD 7 goes from a
6	are absent a lot, the expectation even though	6	negative to a positive?
7	the P-Square descript change, the expectation for	7	
2 0	what the kids will do and therefore the	0	MS_MAPSALA: Everything else stays the
0	standards to which they're being held will yary	0	como
9 10	a lot if you include the attendance	10	DR COHEN: This and is barely significant
10	MS_WOODHOUSE VOUNCY You've highlighted	10	in a very large cample. Brebably the other
11	MS. WOODHOUSE-TOUNG. Tou ve highlighted	11	things that are highly correlated to this. I
12	some negative values and then I see up where you	12	would bet that this is correlated with
13	that's not highlighted. But then we have	13	attendance, that students with emotional
14	highlighted here possible 7.0 I deplt	14	behavioral disorders are probably not attending
15	inginighted here negative 7.0. I don't	15	L den't know that because I didn't look at the
10	understand the number, just the values, why some	10	
17	are highlighted. I understand the negative and	17	Udld.
10	MD EOEDSTED: What's the range? What do	10	MS. MARSALA: It's the next one.
19	MR. FOERSTER. What's the range? What do	19	MC MARCALA: It's a pagative 2.7 the
20	MS_WOODHOUSE VOUNCY I don't understand	20	MS. MARSALA. It's a negative 2.7, the
21	why some things are highlighted and why some	21	bishor
22	aren't	22	MS RROWN: On one model they're expected
23	DR COHEN: Okay akay If comothing's not	23	to go down and
24	bightighted that means in these models we	24	MS MARSALA: Dight
25	American Court Penorting	25	MS. MARSALA. Right.
	850 421 0058		850 421 0058
	000.121.0000		000.121.0000
	257		259
1	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not	1	259 DR COHEN: Yeah and what that means and
1 2	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant.	1	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it
1 2 3	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't	1 2 3	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in
1 2 3 4	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08?	1 2 3 4	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's
1 2 3 4 5	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DB. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore	1 2 3 4 5	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is
1 2 3 4 5 6	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling	1 2 3 4 5 6	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's vellow, that means that it is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LETELLIER: So kids with emotional
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted? DR. COHEN: Yeah.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted? DR. COHEN: Yeah. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LETELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted? DR. COHEN: Yeah. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted? DR. COHEN: Yeah. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me? DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted? DR. COHEN: Yeah. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me? DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a 1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 112 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 112 112 112 112 112 112 112 112 112	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted? DR. COHEN: Yeah. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me? DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a 1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been coded as other health impaired, his expected	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We hadn't highlighted it because that one's not
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted? DR. COHEN: Yeah. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me? DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a 1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been coded as other health impaired, his expected score, his expected growth is going to be almost	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We hadn't highlighted it because that one's not statistically significant. It might be good to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: Yeah.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a 1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been coded as other health impaired, his expected score, his expected growth is going to be almost eight points less than the kid who doesn't have</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We hadn't highlighted it because that one's not statistically significant. It might be good to chance.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore</li> <li>it because it could just be due to sampling</li> <li>error. If it's yellow, that means that it is</li> <li>not due to change.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92</li> <li>that's highlighted I can't see what it's</li> <li>actually related to and then the negative</li> <li>5.36, that's highlighted?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: Yeah.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers</li> <li>themselves, what does that mean to me?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a</li> <li>1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been</li> <li>coded as other health impaired, his expected</li> <li>score, his expected growth is going to be almost</li> <li>eight points less than the kid who doesn't have</li> <li>that condition. If you put other things in the</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LETELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LETELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We hadn't highlighted it because that one's not statistically significant. It might be good to chance. MR. LETELLIER: Okay, let's look at SW-13
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	257 couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08? DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted? DR. COHEN: Yeah. MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me? DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a 1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been coded as other health impaired, his expected score, his expected growth is going to be almost eight points less than the kid who doesn't have that condition. If you put other things in the model, it's minus 5. These two numbers are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We hadn't highlighted it because that one's not statistically significant. It might be good to chance. MR. LeTELLIER: Okay, let's look at SW-13 and SW-14. Go to the second yeah. That's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: Yeah.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a 1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been coded as other health impaired, his expected score, his expected growth is going to be almost eight points less than the kid who doesn't have that condition. If you put other things in the model, it's minus 5. These two numbers are probably not different than each other. That's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We hadn't highlighted it because that one's not statistically significant. It might be good to chance. MR. LeTELLIER: Okay, let's look at SW-13 and SW-14. Go to the second yeah. That's negative 5.36 that's highlighted. The one
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24	<ul> <li>couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: Yeah.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a 1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been coded as other health impaired, his expected score, his expected growth is going to be almost eight points less than the kid who doesn't have that condition. If you put other things in the model, it's minus 5. These two numbers are probably not different than each other. That's within chance, but just due to the other things</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We hadn't highlighted it because that one's not statistically significant. It might be good to chance. MR. LeTELLIER: Okay, let's look at SW-13 and SW-14. Go to the second yeah. That's negative 5.36 that's highlighted. The one underneath it is negative 8.36 which is a
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<ul> <li>couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: Yeah.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a 1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been coded as other health impaired, his expected score, his expected growth is going to be almost eight points less than the kid who doesn't have that condition. If you put other things in the model, it's minus 5. These two numbers are probably not different than each other. That's within chance, but just due to the other things you're including in the model. So all the SWDs,</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We hadn't highlighted it because that one's not statistically significant. It might be good to chance. MR. LeTELLIER: Okay, let's look at SW-13 and SW-14. Go to the second yeah. That's negative 5.36 that's highlighted. The one underneath it is negative 8.36 which is a greater point difference just in simple terms.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<ul> <li>couldn't distinguish it from chance. It was not statistically significant.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers don't mean anything, though, the negative 10.08?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: If it's white, probably ignore it because it could just be due to sampling error. If it's yellow, that means that it is not due to change.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So that negative 7.92 that's highlighted I can't see what it's actually related to and then the negative 5.36, that's highlighted?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: Yeah.</li> <li>MS. WOODHOUSE-YOUNG: So the numbers themselves, what does that mean to me?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: These variables are coded as a 1 or a zero. That means that a kid who has been coded as other health impaired, his expected score, his expected growth is going to be almost eight points less than the kid who doesn't have that condition. If you put other things in the model, it's minus 5. These two numbers are probably not different than each other. That's within chance, but just due to the other things you're including in the model. So all the SWDs, American Court Reporting</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 21 22 23 24 25	259 DR. COHEN: Yeah, and what that means, and I can't tell you specifically, that it correlates with one of these variables that's in this model and not the other model. It's correlated with that. So something else here is explaining that effect, actually over-explaining that effect and having it turn around. MS. MARSALA: So they are in school more DR. COHEN: Maybe the are in school more, maybe they're in smaller classes. MR. LeTELLIER: So kids with emotional problems are going to score 2.82 points higher? DR. COHEN: Okay, I'm sorry. I read the wrong line. MR. LeTELLIER: No, no, that's the one she was DR. COHEN: Yes, but it's not yellow. We hadn't highlighted it because that one's not statistically significant. It might be good to chance. MR. LeTELLIER: Okay, let's look at SW-13 and SW-14. Go to the second yeah. That's negative 5.36 that's highlighted. The one underneath it is negative 8.36 which is a greater point difference just in simple terms. American Court Reporting

	000		000
			262
1	inat's not nignlighted. So I think the point	1	but the rest are pretty decent significant
2	system is not clear in my nead anyway. I don't	2	effects. Remember, we're dealing with a very
3	know.	3	large sample nere.
4	DR. HOVANETZ: Jon, just to be clear, these	4	MR. TOMEI: But for some of those
5	are developmental scales, those points. So	5	individual categories, you may not be dealing
6	think about it; we're talking about a	6	with a very large sample.
7	developmental scale for the FCAT which is 0 to	7	DR. COHEN: That's right, that's right.
8	3,000; and not putting this necessarily in the	8	For some of the individual categories you may
9	context of school level accountability, but I'm	9	have very few kids, particularly the multiple
10	putting it in the context of school level	10	dual
11	accountability. When you're looking at a	11	MR. TOMEI: Right, which is why you see
12	student in reading going from grade 3 to grade	12	large numbers up there that aren't statistically
13	4, the expectations in reading is that they	13	significant in a small
14	learn 280-some points in order to make a year's	14	DR. DORAN: But standard error
15	worth of progress. So when we're talking about	15	MR. TOMEI: So my next question, we're
16	two points on the developmental scale score for	16	actually looking at anticipated variances in the
17	a specific learning disabled student, the swing	17	outcomes. Does that equate to an effect size
18	of four points on a 3,000 point scale or when we	18	for all intents and purposes or would that be
19	talk about a year's worth of knowledge and a	19	DR. DORAN: Yes, it's a natural effect,
20	year's worth of time for school accountability	20	it's an effect on the scale that you're
21	purposes, the minimum expectation is 77 points	21	interested in seeing. So for example, I'd like
22	and that's 9 to 10. So the two points from the	22	to talk about these things call effect sizes.
23	policy perspective is not huge movement on that	23	and an effect size is sort of a metric that we
24	developmental scale So keep that kind of as	24	can use to make a judgment on That's what
25	your context that yes they are specifically	25	Lance is talking about here
20	American Court Reporting	20	American Court Reporting
	850 421 0058		850 421 0058
	261		263
1	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3.000	1	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We
1	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale.	1	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the
1 2 3	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam?	1 2 3	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we
1 2 3 4	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this.	1 2 3 4	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would
1 2 3 4 5	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at for instance the other	1 2 3 4 5	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Bonda, but here
1 2 3 4 5 6	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a pegative 5 36 on the	1 2 3 4 5 6	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C that would indicate that their	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year ECAT	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS_STEWART: Not just overall everybody.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Pight it compares kids by the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an offect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000 you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whather or not it's statistically significant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower. MS. STEWART: Right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 11 2 11 2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whether or not it's statistically significant.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower. MS. STEWART: Right. MR. TOMEI: Just a minor point. What was	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 90	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whether or not it's statistically significant. DR. DORAN: There's practical significance and there's statistical significance
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 24	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower. MS. STEWART: Right. MR. TOMEI: Just a minor point. What was your P-value calculated?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whether or not it's statistically significant. DR. DORAN: There's practical significance and there's statistical significance, and they're not one in the scame
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower. MS. STEWART: Right. MR. TOMEI: Just a minor point. What was your P-value calculated? DR. COHEN: I don't know offhand. I can	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whether or not it's statistically significant. DR. DORAN: There's practical significance and there's statistical significance, and they're not one in the same.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower. MS. STEWART: Right. MR. TOMEI: Just a minor point. What was your P-value calculated? DR. COHEN: I don't know offhand. I can get them for you. We took just a little over	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whether or not it's statistically significant. DR. DORAN: There's practical significance and there's statistical significance, and they're not one in the same. I am going to go to the next slide and get
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower. MS. STEWART: Right. MR. TOMEI: Just a minor point. What was your P-value calculated? DR. COHEN: I don't know offhand. I can get them for you. We took just a little over the 0.05. We took two standard errors out and bisblighted it unlow. There were a negative	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 2	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whether or not it's statistically significant. DR. DORAN: There's practical significance and there's statistical significance, and they're not one in the same. I am going to go to the next slide and get you through the last piece of criteria. Is that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower. MS. STEWART: Right. MR. TOMEI: Just a minor point. What was your P-value calculated? DR. COHEN: I don't know offhand. I can get them for you. We took just a little over the 0.05. We took two standard errors out and highlighted it yellow. There were a couple	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 8 9 20 21 22 23 24 5	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whether or not it's statistically significant. DR. DORAN: There's practical significance and there's statistical significance, and they're not one in the same. I am going to go to the next slide and get you through the last piece of criteria. Is that okay, Sam? Because there's a long conversation
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower. MS. STEWART: Right. MR. TOMEI: Just a minor point. What was your P-value calculated? DR. COHEN: I don't know offhand. I can get them for you. We took just a little over the 0.05. We took two standard errors out and highlighted it yellow. There were a couple among the SWD things that were only marginal, American Court Departing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whether or not it's statistically significant. DR. DORAN: There's practical significance and there's statistical significance, and they're not one in the same. I am going to go to the next slide and get you through the last piece of criteria. Is that okay, Sam? Because there's a long conversation that this group needs to have without me. The
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	261 significant, but what does that mean on a 3,000 point scale. DR. COHEN: Pam? MS. STEWART: Just so I'm clear on this, when we looked at, for instance, the other health impaired that has a negative 5.36 on the Model 3C, that would indicate that their extensive DSS was 5 points lower than other students in that same range of prior year FCAT scores? DR. COHEN: Yes. MS. STEWART: Not just overall everybody, but as you look at comparison with other DR. COHEN: Right, it compares kids by the same prior year's score, the same ELL, the same attendance. Everything else being equal, maybe five points lower. MS. STEWART: Right. MR. TOMEI: Just a minor point. What was your P-value calculated? DR. COHEN: I don't know offhand. I can get them for you. We took just a little over the 0.05. We took two standard errors out and highlighted it yellow. There were a couple among the SWD things that were only marginal, American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	263 Here we have a natural effect size. We don't need to convert it to anything because the effect is a 13.7 difference, and so if we converted it to a standardized effect it would be interpretable to you and to Ronda, but here it's a natural effect on the scale of measurement. MR. TOMEI: The reason I ask that question is because of the earlier comment. If you're looking at a 3,000 point scale and you see a plus or minus two potential on two different models for specific learning disabilities, although it's statistically significant because that's probably a large end population across the entire state, when you're looking at an effect size of about 2 on a scale of 3,000, you have to wonder how useful is that regardless of whether or not it's statistically significant. DR. DORAN: There's practical significance and there's statistical significance, and they're not one in the same. I am going to go to the next slide and get you through the last piece of criteria. Is that okay, Sam? Because there's a long conversation that this group needs to have without me. The American Court Reporting

	264		266
1	last thing that we're going to look at for now;	1	pronounced in this subject as they are in
2	there's a lot more to look at there's a lot	2	reading, but the difference is there. We see
3	more data to look at. We're not going to get	3	smaller average in standard errors in two lags
4	through it today. We're going to look at the	4	than we do with just one.
5	question of whether or not you should include	5	Now if you want to make a more holistic
6	one or two lags or one or two prior test scores.	6	judgment, you can turn back to the box plots
7	So what's the question? Should the	7	that we showed you of the standard errors and
8	value-added model include one or two prior	8	you can look at all of them. So we're not
9	achievement test scores for students? Remember,	9	robbing you of that information. But for sake
10	when we say one or two we're talking about an	10	of making a direct comparison, we choose two
11	independent variable, so if we include two that	11	comparable models, comparable, and they're three
12	means we actually have three test scores: The	12	levels and some other characteristics and they
13	dependent variable, the current score, and then	13	differ only in terms of the lags.
14	the two prior scores.	14	So what other observations do we make here
15	So we're going to look at the standard	15	that are meaningful? Anything?
16	errors again because those statistics are	16	This is a relatively straightforward
17	relevant in helping inform this decision, and	17	criterion.
18	what we're going to look at evidence in favor	18	MR. LeTELLIER: It just looks like there's
19	of a desirable model is the same thing in	19	less error when you go two years.
20	lower standard error so we can find anything in	20	DR. DORAN: Looks like particularly in
21	terms of precision, and what do we care? Well,	21	reading the estimates appear to be a bit more
22	as you bring more information into the	22	precise relative to what you observed in math.
23	statistical model, you may or you may not do a	23	MS. FEILD: The problem is, though, you
24	better job in forming a more precise teacher	24	have a lot of grade levels that by nature of the
25	effect. If you bring in more information, but	25	grade level to go back to the reading, you're
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	265		267
1	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of	1	267 not going to have teachers having that much
1 2	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are	1 2	267 not going to have teachers having that much data.
1 2 3	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it?	1 2 3	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to
1 2 3 4	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it	1 2 3 4	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would
1 2 3 4 5	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe	1 2 3 4 5	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate
1 2 3 4 5 6	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well,	1 2 3 4 5 6	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models. I took the liberty of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags: it's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No. I get that but if you go
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact, these are the exact same if you went back to the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No, I get that but if you go back to your reading chart and probably that's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact, these are the exact same if you went back to the box plot' and if you want to compare it you can	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No, I get that but if you go back to your reading chart and probably that's the way it should be. What has to be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact, these are the exact same if you went back to the box plot; and if you want to compare it you can certainly do that, but for here looking at the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No, I get that but if you go back to your reading chart and probably that's the way it should be. What has to be communicated to the teachers or the stakeholders
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact, these are the exact same if you went back to the box plot; and if you want to compare it you can certainly do that, but for here looking at the comparison, what we see here again that black	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No, I get that but if you go back to your reading chart and probably that's the way it should be. What has to be communicated to the teachers or the stakeholders is that there is differentiation on the standard
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact, these are the exact same if you went back to the box plot; and if you want to compare it you can certainly do that, but for here looking at the comparison, what we see here again that black dot showing that we have smaller average	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 22	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No, I get that but if you go back to your reading chart and probably that's the way it should be. What has to be communicated to the teachers or the stakeholders is that there is differentiation on the standard of error for 4th grade teachers. let's say.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact, these are the exact same if you went back to the box plot; and if you want to compare it you can certainly do that, but for here looking at the comparison, what we see here again that black dot showing that we have smaller average standard errors in the model with the two lags	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No, I get that but if you go back to your reading chart and probably that's the way it should be. What has to be communicated to the teachers or the stakeholders is that there is differentiation on the standard of error for 4th grade teachers, let's say, yersus 5th grade or higher just because of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact, these are the exact same if you went back to the box plot; and if you want to compare it you can certainly do that, but for here looking at the comparison, what we see here again that black dot showing that we have smaller average standard errors in the model with the two lags relative to the model with one in reading. and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No, I get that but if you go back to your reading chart and probably that's the way it should be. What has to be communicated to the teachers or the stakeholders is that there is differentiation on the standard of error for 4th grade teachers, let's say, versus 5th grade or higher just because of the nature of the model. So if you present just to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact, these are the exact same if you went back to the box plot; and if you want to compare it you can certainly do that, but for here looking at the comparison, what we see here again that black dot showing that we have smaller average standard errors in the model with the two lags relative to the model with one in reading, and here's math; the differences are not as	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25 23 24 25 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No, I get that but if you go back to your reading chart and probably that's the way it should be. What has to be communicated to the teachers or the stakeholders is that there is differentiation on the standard of error for 4th grade teachers, let's say, versus 5th grade or higher just because of the nature of the model. So if you present just to 3A and say we're using two years. but if you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	265 it doesn't buy you anything in terms of precision then we would ask the question why are we doing it? But if you bring in more information and it buys you a lot in terms of precision then maybe it's something that's reasonable to do. Well, those are the judgments that you'll be looking at here. This is the question, this is the statistic and what we're looking for and why you should care. So here what I've done instead of taking all of the models, I took the liberty of choosing two models that were comparable but different only in terms of the number of lags, and 3A1 has the one and 3A has both. These are boxed plots that we looked at at the beginning of the day of the standard errors. In fact, these are the exact same if you went back to the box plot; and if you want to compare it you can certainly do that, but for here looking at the comparison, what we see here again that black dot showing that we have smaller average standard errors in the model with the two lags relative to the model with one in reading, and here's math; the differences are not as American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	267 not going to have teachers having that much data. DR. DORAN: Now suppose this group were to say we're going to include two lags. That would not necessarily mean that you would eliminate estimating value-added effects for fourth grade teachers because there you'd have to have that decision that you only use the one lag. MS. FEILD: Right. DR. DORAN: Now in terms of let's explore that further. Suppose you're a fifth grade teacher and every single kid in your class has only one prior test score. You still estimate the model, so I think the policy decision he is not to always use two lags; it's use up to two lags where available. MS. FEILD: No, I get that but if you go back to your reading chart and probably that's the way it should be. What has to be communicated to the teachers or the stakeholders is that there is differentiation on the standard of error for 4th grade teachers, let's say, versus 5th grade or higher just because of the nature of the model. So if you present just to 3A and say we're using two years, but if you American Court Reporting

	268		270
1	only have we're only going to include one, we	1	Well, I'm going to do this. I'm going to
2	have to say, well, by the way, that means your	2	show you an observation that you already made
3	error of measurement is going to be bigger, your	3	and I'm going to toss this over to Sam, and
4	standard error.	4	here's where we are tentatively. Well, do we
5	DR. DORAN: So remember this is one factor	5	want to take a break?
6	that plays into the standard error measurement	6	PANEL MEMBERS: Yes
7	Teachers in grades 5 and up would have the	7	DR. DORAN: All right, we'll take a break.
8	benefit of having possibly, possibly smaller	8	When we come back essentially what we've done
9	standard errors because we're using more	9	now we've walked multiple criteria across all
10	information but it's not a quarantee	10	of the models, but before we get too far along
11	Teachers in grade 4 can still have small	11	there's more data to look at Sam's going to
12	standard errors because there are many factors	12	facilitate a conversation on given what we've
13	that are used in terms of creating the standard	13	learned so far, what models are attractive
14	of error not only the lag. But they would have	14	which ones do we maybe want to set aside? Maybe
15	the down side of not being that extra	15	you're not ready to do that yet but we're at
16	information so that would be something that	16	least to a point where we're ready to have that
17	would it's just an artifact that you don't	17	conversation So I'll leave this microphone
18	teach testing second grade	18	bere and why don't we come back at twenty till
19	MS_FEILD: But that's compounded by what	19	(Whereupon a short break was had )
20	model you choose as to what covariates because	20	MR_EOERSTER: Ladies and centlemen_we're
21	if you choose not to use any covariate at all	21	going to start talking through where we think
22	which would be Model 3A right then really the	22	we're at at this point. Before I get there I
23	lag of two years versus one is the biggest	23	wanted to say this morning that I wanted you all
24	impact on your score: am I correct?	24	to feel comfortable and discussing and asking
25	DR. DORAN: I don't remember exactly, but	25	questions. I think we've covered that bridge:
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	269		271
1		1	we're in good shape there. I also want to say
		-	nere in geou bhape therei i albe hane to bay
2	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have	2	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this
2 3	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted.	2 3	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the
1 2 3 4	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then	2 3 4	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place
1 2 3 4 5	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors	2 3 4 5	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel
2 3 4 5 6	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not	2 3 4 5 6	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors	2 3 4 5 6 7	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled but just the scores	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are comfortable with. So if you're uncomfortable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled but just the scores MS. FEILD: Oh, the scores, okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are comfortable with. So if you're uncomfortable with the rate at which we're marching down this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled but just the scores MS. FEILD: Oh, the scores, okay. DR. DORAN: It can exist even though that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are comfortable with. So if you're uncomfortable with the rate at which we're marching down this path, please anybody jump in and say I'd like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled but just the scores MS. FEILD: Oh, the scores, okay. DR. DORAN: It can exist even though that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are comfortable with. So if you're uncomfortable with the rate at which we're marching down this path, please anybody jump in and say I'd like to talk this one over some more before we put
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled but just the scores MS. FEILD: Oh, the scores, okay. DR. DORAN: It can exist even though that control variate is there. So, yes, you're correct. There are differences in the fixed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are comfortable with. So if you're uncomfortable with the rate at which we're marching down this path, please anybody jump in and say I'd like to talk this one over some more before we put things to a vote and scratch things off the list
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 23 23 23 23 23 24 25 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled but just the scores MS. FEILD: Oh, the scores, okay. DR. DORAN: It can exist even though that control variate is there. So, yes, you're correct. There are differences in the fixed effects that would also help reduce that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are comfortable with. So if you're uncomfortable with the rate at which we're marching down this path, please anybody jump in and say I'd like to talk this one over some more before we put things to a vote and scratch things off the list.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 5	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled but just the scores MS. FEILD: Oh, the scores, okay. DR. DORAN: It can exist even though that control variate is there. So, yes, you're correct. There are differences in the fixed effects that would also help reduce that decision, but even beyond those are other things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 24 25 24 25 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are comfortable with. So if you're uncomfortable with the rate at which we're marching down this path, please anybody jump in and say I'd like to talk this one over some more before we put things to a vote and scratch things off the list. That having been said I'm going to throw
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled but just the scores MS. FEILD: Oh, the scores, okay. DR. DORAN: It can exist even though that control variate is there. So, yes, you're correct. There are differences in the fixed effects that would also help reduce that decision, but even beyond those are other things that will impact the standard errors.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are comfortable with. So if you're uncomfortable with the rate at which we're marching down this path, please anybody jump in and say I'd like to talk this one over some more before we put things to a vote and scratch things off the list. That having been said I'm going to throw out where I think the temperature of the room is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 10 11 12 13 11 12 12 12 12 12 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 3 2 2 2 2	MS. FEILD: Yeah, because 3A and 3A1 have no covariates, no SWD, ELL, attendance, gifted. So if we choose Model 3A which has two lags then your statement about there are other factors that influence that 4th grade teacher is not true because we don't have any other factors going into the model DR. DORAN: No, no. The things that go into playing the standard errors. It's the number of kids in the class, that's always the case, and it's the homogeneity of kids within that class that goes with the standard errors. So there are things MS. FEILD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, because we're not including homogeneity DR. DORAN: Homogeneity, not the controlled but just the scores MS. FEILD: Oh, the scores, okay. DR. DORAN: It can exist even though that control variate is there. So, yes, you're correct. There are differences in the fixed effects that would also help reduce that decision, but even beyond those are other things that will impact the standard errors.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	that it is a distinct honor to be a part of this group. I mean, I am really astonished at the quality of the discussion that has taken place already today and I hope that you guys feel equally gratified. I have every confidence that we have lots of people around the table that see this. The struggle is getting us all to see what one another sees and that has proven to be challenging. Where I think I would like us to go is this: An effective strategy last time was ruling things out so that we can focus on the things that we want to keep in play. That having been said, I don't want to move us down the path any more quickly than you guys are comfortable with. So if you're uncomfortable with the rate at which we're marching down this path, please anybody jump in and say I'd like to talk this one over some more before we put things to a vote and scratch things off the list. That having been said I'm going to throw out where I think the temperature of the room is American Court Reporting

	272		274
1	with respect to some of these models so that we	1	Okay. So can I have a motion that we'll
2	can get a sense of where to start.	2	cease to consider Model 1A?
3	Is it fair to say I'll start with the	3	MR. TOMEI: So moved.
4	easiest one first Model 4, the sustained	4	MR. LeTELLIER: Second.
5	differences model that has the lowest amount of	5	MR. FOERSTER: All in favor, raise their
6	precision, and the least number of variables	6	hand? Okay. Thank you very much.
7	folded into it. This doesn't appear to be where	7	That leaves us with the three variants of
8	any of us wants to go. Is that a fair	8	Model 3, one of which we include no additional
9	assumption? So could we put that one to a vote	9	covariates one in which we include just the
10	that the committee would like to cease	10	basics which would be ELL_SWD_diffed_and
11	consideration of Model 4, the sustained	11	attendance and then the kitchen sink variety
12	differences model	12	I think again given the discussion that we've
13	MS_FEILD: So moved	13	had to this point that we're all in favor of
14	MR LeTELLIER: Second	14	including additional covariates maybe lots of
15	MR ECERSTER: I love it Thank you All	15	them, which would mean that Model 3A is not
16	in favor?	16	something we want to consider any further. Is
17	DP HOV/ANETZ: Remember hold your hand up	17	that where we're at?
18	MP_EOERSTEP: Veah we've got to get the	18	
19	camera around	19	MR_EOERSTER: So can I have a motion that
20	Okay Thank you We'll scratch that one	20	we the committee wishes to cease
21	off the list	21	consideration of Model 3A?
22	Where can we go next? The one lag models	22	MS BROWN: So moved
23	Are we all comfortable that we want to put in	23	MR. LeTELLIER: Second.
24	two lags and do we all understand that we're not	24	MR_EOERSTER: All in favor? Thanks
25	saving that we're going to include only data for	25	Okay We're boning in I think Most of
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	273		275
1	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that	1	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the
1 2	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we	1	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted,
1 2 3	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean	1 2 3	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which
1 2 3 4	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would	1 2 3 4	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications
1 2 3 4 5	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved.	1 2 3 4 5	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be
1 2 3 4 5 6	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me.	1 2 3 4 5 6	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. TOMEI: Second.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. TOMEI: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. TOMEI: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. TOMEI: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. TOMEI: Second. MR. TOMEI: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which does not include school effect and variance of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list of covariates, some of which were found to be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which does not include school effect and variance of Model 3 which do include school effect. I think	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list of covariates, some of which were
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which does not include school effect and variance of Model 3 which do include school effect. I think where we're at after much discussion on school	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list of covariates, some of which were found to be statistically not significant; and I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which does not include school effect and variance of Model 3 which do include school effect. I think where we're at after much discussion on school effect, and I don't think we're done with that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list of covariates, some of which were found to be statistically not significant; and I think we can pick up discussion with which of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. TOMEI: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which does not include school effect and variance of Model 3 which do include school effect. I think where we're at after much discussion on school effect, and I don't think we're done with that discussion, but we all agree that it matters and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list of covariates, some of which were found to be statistically not significant; and I think we can pick up discussion with which of those covariates we want to be included; and I'm
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which does not include school effect and variance of Model 3 which do include school effect. I think where we're at after much discussion on school effect, and I don't think we're done with that discussion, but we all agree that it matters and we do want it to be taken into account somehow.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list of covariates, some of which were found to be statistically significant, some of which were found to be statistically not significant; and I think we can pick up discussion with which of those covariates we want to be included; and I'm going to do my best here to talk through some of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which does not include school effect and variance of Model 3 which do include school effect. I think where we're at after much discussion on school effect, and I don't think we're done with that discussion, but we all agree that it matters and we do want it to be taken into account somehow. The how is what remains to be determined. Is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list of covariates, some of which were found to be statistically significant, some of which were found to be statistically not significant; and I think we can pick up discussion with which of those covariates we want to be included; and I'm going to do my best here to talk through some of the factors that should be taken into
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. TOMEI: Second. MR. TOMEI: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which does not include school effect and variance of Model 3 which do include school effect. I think where we're at after much discussion on school effect, and I don't think we're done with that discussion, but we all agree that it matters and we do want it to be taken into account somehow. The how is what remains to be determined. Is that where everybody's at?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list of covariates, some of which were found to be statistically significant, some of which were found to be statistically not significant; and I think we can pick up discussion with which of those covariates we want to be included; and I'm going to do my best here to talk through some of the factors that should be taken into consideration when we're talking about that.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	273 which we have two scores, but when we have that data we're going to use two scores? When we have only one, we'll use it. So that would mean that what we would MS. FEILD: So moved. MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, don't "so moved" me. Give me a motion. Which ones have one lags? PANEL MEMBERS: One and 3A1. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So the motion is that we will cease consideration of Model 1 and Model 3A1, is that right? MS. FEILD: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Oh, this is fun. Thank you very much. Okay. That leaves us with Model 1A which does not include school effect and variance of Model 3 which do include school effect. I think where we're at after much discussion on school effect, and I don't think we're done with that discussion, but we all agree that it matters and we do want it to be taken into account somehow. The how is what remains to be determined. Is that where everybody's at? American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	275 us feel like we want to factor in some of the additional covariates beyond ELL, SWD, gifted, and attendance, and we need to discuss which ones and how and why and what the implications of that are, but we don't really want to be considering some aspect of the kitchen sink model, which is 3C. Is that a fair statement? PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, then I need a motion that we wish to cease considering Model 3B. MS. NOYA: So moved. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. LeTELLIER: Second. MR. FOERSTER: All in favor? Thank you. Okay, time to go home. Model 3C. We stopped when we were looking at the list and I'm hoping we can get the slide back up so everybody can look at it. The list of covariates, some of which were found to be statistically significant, some of which were found to be statistically not significant; and I think we can pick up discussion with which of those covariates we want to be included; and I'm going to do my best here to talk through some of the factors that should be taken into consideration when we're talking about that. American Court Reporting

	276		278
1	With respect to the factors that are	1	MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded. All
2	statistically insignificant, that means that	2	those in favor of keeping all of them?
3	they do not help in a predictive capacity at	3	MR. TOMEI: Do we discuss this before
4	all, and we know that for sure because we looked	4	taking a final vote?
5	at all the data district-wide, and there's no	5	MR. FOERSTER: Absolutely, and thank you
6	evidence to suggest that incorporating those	6	for jumping in.
7	things give us any ability to predict student	7	MR. TOMEI: Pros and cons say every side of
8	outcomes any more accurately than not including	8	this debate, okay. The question I would ask is
9	them. That having been said, it's hard for me	9	if we choose to keep this in and we know that
10	to imagine a scenario where we would to be	10	that's an insignificant number, how are we going
11	talking to people about why those things are	11	to put this in the model if we leave it in the
12	still in there because AIR has done the work.	12	model? Are we going to apply that effect size,
13	We can say for sure it'll matter. That's my	13	which we know is probably random?
14	opinion.	14	MR. FOERSTER: That's a great point. I
15	The counter-point could be that keeping	15	think what the implication is that it could do
16	them in does no harm and it gives us the	16	more harm than good by leaving it in, right?
17	opportunity to explain to teachers who might be	17	MR. TOMEI: Especially if the effect size
18	impacted by one of these categories say.	18	is rather large, look at the dual sensory
19	hearing impaired, visually impaired,	19	impaired. Huge effect size. If we factor that
20	emotionally, behavioral, these factors that do	20	in to an expectation for a given student, one we
21	not have statistical significance it may be	21	know that statistically that could have been
22	politically useful to say that those have been	22	iust a random variance and not really
23	left in the model.	23	attributable to that characteristic, then we're
24	DR. COHEN: I may have left a slightly	24	potentially doing more harm by leaving it in the
25	wrong impression. This is a general pattern,	25	model than good. So the question becomes how do
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	077		
	277		279
1	but remember we estimated 112 different models	1	279 we factor these in, particularly if we keep in
1 2	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some	1 2	279 we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically
1 2 3	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them	1 2 3	279 we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant?
1 2 3 4	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other	1 2 3 4	279 we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this
1 2 3 4 5	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on,	1 2 3 4 5	279 we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said.
1 2 3 4 5 6	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math.	1 2 3 4 5 6	we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	279 we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LETELLIER: With the knowledge that we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance. Let's look at what statistical significance
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance. Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said.</li> <li>MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade.</li> <li>Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance.</li> <li>Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 10	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said.</li> <li>MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade.</li> <li>Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance.</li> <li>Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive</li> <li>I'm sorry a negative effect there.</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 10 17 18 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant number. How would we if we decide to take out	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance. Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive I'm sorry a negative effect there. So I don't even know how many dual sensory</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 2	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant number. How would we if we decide to take out something like that, how would we explain that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said.</li> <li>MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade.</li> <li>Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance.</li> <li>Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive</li> <li>I'm sorry a negative effect there.</li> <li>So I don't even know how many dual sensory impaired students have it in the state. Did anythedy can that?</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 1	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant number. How would we if we decide to take out something like that, how would we explain that we're going to allow for the other ones, but if	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance. Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive I'm sorry a negative effect there. So I don't even know how many dual sensory impaired students have it in the state. Did anybody say that? DANEL MEMPED: Vary emails
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant number. How would we if we decide to take out something like that, how would we explain that we're going to allow for the other ones, but if your son just had a traumatic brain injury that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance. Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive I'm sorry a negative effect there. So I don't even know how many dual sensory impaired students have it in the state. Did anybody say that? PANEL MEMBER: Very small. MP. TOMEL: Very small.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 22 22	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant number. How would we if we decide to take out something like that, how would we explain that we're going to allow for the other ones, but if your son just had a traumatic brain injury that it's not statistically significant? MS. BROWN! Or to the topener. I mean that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance. Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive I'm sorry a negative effect there. So I don't even know how many dual sensory impaired students have it in the state. Did anybody say that?</li> <li>PANEL MEMBER: Very small. MR. TOMEI: Very minimal.</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 4	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant number. How would we if we decide to take out something like that, how would we explain that we're going to allow for the other ones, but if your son just had a traumatic brain injury that it's not statistically significant? MS. BROWN: Or to the teacher. I move that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant?</li> <li>DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade.</li> <li>Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance.</li> <li>Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive</li> <li>I'm sorry a negative effect there. So I don't even know how many dual sensory impaired students have it in the state. Did anybody say that?</li> <li>PANEL MEMBER: Very small. MR. TOMEI: Very minimal. MS. WESTPHAL: But there's a potential that the reason if I'm understand this why it'ls pat</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant number. How would we if we decide to take out something like that, how would we explain that we're going to allow for the other ones, but if your son just had a traumatic brain injury that it's not statistically significant? MS. BROWN: Or to the teacher. I move that we include them all. DANEL MEMBERS: Second	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	279 we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance. Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive I'm sorry a negative effect there. So I don't even know how many dual sensory impaired students have it in the state. Did anybody say that? PANEL MEMBER: Very small. MR. TOMEI: Very minimal. MS. WESTPHAL: But there's a potential that the reason if I'm understand this why it's not significant is hore used on the state.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant number. How would we if we decide to take out something like that, how would we explain that we're going to allow for the other ones, but if your son just had a traumatic brain injury that it's not statistically significant? MS. BROWN: Or to the teacher. I move that we include them all. PANEL MEMBERS: Second. American Court Penorting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	279 we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance. Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive I'm sorry a negative effect there. So I don't even know how many dual sensory impaired students have it in the state. Did anybody say that? PANEL MEMBER: Very small. MR. TOMEI: Very minimal. MS. WESTPHAL: But there's a potential that the reason if I'm understand this why it's not significant is because you only pooled I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	but remember we estimated 112 different models or something like that. In some of them, some of the particularly SWD variables, some of them pop up as significant in other grades or other subjects. I think that's what it's based on, not a grade 7 math. MR. FOERSTER: That's an important point. DR. COHEN: I mean, it's not all that difficult but yes, this is a PANEL MEMBERS: (Laughing, talking, over-speaking.) DR. COHEN: Sam. MR. FOERSTER: Yes, Jon? MR. LeTELLIER: With the knowledge that we just had, let's look at number SWD 12, traumatic brain injury, and let's say that some of those other grades that there was a significant number. How would we if we decide to take out something like that, how would we explain that we're going to allow for the other ones, but if your son just had a traumatic brain injury that it's not statistically significant? MS. BROWN: Or to the teacher. I move that we include them all. PANEL MEMBERS: Second. American Court Reporting 850.421.0058	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	279 we factor these in, particularly if we keep in things that have proven to be statistically insignificant? DR. COHEN: But we only have that for this grade. That's the problem, what you just said. MR. TOMEI: We can fix that, though, Jon. DR. COHEN: We have all the data here, we still don't have it for each and every grade. Let me just make the case of a dual sensory impaired, just as an example. The most likely value for that typical value of the population is that number. So the chance is greater than about a 5% chance that could be due to chance. Let's look at what statistical significance means. It is still more likely than not that that is an effect, that there's a positive I'm sorry a negative effect there. So I don't even know how many dual sensory impaired students have it in the state. Did anybody say that? PANEL MEMBER: Very small. MR. TOMEI: Very minimal. MS. WESTPHAL: But there's a potential that the reason if I'm understand this why it's not significant is because you only pooled I American Court Reporting 850 421 0058

	280		282
1	mean it's a low incident	1	used
2	MS_BROWN: But in a lot of those instances	2	MS_WESTDHAL: If we don't put that in
2	like emotional helpsvier I just nicked and	2	there then her students are thrown into the
3	like emotional behavior 1 just picked one.	3	concerned non-verticent and she is going to look like
4	Okay, let's take emotional behavior now. It's	4	general population and she is going to look like
5	not showing a significant it's not yellow,	5	she's not as effective am I getting
6	but there's a chance that there's a teacher that	6	that?
7	has six kids in her classroom and all six of	7	MR. TOMEI: I just want to say that
8	those kids are EBD.	8	actually I'm in favor of keeping all the
9	DR. COHEN: Even if it is the best estimate	9	variables in, but I think we need to be
10	of how much impact it has is only a point or two	10	cautious. What we're not looking at here we
11	on the scale; within 7th grade the scale ranges	11	know the ones that are not significant were less
12	hundreds of points. I think the typical growth	12	than 95% certain, but what we don't know is, was
13	in the 8th grade is on the order of 250 points,	13	it 94% or was it 55% for some of these
14	not the exact number but that's the right	14	variables, but the data exists. So there's more
15	magnitude. On average, there's about a 1 or 2	15	work to be done to figure out how do we factor
16	point difference among these kids.	16	these variables properly and effectively and
17	MS. WESTPHAL: I'm quessing because you	17	appropriately into the model if we keep them
18	pulled math we would see different numbers for	18	all? So I thought we should have that
19	reading.	19	discussion before we
20	DR COHEN: I can hold that	20	MR_EOERSTER: I am so glad that you pulled
21	MS WESTPHAL: But my point is okay let's	21	the reins. I think it's fair to say that we
22	just take that out of it and say there is one	22	have already parrowed things down a lot I
22	that's more significant, dual sensory impaired	22	mean we're down to one model and we're talking
23	Maybe those kids are concentrated at the school	23	about which variables do we want to include and
24	for the deaf, for the blind, for example. There	24	not include, and my understanding from Harold
25	American Court Departing	25	American Court Departing
	000.421.0000		000.421.0058
			283
1	could be a teacher who only has those students,	1	and Jon and Christy was that was essentially
2	so let's say she has four students in her class.	2	what we needed to try to get to happen this
3	All four of her students are dual sensory and	3	afternoon. I'm wondering if what we do instead
4	for her or him it's going to make a big	4	of trying to nail this today since it is late in
5	difference if we don't. Otherwise, would we not	5	the day, I think we're tired, and I think we
6	be throwing them into the general population?	6	would all benefit perhaps with some reflection
7	DR. COHEN: Otherwise we would be throwing	7	and some time to think tonight.
8	them into the general population. But that is	8	What do you guys think about handing it
9	not statistically significant. Really, what	9	back to AIR and let's keep working through the
10	that means is that it says we're not 95% certain	10	agenda that they have prescribed for us, and we
11	that this is different than zero, right? But in	11	will take this issue up tomorrow as we put a
12	the data we have in this sample, the average	12	finer point on what exactly we'd like to see in
13	score is 121 points less than you would expect	13	the model?
14	of a very similar student who didn't have the	14	MR. LeTELLIER: If we do that, I think
15	same disability.	15	that's a great idea. Two things, one can we
16	MS. WESTPHAL: So worst case scenario for	16	have them do some of that data that we were
17	that teacher, her scores come back and the	17	looking at
18	statistician says, you know what? There's not	18	MR. FOERSTER: For other grades and
19	enough data; we don't have a big enough	19	subjects?
20	population in your room to say whether you're	20	MR. LeTELLIER: Yeah, and then the other
21	highly effective, not effective; so we've got to	21	thing is what Lance was saying; are we able to
22	put you right here and now your evaluation is	22	data-wise statistically make it so that we can
23	going to take over the bigger percentage piece.	23	include if we want to just include everything,
24	MS. ACOSTA: The business rule can control	24	include it and come up with a way to have the
25	whether or not that particular piece of data is	25	data be useful in a model or is it going to from
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058

	284		286
1	what you're saving, are there some things if we	1	among them
2	included it no matter what we did, it would	2	Some of the things like class homogeneity
2	negatively affect things? Because just for	2	which is significant in one of the models: it's
4	myself as I think about it tonight. I just want	4	significant here and there, but it's a tiny
5	to know what to kind of have ruminate around in	5	effect. You need a class that had if you had
6	my head in thinking	6	a class that had a 100-point difference between
7	MS FEILD: I also want to know as I'm	7	the $25^{\text{th}}$ percentile and the 75th percentile you
8	looking at these things, it's not 20 indicators	8	would have a 1 point difference. If you had a
9	really I'm looking at them under categories	9	four point difference, you need basically two
10	and are we talking about fine-nicking and saving	10	years of growth within one class A very
11	that we're going to go in and in terms of the	11	diverse class and that would still only count
12	SWD we're not going to include the dual sensory	12	for four points.
13	and we're not going to include visual, but we'll	13	So that small, it's kind of an unusual
14	include the others. I mean, are we even going	14	measure. You might think about whether you want
15	to get to that granularity?	15	to keep that one.
16	Do we want to do that or do we want to look	16	MR. LeTELLIER: That was Sam's question.
17	at it as an overall; if this child is SWD, some	17	Was there any harm if we keep them all?
18	of them maybe, you know, have positive/negative	18	DR. COHEN: There is no harm in keeping
19	depending by different grade levels, so should	19	them unless they're correlated with other things
20	we be thinking about it as a whole or are we	20	that you're keeping in there in terms of the
21	going to sit here and say, okay, well, the dual	21	ultimate estimated teacher effect and the
22	sensory in grade 3, 5, and 9, it was it	22	aggregate shouldn't make any difference for one
23	showed an effect, but in the other grades it	23	or two teachers, for some small number of
24	didn't, so I'm not sure we want to do that. I	24	teachers because two things are correlated.
25	just want us to think about that because I would	25	There's a trade-off in what the effect is
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	285		287
1	think about it as kind of SWD is a whole, class	1	attributed to.
2	size is a whole, modal age is a whole, mobility	2	If most of the kids who have specific
3	is a whole. To me there	3	learning disability are in very homogenous
4	MR. FOERSTER: Maybe there would be some	4	classes, they tend to be other kids who are
5	MS. FEILD: To me, it would be a yes or no	5	challenging in those classes, the exact effect
6	for the category.	6	or either one of those variables is going to be
<i>'</i>	MR. FOERSTER: That point is well taken. I		trading off. Sometimes one will be bigger,
ō	mean we would have to be doing late of eifting	Ö	comptimes the other will be bigger perceiply
0	mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting	0	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially
9 10	mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember	9	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things
9 10 11	mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember.	9 10 11	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now
9 10 11 12	mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the	9 10 11 12	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now.
9 10 11 12 13	mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do	9 10 11 12 13	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time?
9 10 11 12 13 14	mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.	9 10 11 12 13 14	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that. DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that. DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking them apart, you do wind up with an explanation</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school. MS. BOURN: So interpret the effect size
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking them apart, you do wind up with an explanation problem. The teachers who have the disability,</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school. MS. BOURN: So interpret the effect size for me.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking them apart, you do wind up with an explanation problem. The teachers who have the disability, whatever it is, you kick them out; you have to</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school. MS. BOURN: So interpret the effect size for me. DR. DORAN: So what this is saying is for
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking them apart, you do wind up with an explanation problem. The teachers who have the disability, whatever it is, you kick them out; you have to have different models for different grades</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school. MS. BOURN: So interpret the effect size for me. DR. DORAN: So what this is saying is for every additional day that a student was in the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking them apart, you do wind up with an explanation problem. The teachers who have the disability, whatever it is, you kick them out; you have to have different models for different grades subject and then that will change your year to</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school. MS. BOURN: So interpret the effect size for me. DR. DORAN: So what this is saying is for every additional day that a student was in the school, they have a
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking them apart, you do wind up with an explanation problem. The teachers who have the disability, whatever it is, you kick them out; you have to have different models for different grades subject and then that will change your year to get the data each year. Particular ones that</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school. MS. BOURN: So interpret the effect size for me. DR. DORAN: So what this is saying is for every additional day that a student was in the school, they have a MS. BOURN: A 0.16.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking them apart, you do wind up with an explanation problem. The teachers who have the disability, whatever it is, you kick them out; you have to have different models for different grades subject and then that will change your year to get the data each year. Particular ones that pop up for significant ones may be different. I</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school. MS. BOURN: So interpret the effect size for me. DR. DORAN: So what this is saying is for every additional day that a student was in the school, they have a MS. BOURN: A 0.16. DR. DORAN: they would have a 0.18 or a
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<ul> <li>mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that.</li> <li>DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking them apart, you do wind up with an explanation problem. The teachers who have the disability, whatever it is, you kick them out; you have to have different models for different grades subject and then that will change your year to get the data each year. Particular ones that pop up for significant ones may be different. I think it would be a headache to pick and choose</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school. MS. BOURN: So interpret the effect size for me. DR. DORAN: So what this is saying is for every additional day that a student was in the school, they have a MS. BOURN: A 0.16. DR. DORAN: they would have a 0.18 or a 0.18 difference in their expected scale for each
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	mean, we would have to be doing lots of sifting through grades and subjects and it makes it harder to explain and impossible to remember. Harold or Jon, can you present a counter-argument for keeping all of the variables in the model? And why wouldn't we do that. DR. COHEN: No, there's not a reason to keep all of the SWD variables as a group. Some of them are significant. If we start breaking them apart, you do wind up with an explanation problem. The teachers who have the disability, whatever it is, you kick them out; you have to have different models for different grades subject and then that will change your year to get the data each year. Particular ones that pop up for significant ones may be different. I think it would be a headache to pick and choose American Court Reporting	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	sometimes the other will be bigger, especially since there's not enough information in the data. So those correlations are the only things that are set for now. MS. BOURN: Harold, can you explain how the attendance is calculated one more time? DR. BOURN: The attendance was something that was in the data, and that was the number of days a student was actually enrolled in the school. MS. BOURN: So interpret the effect size for me. DR. DORAN: So what this is saying is for every additional day that a student was in the school, they have a MS. BOURN: A 0.16. DR. DORAN: they would have a 0.18 or a 0.18 difference in their expected scale for each American Court Reporting

	288		290
1	dav.	1	you may or may not want to include that in the
2	MS. KEARSCHNER: I don't remember, what's	2	model. The problematic thing being that you
3	the difference between class 1 and class 2 and	3	have just established different expectations for
4	class 3 through 6?	4	kids. While that's helpful from the teacher
5	DR. DORAN: This is the number of classes	5	evaluation standpoint and seems to level the
6	the student was enrolled in for the same	6	field, it's problematic in that you have
7	courses. What's the definition	7	different expectations for kids. I just want to
8	MS. KEARSCHNER: Subjects.	8	bring that up because it was a point of lots of
9	DR. DORAN: The same subjects? There are	9	conversation last time and I think we should be
10	some students who are associated with multiple	10	making these decisions with that in mind. Any
11	classes for the same subject.	11	thoughts on that?
12	MR. LeTELLIER: Could you put a slide up	12	DR. DORAN: Sam, it's actually where we're
13	tomorrow because we're not going to vote on this	13	going to next. We're going to show the
14	today and we would be able to think about that?	14	consequences on the different expectations for
15	That might in parentheses just have those little	15	different groups of kids, not for every single
16	things so that as we're looking at it, that	16	one of these particular categories. That's
17	would be easier, I think, for us to say that's	17	actually where we're going with the data.
18	based on this, that's based on this.	18	MR. FOERSTER: Okay. Before I hand it back
19	DR. DORAN: so it's a little hard to	19	over to you, committee, AIR is going to have one
20	assemble -	20	night to do some additional materials
21	DR. HOVANETZ: It goes back to the finding	21	preparation, analysis, whatever. Can you or do
22	of the variable that we did this morning and how	22	you have any specific requests that you would
23	we defined it, whether it was a cognitive	23	like to see prepared for tomorrow? Ms. Bourn?
24	variable saying if this student has this	24	MS. BOURN: I think this goes back to the
25	characteristic their expectation is this much	25	huge hour-plus long discussion, and if I'm
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	289		291
1	289 different versus the continuous variables that	1	291 understanding what I think most of us are
1 2	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being	1 2	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth
1 2 3	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each	1 2 3	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B
1 2 3 4	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each	1 2 3 4	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my
1 2 3 4 5	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an	1 2 3 4 5	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high
1 2 3 4 5 6	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an	1 2 3 4 5 6	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR_COHEN: I'm working on a little
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a majority of the variable that we talked about:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MB. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, lon.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a majority of the variable that we talked about; it's just one single expectation, if the student	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MR. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, Jon. Are there any other specifics that you guys
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a majority of the variable that we talked about; it's just one single expectation, if the student has this characteristic or trait, their	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MR. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, Jon. Are there any other specifics that you guys would like to see prepared to inform tomorrow's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a majority of the variable that we talked about; it's just one single expectation, if the student has this characteristic or trait, their expectation is older by that many.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MR. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, Jon. Are there any other specifics that you guys would like to see prepared to inform tomorrow's discussion about how we're going to finalize a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a majority of the variable that we talked about; it's just one single expectation, if the student has this characteristic or trait, their expectation is older by that many. MR. FOERSTER: I quess we should point out.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MR. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, Jon. Are there any other specifics that you guys would like to see prepared to inform tomorrow's discussion about how we're going to finalize a recommendation?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a majority of the variable that we talked about; it's just one single expectation, if the student has this characteristic or trait, their expectation is older by that many. MR. FOERSTER: I guess we should point out, also, that there is this policy implication that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MR. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, Jon. Are there any other specifics that you guys would like to see prepared to inform tomorrow's discussion about how we're going to finalize a recommendation? MS. BROWN: Did we ask AIR to do certain
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable that we talked about; it's just one single expectation, if the student has this characteristic or trait, their expectation is older by that many. MR. FOERSTER: I guess we should point out, also, that there is this policy implication that we've talked a good bit about last time. Just	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MR. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, Jon. Are there any other specifics that you guys would like to see prepared to inform tomorrow's discussion about how we're going to finalize a recommendation? MS. BROWN: Did we ask AIR to do certain districts? Is that already on the agenda to be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a majority of the variable that we talked about; it's just one single expectation, if the student has this characteristic or trait, their expectation is older by that many. MR. FOERSTER: I guess we should point out, also, that there is this policy implication that we've talked a good bit about last time. Just because you see that a characteristic can be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MR. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, Jon. Are there any other specifics that you guys would like to see prepared to inform tomorrow's discussion about how we're going to finalize a recommendation? MS. BROWN: Did we ask AIR to do certain districts? Is that already on the agenda to be done?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a majority of the variable that we talked about; it's just one single expectation, if the student has this characteristic or trait, their expectation is older by that many. MR. FOERSTER: I guess we should point out, also, that there is this policy implication that we've talked a good bit about last time. Just because you see that a characteristic can be argued to weigh in on expected student growth,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MR. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, Jon. Are there any other specifics that you guys would like to see prepared to inform tomorrow's discussion about how we're going to finalize a recommendation? MS. BROWN: Did we ask AIR to do certain districts? Is that already on the agenda to be done? MR. FOERSTER: Well, I think Juan made a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	289 different versus the continuous variables that we talked about continuous variables being homogeneity, age, attendance where each incremental unit is associated with each incremental DSS point difference. So an increase in one day of attendance equates to an increase of an expectation of a 0.16. MR. TOMEI: I get that for the attendance points now. The other ones? DR. HOVANETZ: So for mobility for each additional school transition, the expectation for their growth is decreased by five points. So the continuous variables is each increment the variable moves, the DS doesn't impact it by the amount that you see up there or the dichotomous variable which is basically a majority of the variable that we talked about; it's just one single expectation, if the student has this characteristic or trait, their expectation is older by that many. MR. FOERSTER: I guess we should point out, also, that there is this policy implication that we've talked a good bit about last time. Just because you see that a characteristic can be argued to weigh in on expected student growth, American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 24 25	291 understanding what I think most of us are struggling with, it's going back to the growth piece; if I'm a teacher in school A and school B and I establish the same amount of growth for my students in both schools, and one's a high performing school and one's a low performing school, what does that do to how I look? MR. TOMEI: What's the implication? MR. FOERSTER: In a variety of scenarios, I'm assuming, with one extreme being there is no school effect considered and the other extreme school effect is completely attributed to the school and perhaps some DR. COHEN: I'm working on a little spreadsheet that shows some examples of that; I should have that in an hour. MR. FOERSTER: Perfect. Thank you, Jon. Are there any other specifics that you guys would like to see prepared to inform tomorrow's discussion about how we're going to finalize a recommendation? MS. BROWN: Did we ask AIR to do certain districts? Is that already on the agenda to be done? MR. FOERSTER: Well, I think Juan made a American Court Reporting

	292		294
1	great point there and I'm going to do my best to	1	each each county yes, everybody would be
2	explain why that was problematic.	2	held to the same standard; it's just now those
3	PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)	3	counties have that variable in there to
4	DR. COHEN: What I can do I have all the	4	MS. BOURN: Because we decided to leave it
5	grade 7 data, for example, on my laptop and it's	5	in.
6	very easy to run the average teacher effect in	6	MS_FEILD: We already nicked 3C_If we
7	each subject by district, and you guys can look	7	already nicked 3C the question is for me, what
8	through your own districts and say I like this	8	additional data do we need to know about to make
9	model. I don't like that model because it made	9	further refinements on Model 3C right?
10	me look had. Oh doesn't it	10	MR LeTELLIER: That's exactly it
11	MR LETELLIER: I think there is some use	11	MS FEILD: Right? Because we've already
12	to that and you've got to realize not all 67	12	nicked 3C All this stuff school effects no
13	counties are represented here so it's not just	13	school effects So
14	for the county It's just so much as what some	14	MR LETELLIER: I was just confused when he
15	of us were discussing are there any variables	15	was talking about you don't want to include
16	that in some county might have heavier weight	16	homogeneity and things like that and I wanted to
17	than another that in the average across the	17	make sure we didn't go back to there where we
18	state	18	were taking out stuff and then there's where we
19	DR. COHEN: No. that we can do right now is	19	would need to run that data to see. If we're
20	run 67 different	20	aoina to
21	MR. LETELLIER: No. no. I'm not saving to	21	MS. FEILD: That's what I say. What do we
22	run 67 counties. Their whole thing was whether	22	need to look at in 3C particular to make the
23	or not there might be a county that it will be	23	final recommendation? As for example, if we
24	impacted upon more, and remember we had	24	already include school effects which 3C does
25	discussed running two or three counties just to	25	have, how do we want to weight it? Do we want
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	000		005
	293		295
1	see.	1	to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by
1 2	see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's	1 2	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables
1 2 3	293 see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative	1 2 3	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is
1 2 3 4	293 see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional	1 2 3 4	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw
1 2 3 4 5	293 see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone	1 2 3 4 5	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't
1 2 3 4 5 6	293 see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is	1 2 3 4 5 6	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	293 see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	See. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	293 see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	293 see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LETELLIER: No, it's just we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	See. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	293 see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	See. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	See. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	See. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	See. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 10	See. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't matter if it you put it in or don't, it's paglipible. But for two on three counties it's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and MS. BROWN: I'm sorry; I thought you said
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't matter if it you put it in or don't, it's negligible. But for two or three counties it's hunge and it's real and it's statistically real	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	<ul> <li>to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know.</li> <li>MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is?</li> <li>MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading.</li> <li>MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and</li> <li>MS. BROWN: I'm sorry; I thought you said you just threw it out on the table. Would it lower our expectations if we did that? Whataware</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 4	see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't matter if it you put it in or don't, it's negligible. But for two or three counties it's huge and it's real and it's statistically real for those counties. That's what we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	<ul> <li>to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know.</li> <li>MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is?</li> <li>MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading.</li> <li>MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and</li> <li>MS. BROWN: I'm sorry; I thought you said you just threw it out on the table. Would it lower our expectations if we did that? Whatever you said right before the</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	See. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't matter if it you put it in or don't, it's negligible. But for two or three counties it's huge and it's real and it's statistically real for those counties. That's what we're MS_BOURNY: Then we know that for that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and MS. BROWN: I'm sorry; I thought you said you just threw it out on the table. Would it lower our expectations if we did that? Whatever you said right before the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't matter if it you put it in or don't, it's negligible. But for two or three counties it's huge and it's real and it's statistically real for those counties. That's what we're MS. BOURN: Then we know that for that model we should keen it in, in order to have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	<ul> <li>to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know.</li> <li>MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is?</li> <li>MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading.</li> <li>MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and</li> <li>MS. BROWN: I'm sorry; I thought you said you just threw it out on the table. Would it lower our expectations if we did that? Whatever you said right before the</li> <li>MR. FOERSTER: You want to see what the. Actual numbers are L got you glary for the set of the</li></ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't matter if it you put it in or don't, it's negligible. But for two or three counties it's huge and it's real and it's statistically real for those counties. That's what we're MS. BOURN: Then we know that for that model we should keep it in, in order to have fairness across the board	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 34	<ul> <li>to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know.</li> <li>MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is?</li> <li>MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading.</li> <li>MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and</li> <li>MS. BROWN: I'm sorry; I thought you said you just threw it out on the table. Would it lower our expectations if we did that? Whatever you said right before the</li> <li>MR. FOERSTER: You want to see what the. Actual numbers are, I got you, okay. So</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't matter if it you put it in or don't, it's negligible. But for two or three counties it's huge and it's real and it's statistically real for those counties. That's what we're MS. BOURN: Then we know that for that model we should keep it in, in order to have fairness across the board. MB_LETELLIER: Exactly ves_Not that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and MS. BROWN: I'm sorry; I thought you said you just threw it out on the table. Would it lower our expectations if we did that? Whatever you said right before the MR. FOERSTER: You want to see what the. Actual numbers are, I got you, okay. So we're back to maybe we don't want to include SWD because there is this other thing to consider
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't matter if it you put it in or don't, it's negligible. But for two or three counties it's huge and it's real and it's statistically real for those counties. That's what we're MS. BOURN: Then we know that for that model we should keep it in, in order to have fairness across the board. MR. LeTELLIER: Exactly, yes. Not that American Court Reporting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	295 to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and MS. BROWN: I'm sorry; I thought you said you just threw it out on the table. Would it lower our expectations if we did that? Whatever you said right before the MR. FOERSTER: You want to see what the. Actual numbers are, I got you, okay. So we're back to maybe we don't want to include SWD because there is this other thing to consider American Court Reporting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 24 25	see. DR. COHEN: We talked about that, but let's say we find there is a strong negative co-efficient for students with emotional behavioral disorders in one county. Everyone else is zero or positive, this one county is negative. Do we then hold that county to a different standard and say, okay, we expect lower growth from you? MR. LeTELLIER: No, it's just we're including as a variable across the we're including as a variable across the state and what we had talked about earlier unless I misunderstand this is that if there there may be in some instances maybe ELL is a good example where a specific county, it would impact them more. If the other counties, it doesn't matter if it you put it in or don't, it's negligible. But for two or three counties it's huge and it's real and it's statistically real for those counties. That's what we're MS. BOURN: Then we know that for that model we should keep it in, in order to have fairness across the board. MR. LeTELLIER: Exactly, yes. Not that American Court Reporting 850.421.0058	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 24 25	to weight it 10%, 40%? That may differ by district, right, and including the variables you're talking about. If there is differentiation by grade, do we want to throw out SWD across the Board? Maybe not, I don't know. MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to look at SWD in grades other than 7 math, which is what this is? MS. FEILD: I'd like to see 4the or 5th grade reading. MR. FOERSTER: I'm sure we can; the question is, is it going to change the decision because it seems like the committee is in favor of keeping all of those in there. We haven't gotten the counter-argument for why that would be a bad thing in any way, and MS. BROWN: I'm sorry; I thought you said you just threw it out on the table. Would it lower our expectations if we did that? Whatever you said right before the MR. FOERSTER: You want to see what the. Actual numbers are, I got you, okay. So we're back to maybe we don't want to include SWD because there is this other thing to consider American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

	000		000
	296		298
1	that we're creating different expectations.	1	some of the implications of that
2	MR. TOMEI: No, no, no.	2	MS. FEILD: So if we're not comfortable,
3	MR. COPA: Let me just add one thing that	3	what happens?
4	might be helpful. Since the committee has	4	DR. COHEN: Then we circle back and Sam has
5	narrowed it down basically to one model. I mean	5	a hard job We have to go back
6	we went through a whole hunch of slides. They	c	MD ECEDETED: Voab this isn't in concrete
-	we well unough a whole build of sides. They	0	MR. FOERSTER. Teall, unis isn't in concrete
1	basically estimated 112 models and they were	1	but it seems like everybody was pretty we
8	just presenting grade / math and reading as an	8	were going to 3C. I mean, we were heading that
9	example just based on space. But now since	9	way, so maybe we keep marching down that path
10	we're down to one model, AIR can share all 14	10	and see problems we'll back up.
11	grade and subject combinations for that one	11	DR. DORAN: So sort of big picture of where
12	model so you can see the results for 4th grade,	12	we are, you know, is we spent a tremendous
13	5th grade, reading, math, et cetera.	13	amount of time this morning evaluating the
14	MR TOMEL: It might also be beinful too	14	models against some criteria, and you've come to
15	rather than us trying to amalgamate what we're	15	at least what's a tentative conclusion about
15		15	at least what's a tentative conclusion about
16	looking at across 14 models, if we could see	16	which of the models you favor more than others.
17	perhaps a list of any of these variables that	17	But now what we want to do is start showing
18	were bound to be not significant for either	18	you some of the impact data. What's the impact
19	subject in any grade level and what the greatest	19	on these model decision on expectations? What's
20	effect size was for those that were	20	the correlation of these with teacher with
21	insignificant across all grades in both	21	characteristics or student characteristics and
22	subjects, is that doable?	22	so forth? Now you can make decisions about I
23	DR. COHEN: It probably is, but I'm going	23	even like this model more or now I have concerns
24	to need to write that down. I'm going to fill	24	about this decision, and I want to come back and
24	up a notopod to write that down. This going to his	24	revisit come of these issues
25	up a notepau to write triat down. Okay.	25	Tevisit some of those issues.
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	297		299
1	MR. TOMEI: I'm just wondering if we have	1	MR. TOMEI: Since I was the guilty party
2	any variables that prove to be insignificant for	2	that disrupted the vote, I just want to remind
3	both subjects in all grades and then what was	3	Sam that we actually had a motion and a second,
4	the greatest effect size for those, any one,	4	and we were in the middle of a vote and we
5	just the single greatest effect size because	5	probably need to either finish that vote or have
6	that may tell us if there are any variables that	6	that motion retracted and tabled until
7	really might just be worth not putting in the	7	DR HOVANETZ: We don't need to retract a
0	medal that summany	0	motion to table
0	MC FEI D. Commention is if we misled	ð	MD TOMEL On table it. We need to de
9	MS. FEILD: So my question is if we picked	9	MR. TOMET: Or table it. we need to do
10	the model we have to decide if we want to	10	something probably to finish up the vote that I
11	include some of the covariates, right? What	11	disrupted since I was guilty of doing that.
12	other decisions is AIR going to need from us by	12	MR. FOERSTER: What's the point of order,
13	the end of the day tomorrow?	13	Linda?
14	PANEL MEMBER: Percent.	14	MS. KEARSCHNER: To table.
15	MS. FEILD: A percent of what school	15	MR. TOMEI: So we need a motion to table.
16	effect, but what else because I'm not sure that	16	And what was the motion at hand.
17	there's other pieces that we haven't even	17	PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)
18	discussed	18	MR_EOERSTER: So I need a motion to table
10	DP COHEN: We want to show you some impact	10	the motion to include all covariates in Model
19	data. What does this model shoke any shout	19	
20	uata. What does this model choice say about	20	
21	expectations for students with different	21	MS. KEARSCHNER: You're tabling discussion
22	characteristics, and which groups of teachers	22	to bring it back for a vote later.
23	seem to do better or worse under this model, so	23	MS. FEILD: So we can then table our
24	that you can take a look at the impact of your	24	discussion for tomorrow, so we can table the
25	decision and make sure you're comfortable with	25	discussion for tomorrow's meeting.
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850 421 0058	1	850 421 0058

	300		302
1	MR. FOERSTER: Do I have a second?	1	We've done a lot today. We've made some very
2	PANEL MEMBER: Second.	2	important decisions. I leave it to the
3	MR. FOERSTER: All those in favor of	3	committee. We can keep going till 5:00 or we
4	tabling discussion on including covariates for	4	can stop now and reconvene tomorrow morning.
5	3C? All in favor? Okay. Thank you.	5	MS. BROWN: Can I ask a question? What's
6	DR. DORAN: We have a come a long way and	6	on the agenda for tomorrow because I need to
7	this is a lot of information. This was a lot of	7	know what we're adding to tomorrow to make sure
8	work and I think evaluating these models against	8	so I can make that connection.
9	these criteria was just a lot to get through.	9	DR. HOVANETZ: The only thing, if you want
10	We still have more, more data, but I don't want	10	to flip through the power point presentation is
11	to overwhelm everybody. It's towards the end of	11	just the impact of the variable that we're
12	the day.	12	talking about right now. We're picking up on
13	Why don't I do this? Why don't I present	13	the variable discussion and sharing more
14	some additional slides, just to move forward a	14	information. We'll have you fill out an
15	little bit but not too aggressively then try and	15	evaluation before you leave, you can write down
16	cover too much in the next half-hour. Then	16	your specific questions that you had just like
17	we'll be at a little slower pace because it's	17	we did last time, we'll review those tonight,
18	toward the end of the day and we'll get a sense	18	and we'll start in the morning responding to all
19	of how everyone is in the room.	19	of the questions that you all are leaving here
20	One of the things that Sam mentioned just	20	with today. We'll do a recap of this day's
21	now is we want to give you all of the	21	discussion, so we'll just spend the first hour
22	information that you need so that by the end of	22	recapping and answer questions; and then
23	the day tomorrow when you make that decision or	23	literally just bagging it right back into where
24	that recommendation to go towards the	24	we are. So the stimulation on the school effect
25	American Court Departing	25	American Court Departing
	201		202
4	given an encerturity to think about this the	1	the model
י 2	consequences: you were given all of the	2	Harold will go through the rest of the
2	information so that to the degree that we can do	2	slides which you can take a look at tonight if
4	stuff tonight reliably and efficiently, we want	4	you want to go ahead and preview what we're
5	to make sure that you have that information	5	going to be looking at tomorrow, but it really
6	That was sort of the goal of where we wanted to	6	is diving into the decisions of now that we're
7	be today. So if you need anything, ask. We've	7	looking at variance Model 3C here's the impact
8	got computers.	8	of this data that we run and here's where the
9	5	•	
	Let's look at a couple of other things.	9	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed
10	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations.	9 10	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the
10 11	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what	9 10 11	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of
10 11 12	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with	9 10 11 12	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take
10 11 12 13	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go	9 10 11 12 13	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information
10 11 12 13 14	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead.	9 10 11 12 13 14	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions.
10 11 12 13 14 15	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects conversation model, and this is a big, huge,	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract rather than looking at all grades, both
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects conversation model, and this is a big, huge, weighty discussion that might be best served for	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract rather than looking at all grades, both subjects, at the same time and just getting the
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects conversation model, and this is a big, huge, weighty discussion that might be best served for us to start tomorrow rather than after 4:00	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract rather than looking at all grades, both subjects, at the same time and just getting the information out there to inform the discussion
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects conversation model, and this is a big, huge, weighty discussion that might be best served for us to start tomorrow rather than after 4:00 today, just because you've made a lot of	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract rather than looking at all grades, both subjects, at the same time and just getting the information out there to inform the discussion that way.
<ol> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects conversation model, and this is a big, huge, weighty discussion that might be best served for us to start tomorrow rather than after 4:00 today, just because you've made a lot of progress and decisions and have a lot to chew	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract rather than looking at all grades, both subjects, at the same time and just getting the information out there to inform the discussion that way. So we'll take 15 minutes. You can complete
<ol> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects conversation model, and this is a big, huge, weighty discussion that might be best served for us to start tomorrow rather than after 4:00 today, just because you've made a lot of progress and decisions and have a lot to chew on, we want to show the school effect impact	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract rather than looking at all grades, both subjects, at the same time and just getting the information out there to inform the discussion that way. So we'll take 15 minutes. You can complete the evaluation, things that are still burning
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects conversation model, and this is a big, huge, weighty discussion that might be best served for us to start tomorrow rather than after 4:00 today, just because you've made a lot of progress and decisions and have a lot to chew on, we want to show the school effect impact stuff and then	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract rather than looking at all grades, both subjects, at the same time and just getting the information out there to inform the discussion that way. So we'll take 15 minutes. You can complete the evaluation, things that are still burning questions you'll be able to jot down. We'll
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects conversation model, and this is a big, huge, weighty discussion that might be best served for us to start tomorrow rather than after 4:00 today, just because you've made a lot of progress and decisions and have a lot to chew on, we want to show the school effect impact stuff and then MR. COPA: Let me offer option CA 2, 3, 4.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract rather than looking at all grades, both subjects, at the same time and just getting the information out there to inform the discussion that way. So we'll take 15 minutes. You can complete the evaluation, things that are still burning questions you'll be able to jot down. We'll answer those tonight and start the presentation
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Let's look at a couple of other things. We're going to talk about the expectations. Recall we talked a little bit earlier about what these growth expectations are and I shared with you earlier that we're going to talk about go ahead. DR. HOVANETZ: We're actually going to see if we any suspend this discussion quick so we can have Jon present the school effects conversation model, and this is a big, huge, weighty discussion that might be best served for us to start tomorrow rather than after 4:00 today, just because you've made a lot of progress and decisions and have a lot to chew on, we want to show the school effect impact stuff and then MR. COPA: Let me offer option CA 2, 3, 4. American Court Reporting	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	decision points are, so now that you've narrowed it down to Model 3C it's presenting all the information by grade and by subject for each of the covariates that you all had asked us to take a look at. So it's presenting that information and starting to make those decisions. I think without all of that comprehensive information in front of you, it might be more difficult to have a conversation in the abstract rather than looking at all grades, both subjects, at the same time and just getting the information out there to inform the discussion that way. So we'll take 15 minutes. You can complete the evaluation, things that are still burning questions you'll be able to jot down. We'll answer those tonight and start the presentation American Court Reporting

	304
1	tomorrow just recanning what we talked about
2	today and answer any unresolved questions that
3	you have.
4	MR. FOFRSTER: Okay, Are you all
-	comfortable with Christyle plan?
Э	comortable with Christy's plan?
6	MS. NOYA: Yes, I am.
7	DR. HOVANETZ: Okay. Don't go anywhere.
8	* * * * *
õ	(Whenever, this sensitive Devil of the
9	(whereupon, this concludes Day 1 of the
10	meeting.)
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	American Court Reporting
	850 471 0058
	000.421.0000
	305
1	305 <u>CERTIFICATE</u>
1	305 <u>CERTIFICATE</u>
1 2 3	305 <u>CERTIFICATE</u> THE STATE OF FLORIDA )
1 2 3 4	305 <u>CERTIFICATE</u> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA )
1 2 3 4 5	305 <u>CERTIFICATE</u> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA )
1 2 3 4 5 6	305 <u>CERTIFICATE</u> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) L Suzette A Bragg, Court Reporter and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	305 <u>CERTIFICATE</u> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notany Public, State of Elorida at Largo
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	305 <u>CERTIFICATE</u> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO USE FINY OF FUNCTION that the achieve entitled
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. LEURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their coursel
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, por have I any financial interest in the outcome of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 10	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 14 15 16 17 8 9 20 21	305 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 11 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 11 12 11 12 10 11 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 11 11 11 11 11	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011. SUZETTE A. BRAGG, Notary Public
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011. SUZETTE A. BRAGG, Notary Public State of Florida at Large
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011. SUZETTE A. BRAGG, Notary Public State of Florida at Large My Commission Expires: 2/21/2013
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011. SUZETTE A. BRAGG, Notary Public State of Florida at Large My Commission Expires: 2/21/2013
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011. SUZETTE A. BRAGG, Notary Public State of Florida at Large My Commission Expires: 2/21/2013
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011. SUZETTE A. BRAGG, Notary Public State of Florida at Large My Commission Expires: 2/21/2013
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	305 CERTIFICATE THE STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF WAKULLA ) I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled and numbered cause was heard as herein above set out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 304, inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription of the proceedings in said cause. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to or employed by any of the parties or their counsel, nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of this action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th day of June, 2011. SUZETTE A. BRAGG, Notary Public State of Florida at Large My Commission Expires: 2/21/2013

		1	1
0	1	234:18, 239:4, 239:5, 239:8, 273:23	219:12, 228:14, 231:23, 235:6, 240:2,
U U	4	accountability	242:18 243:15 302:22 303:25 304:2
<b>0</b> 260-7	4 000:05 055:10 060:10 069:11	accountability [4] - 248.2, 200.9, 200.11,	242.10, 243.15, 502.22, 503.25, 504.2
	4 [7] - 229.25, 255.19, 200.15, 200.11,	260:20	answered [1] - 208:6
<b>0.05</b> [1] - 261:23	272:4, 272:11, 301:25	accounted [8] - 228:3, 228:18, 228:19,	anticipated [1] - 262:16
<b>0.16</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 287:23, 289:7	<b>40</b> <sub>[1]</sub> - 253:13	228:21, 234:2, 234:12, 234:13, 240:5	anyway <sub>[1]</sub> - 260:2
<b>0.18</b> [2] - 287:24, 287:25	<b>40%</b> [1] - 295:1	accounting [5] - 227:20, 238:5, 238:9,	apart [2] - 222:3, 285:18
<b>0.8</b> [1] - 256:13	4:00 [2] - 226:17, 301:20	238:10, 239:10	apologies [1] - 210:19
<b>0.9</b> [1] - 237:17	4th [3] - 267:22, 269:6, 296:12	accounts [5] - 229:1, 229:2, 229:4, 239:3,	appear [4] - 233:23, 253:24, 266:21, 272:7
0.91 [1] - 237:17	4the [1] - 295:10	241:17	applied [1] - 250:23
0.92		accurately [1] - 276:8	apply m - 212:20, 278:12
	5	achieve - 243:24	apportion = 224:11 225:4 225:11
4	, v	achievement	226-6
1	5 m - 202.6 202.7 229.16 257.22 261.8	248:25 240:1 240:10 251:25 264:0	220.0
4 200-2 225-10 229-6 229-7 229-19	269.7 294.22	248.25, 249.1, 249.10, 251.25, 264.9	apportioned [2] - 204:2, 225:7
T [17] - 200.2, 225.10, 226.6, 226.7, 226.16,	200.7, 204.22	achieving [2] - 219:6, 219:10	apportioning [3] - 225:13, 225:15, 226:7
229:25, 234:6, 241:13, 242:4, 242:8,	<b>5%</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 229:9, 279:13	acknowledge [3] - 201:23, 208:22, 237:12	apportionment [1] - 226:13
257:17, 273:10, 280:15, 286:8, 288:3,	<b>5.36</b> [3] - 257:12, 259:23, 261:6	ACOSTA [1] - 281:24	appropriate [1] - 225:1
304:9, 305:12	<b>50</b> [1] - 255:15	action [1] - 305:18	appropriately [1] - 282:17
<b>10</b> <sub>[1]</sub> - 260:22	<b>55%</b> [1] - 282:13	actions [1] - 208:24	argue [2] - 248:10, 248:11
<b>10%</b> [1] - 295:1	5:00 [1] - 302:3	actual 151 - 216:7. 223:2. 223:9. 234:25.	argued (4) - 289:25
<b>10.08</b> [1] - 257:4	5th [3] - 267:23, 295:10, 296:13	295:23	argument 200.9 202.2 202.5 249.4
<b>100</b> m - 209:21, 255:13		add 206:22 226:14 229:12 220:11	argument [6] - 200.8, 203.3, 203.3, 240.4,
<b>100%</b>	6	add [8] - 200.23, 200.14, 200.12, 200.11,	205.12, 295.10
100-point	0	200.0, 200.7, 200:10, 290:3	Ariene [1] - 213:15
<b>140</b> 07711 000-7	<b>6</b> = 288:4	added [12] - 204:15, 205:1, 208:2, 209:7,	array [1] - 238:4
112 <sub>[2]</sub> - 277:1, 296:7		210:15, 212:9, 217:3, 217:5, 236:25,	artifact [2] - 249:17, 268:17
12 <sub>[1]</sub> - 277:15	00% [4] - 228:19, 229:2, 229:14, 234:13	253:8, 264:8, 267:6	aside [1] - 270:14
<b>121</b> [1] - 281:13	<b>62%</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 229:4, 229:14	adding [2] - 251:11, 302:7	aspect [1] - 275:6
<b>13.7</b> [1] - 263:3	<b>67</b> [7] - 242:16, 249:25, 250:22, 250:23,	Adding [1] - 253:11	assemble [1] - 288:20
13th [1] - 305:20	292:12, 292:20, 292:22	additional [9] - 229:6, 274:8, 274:14, 275:2,	assistant m - 221:14 221:15
<b>14</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 296:10, 296:16		287:21, 289:11, 290:20, 294:8, 300:14	251:25 251:15 299:10 290:4
<b>15</b> [4] - 303:22	7	administrator w = 221:11	associated [3] - 251.25, 266.10, 269.4
<b>16</b>	· ·	administrator [1] - 221.11	assume [2] - 219:7, 223:23
<b>10</b> [1] - 200.14	<b>7</b> [6] - 258:5, 258:7, 277:6, 292:5, 295:8,		assumes [1] - 223:22
<b>19</b> [1] - 199.12	296:8	administrators" [1] - 220:20	assuming [3] - 224:2, 248:18, 291:10
<b>1A</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 273:17, 274:2	<b>70</b> m = 256.15	advice [1] - 226:23	assumption [1] - 272:9
	7.02 257.0	advocate [1] - 235:16	assumptions [1] - 200:5
2	7.92 [1] - 257.9	affect [3] - 220:21, 224:19, 284:3	astonished [1] - 271:3
	<b>70%</b> [1] - 241:18	affectionately [1] - 214:24	attach (1) - 217:11
<b>2</b> <sub>[9]</sub> - 199:13, 228:19, 229:1, 229:3, 229:25,	<b>75th</b> [1] - 286:7	affects [3] - 206:19, 210:22, 218:6	attached m - 205:15
263:16, 280:15, 288:3, 301:25	<b>77</b> [1] - 260:21	affixed [4] - 305:20	Attendence 355:7
<b>2%</b> [1] - 229:8	7th [7] - 240:14, 240:16, 240:17, 241:1,	afternoon - 283:3	
<b>2.7</b> [1] - 258:20	241:13, 242:5, 280:11	ano	attendance [17] - 237:20, 237:21, 255:9,
<b>2.82</b> (1) - 259:12		age [4] - 231.7, 234.21, 205.2, 209.3	255:16, 255:17, 255:20, 256:10, 258:14,
2/21/2012 205:24	8	agenda [3] - 283:10, 291:23, 302:6	261:16, 269:3, 274:11, 275:3, 287:13,
212 1120 13 [1] = 303.24	Ŭ	aggregate [4] - 216:9, 237:15, 238:19,	287:14, 289:3, 289:6, 289:8
<b>20</b> <sub>[4]</sub> - 245.23, 255.9, 255.11, 264.6	8 121 - 254:25, 255:16	286:22	attending [1] - 258:15
<b>20%</b> <sub>[3]</sub> - 228:18, 229:1, 234:12	<b>8 36</b> m - 259:24	aggression [1] - 202:5	attractive [1] - 270:13
<b>2011</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 199:12, 305:21	9 9E 056:10	aggressively [1] - 300:15	attributable [1] - 278:23
<b>25</b> <sub>[3]</sub> - 229:4, 229:15, 255:16	<b>0.03</b> [1] - 230.13	<b>ago</b> [1] - 238:25	attribute [5] - 203:14, 205:23, 212:14,
<b>250</b> [1] - 280:13	8th [1] - 280:13	agree [2] - 225:6, 273:22	216:2 218:24
25th [1] - 286:7		ahead <sub>[4]</sub> - 236:11, 254:23, 301:14, 303:4	attributed m = 206:6 207:5 207:13
<b>28</b> [1] - 255:24	9	<b>AIR</b> m = 199.18 199.19 276.12 283.9	210:12 210:15 287:1 201:12
280-some [1] - 260:14		200:10, 201:22, 206:10, 207:12	219.13, 219.13, 207.1, 291.12
	<b>9</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 260:22, 284:22	290.19, 291.22, 296.10, 297.12	attributing [5] - 213:5, 213:9, 213:10,
2	<b>94%</b> [1] - 282:13	Algebra [3] - 241:13, 242:4, 242:8	219:2, 219:4
3	<b>95%</b> [2] - 281:10, 282:12	allow [1] - 277:20	authorized [1] - 305:10
3 m = 220.4 220.25 260.12 272.10 274.9	<b>96</b> [1] - 209:20	almost [4] - 206:7, 251:18, 254:25, 257:19	available [2] - 211:16, 267:16
<b>3</b> [8] - 223.4, 223.20, 200.12, 273.13, 274.0,	<b>96's</b> [1] - 209:20	amalgamate [1] - 296:15	average [30] - 200:18, 200:21, 201:7, 201:9,
204.22, 200.4, 301.23	10	ambassadors [1] - 229:22	201:11, 201:13, 202:13, 202:22, 203:1,
<b>3%</b> <sub>[1]</sub> - 229:8	Δ	AMERICAN [1] - 199:2	203:20, 203:25, 206:25, 207:1, 207:2,
<b>3,000</b> [5] - 260:8, 260:18, 261:1, 263:10,	I ^	amount [10] - 223:18, 223:21, 224:16,	207:3, 211:9, 212:18, 215:13, 215:14,
263:16	abilities on - 241:16	225:9, 233:11, 238:24, 272:5, 289:15.	224:5, 244:24, 265:22, 266:3, 280:15.
<b>30</b> [2] - 227:6, 227:16	ability 201:19 276:7	291:4. 298:13	281:12, 292:6, 292:17
<b>304</b> <sub>[1]</sub> - 305:12		Analysis (4) - 199:17	averages (4) - 245:2
<b>38</b> <sub>[1]</sub> - 220:23	aDIE [6] - 217:13, 235:6, 244:7, 283:21,	analysis (1) .00.17	
<b>3A</b> [9] - 236:6, 236:8, 265:15, 267:25,	288:14, 303:24	analysis [4] - 202.0, 240.4, 247.11, 290.21	
268:22, 269:2. 269:4. 274:15. 274:21	above-entitled [1] - 305:8	anu s [1] - 217:19	В
<b>3A1</b> rel - 236:8 265:15 269:2 273:8	absent [3] - 255:10, 256:5, 256:6	<b>ANN</b> [1] - 199:20	
273.11	Absolutely [1] - 278:5	<b>Ann</b> [5] - 217:25, 218:9, 219:11, 219:17,	<b>Dag</b> [4] - 204:16, 204:22, 292:10, 295:17
2P 275-10	abstract [1] - 303:17	226:18	bagging [1] - 302:23
	abstraction [1] - 217:10	<b>Ann's</b> [1] - 218:15	balance [1] - 246:6
<b>3C</b> [16] - 234:4, 253:25, 261:7, 275:7,	Academy [1] - 199:8	Anna [2] - 223:25, 251:5	bar [6] - 200:7, 202:3, 202:9, 203:10,
275:15, 294:6, 294:7, 294:9, 294:12,	accenting rg = 248.8	Anna's [2] - 245:22, 248:7	204:21, 206:17
294:22, 294:24, 298:8, 299:20, 300:5,	accomplished 205:0	annexed [1] - 305:12	barely [1] - 258:10
303:7, 303:10		answer (10) - 201:3 208:6 208:9 212:25	based [13] - 206:8, 206:10, 207:12, 207:14.
	according [1] - 255:21	213.12 216.21 216.22 217.12 217.12	230:24, 234:19, 234:24, 247:13, 254:2
	account [8] - 228:8, 233:12, 233:17,	210.12, 210.21, 210.22, 211.12, 211.13,	

277:5. 288:18. 296:9 basics [1] - 274:10 basing [1] - 209:19 become [1] - 214:4 becomes [6] - 205:20, 207:11, 227:22, 231:7, 245:16, 278:25 beginning [1] - 265:16 behavior [2] - 280:3, 280:4 behavioral [3] - 258:15, 276:20, 293:5 behind [2] - 254:22 belief [2] - 209:15, 210:2 believes [3] - 211:19, 218:1, 219:18 below [2] - 207:3, 245:1 benefit [2] - 268:8, 283:6 best [5] - 241:8, 275:23, 280:9, 292:1, 301.19 bet [1] - 258:13 better [18] - 201:1, 204:1, 210:23, 210:25, 211:1, 213:8, 213:9, 227:10, 234:9, 246:3, 246:21, 246:23, 247:1, 247:6, 251:9, 255:20, 264:24, 297:23 between [10] - 219:24, 220:1, 229:14, 229:23, 231:17, 236:8, 244:6, 244:10, 286:6. 288:3 beyond [3] - 216:20, 269:24, 275:2 biased [1] - 219:20 big [10] - 221:19, 231:4, 238:19, 240:12, 252:2, 255:23, 281:4, 281:19, 298:11, 301:18 bigger [4] - 268:3, 281:23, 287:7, 287:8 biggest [1] - 268:23 bit [7] - 207:14, 216:22, 216:23, 266:21, 289:23, 300:15, 301:11 black [1] - 265:21 blind [1] - 280:25 board [2] - 203:25, 293:24 Board [1] - 295:5 book [1] - 208:11 borrow [1] - 205:5 bottom [1] - 220:12 bound [1] - 296:18 Bourn [1] - 290:23 BOURN [10] - 212:1, 224:16, 236:4, 287:12, 287:14, 287:18, 287:23, 290:24, 293:22, 294:4 box [2] - 265:19, 266:6 boxed [1] - 265:16 BRAGG [1] - 305:23 Bragg [1] - 305:6 brain [2] - 277:16, 277:21 break [5] - 224:3, 226:17, 270:5, 270:7, 270:19 breaking [1] - 285:17 bridge [1] - 270:25 brightest [1] - 241:2 bring [7] - 216:15, 217:19, 264:22, 264:25, 265:4. 290:8. 299:22 BROWN [30] - 205:12, 206:3, 207:12, 209:9. 209:14. 211:11. 212:10. 212:23. 218:18, 225:22, 226:1, 226:9, 226:12, 237:25, 238:18, 241:12, 242:6, 242:15, 242:24, 243:3, 243:17, 248:13, 249:21, 258:23, 274:22, 277:23, 280:2, 291:22, 295:18, 302:5 Building [1] - 199:8 built [1] - 223:11 bunch [5] - 214:19, 229:5, 252:2, 255:19, 296:6 burning [1] - 303:23 business [1] - 281:24 **buy** [9] - 227:9, 229:6, 229:7, 230:14,

230:20, 237:11, 239:11, 247:5, 265:1 buying  $_{[1]}$  - 248:3 buys  $_{[1]}$  - 265:5

С

CA [1] - 301:25 calculate [1] - 207:9 calculated [4] - 202:23, 203:11, 261:20, 287.13 calculating [3] - 202:10, 202:25, 249:25 calculation [1] - 205:21 calculations [1] - 248:20 camera [1] - 272:19 camp [1] - 247:15 cannot [1] - 243:15 capacity [1] - 276:3 capture [2] - 237:2, 237:4 care [6] - 220:12, 229:13, 229:19, 230:21, 264:21, 265:10 careful [1] - 235:2 case [5] - 203:7, 245:5, 269:12, 279:9, 281:16 cases [1] - 254:9 categories [5] - 262:5, 262:8, 276:18, 284:9, 290:16 category [1] - 285:6 caused [1] - 208:11 causing [4] - 210:16, 212:13, 212:17, 213:7 cautious [2] - 235:22, 282:10 cease [5] - 272:10, 273:10, 274:2, 274:20, 275:10 centered [2] - 204:11, 204:18 Central [1] - 199:7 certain [5] - 223:18, 244:18, 281:10, 282:12, 291:22 Certainly [1] - 254:12 certainly [2] - 222:21, 265:20 CERTIFY [2] - 305:8, 305:15 cetera [1] - 296:13 challenging [2] - 271:11, 287:5 chance [8] - 254:20, 257:1, 257:24, 259:20, 279:12, 279:13, 280:6 Chancellor [1] - 199:16 change [14] - 217:7, 217:8, 235:9, 235:17, 240:4, 244:12, 244:13, 244:15, 249:15, 256:7, 257:8, 285:22, 295:13 changing [2] - 241:14, 241:15 characteristic [5] - 236:18, 278:23, 288:25, 289:19. 289:24 characteristics [5] - 243:13, 266:12, 297:22. 298:21 chart [1] - 267:18 chew [1] - 301:22 child [1] - 284:17 children [1] - 214:16 choice [3] - 214:2, 219:24, 297:20 choose [9] - 220:1, 245:22, 246:15, 266:10, 268:20, 268:21, 269:4, 278:9, 285:25 choosing [3] - 242:4, 249:14, 265:13 chose [1] - 205:21 CHRISTY [1] - 199:19 Christy [6] - 218:5, 218:8, 218:20, 219:12, 222:18, 283:1 Christy's [1] - 304:5 circle [1] - 298:4 circles [2] - 220:4, 221:1 circular [2] - 216:19, 217:17 clarify [1] - 205:12 class [22] - 230:11, 237:20, 241:1, 242:3, 253:4, 253:9, 253:13, 253:21, 253:22,

267:12. 269:11. 269:13. 281:2. 285:1. 286:2, 286:5, 286:6, 286:10, 286:11, 288:3, 288:4 Class [1] - 253:4 classes [9] - 253:7, 253:16, 253:20, 259:10, 287:4, 287:5, 288:5, 288:11 classification [6] - 204:12, 204:19, 204:23, 205:5, 231:23, 235:9 classifications [2] - 204:7, 244:8 classified [1] - 204:25 classroom [1] - 280:7 classrooms [1] - 240:18 cleaning [1] - 251:10 clear [4] - 246:14, 260:2, 260:4, 261:4 close [1] - 244:7 closer [1] - 210:25 co [4] - 249:15, 251:24, 255:9, 293:4 co-efficiencies [1] - 251:24 co-efficient [2] - 255:9, 293:4 co-efficients [1] - 249:15 coded [2] - 257:16, 257:18 cognitive [1] - 288:23 COHEN [65] - 199:18, 203:5, 206:14, 207:16, 208:5, 208:19, 209:24, 212:12, 212:25, 214:7, 215:12, 215:25, 217:22, 218:20, 222:13, 222:18, 225:3, 225:8, 225:19, 226:5, 226:10, 237:12, 240:2, 240:15, 240:20, 241:25, 242:14, 248:21, 251:8. 254:8. 254:12. 254:18. 256:24. 257.5 257.13 257.16 258.7 258.10 258:19, 259:1, 259:9, 259:13, 259:17, 261:3. 261:11. 261:14. 261:21. 262:7. 276:24, 277:8, 277:12, 279:4, 279:7, 280:9. 280:20. 281:7. 285:15. 286:18. 291:14, 292:4, 292:19, 293:2, 296:23, 297:19. 298:4 colleagues [3] - 207:17, 211:5, 218:7 combination [3] - 205:15, 211:13, 223:13 combinations [1] - 296:11 combine [1] - 226:11 comfort [2] - 222:4, 222:11 comfortable [7] - 248:3, 270:24, 271:18, 272:23, 297:25, 298:2, 304:5 coming [1] - 231:2 comment [2] - 245:22, 263:9 Commission [1] - 305:24 commissioner [1] - 300:25 COMMITTEE [1] - 199:6 committee [8] - 226:19, 248:18, 272:10, 274:20, 290:19, 295:14, 296:4, 302:3 common [29] - 206:18, 206:22, 207:4, 207:8, 207:17, 208:20, 208:23, 210:9, 210:12, 210:16, 211:5, 211:7, 211:13, 211:20, 211:22, 211:23, 212:13, 212:17, 212:20, 213:3, 213:5, 213:7, 213:10, 216:2, 218:25, 219:1, 219:14, 223:6 communicated [1] - 267:20 comparable [7] - 234:6, 234:16, 237:9, 239:6, 265:13, 266:11 compare [3] - 226:14, 228:9, 265:19 compared [1] - 240:19 compares [1] - 261:14 comparing [3] - 202:3, 202:22, 250:19 comparison [6] - 203:13, 248:22, 250:2, 261:13, 265:21, 266:10 complete [1] - 303:22 completely [7] - 203:14, 204:2, 210:10, 210:18, 224:3, 244:22, 291:12 complex [5] - 227:19, 229:20, 245:23, 246:5, 246:10 complicated [4] - 205:2, 227:6, 227:21,

248:8 component [34] - 206:18, 206:20, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:8, 207:9, 207:18, 208:21, 208:23, 208:24, 210:4, 210:9, 210:12, 210:17, 211:6, 211:7, 211:20, 211:22, 211:23, 212:13, 212:17, 212:18, 212:21, 213:3, 213:5, 213:7, 213:10, 218:25, 219:1, 219:14, 223:6, 231:11 compounded [1] - 268:19 comprehensive [1] - 303:15 comprise [1] - 305:13 computers [1] - 301:8 concentrated [2] - 211:2, 280:24 concentration [1] - 243:5 concerns [1] - 298:23 concludes [1] - 304:9 conclusion [3] - 201:21, 247:13, 298:15 concrete [2] - 222:24, 298:6 condition [1] - 257:21 conditioning [1] - 237:3 Conditions [1] - 217:6 conditions [1] - 217:7 confidence [2] - 232:21, 271:7 confused [4] - 205:13, 211:10, 221:20, 294:14 confusing [1] - 223:15 confusion [1] - 222:3 connection [1] - 302:8 cons [1] - 278:7 consensus [2] - 221:20, 225:14 consequence [3] - 200:13, 202:25, 223:12 consequences [4] - 217:18, 238:15, 290.14 301.2 consequentially [1] - 202:19 consequently [1] - 209:2 consider [3] - 274:2, 274:16, 295:25 consideration [5] - 200:15, 272:11, 273:10, 274:21, 275:25 considered [4] - 211:24, 232:20, 251:16, 291:11 considering [2] - 275:6, 275:10 consistently [1] - 241:23 contemplate [1] - 200:10 context [3] - 260:9, 260:10, 260:25 continuation [1] - 200:2 continue [1] - 217:15 continuous [3] - 289:1, 289:2, 289:13 continuum [4] - 220:1, 225:24, 226:2 contradiction [1] - 224:2 contribute [2] - 207:15, 219:1 contributing [1] - 207:17 contribution [1] - 210:11 control [23] - 212:2, 227:5, 228:4, 228:9, 228:10, 229:23, 230:10, 230:11, 230:12, 230:17. 236:5. 238:11. 238:12. 240:22. 242:12, 246:20, 250:6, 251:20, 251:23, 269:21.281:24 controlled [1] - 269:17 controlling [3] - 238:23, 250:9, 255:25 conversation [12] - 216:18, 223:1, 230:9, 235:21, 237:14, 251:6, 263:24, 270:12, 270:17, 290:9, 301:18, 303:17 convert [1] - 263:2 converted [1] - 263:4 COPA [4] - 199:17, 249:22, 296:3, 301:25 correct [6] - 208:18, 240:14, 242:13, 268:24, 269:22, 305:13 correlated [12] - 231:19, 236:3, 237:16, 237:18, 244:11, 251:12, 252:21, 258:12, 258:13, 259:5, 286:19, 286:24 correlates [1] - 259:3

correlation [5] - 231:17, 244:6, 244:10, 254:11, 298:20 correlations [1] - 287:10 counsel [1] - 305:16 count [1] - 286:11 counter [3] - 276:15, 285:12, 295:16 counter-argument [2] - 285:12, 295:16 counter-point [1] - 276:15 counties [17] - 244:21, 244:22, 244:25, 245:1, 245:3, 249:2, 250:19, 250:24, 251:1. 255:11. 292:13. 292:22. 292:25. 293:17, 293:19, 293:21, 294:3 COUNTY [1] - 305:4 county [9] - 244:24, 292:14, 292:16, 292:23, 293:5, 293:6, 293:7, 293:16, 294.1 County [4] - 247:23, 250:10, 250:12, 250:13 couple [6] - 200:5, 202:18, 216:14, 228:15, 261:24. 301:9 course [2] - 220:15, 241:21 courses [2] - 241:15, 288:7 Court [1] - 305:6 covariate [4] - 235:10, 235:13, 242:12, 268:21 covariates [31] - 227:7, 227:14, 227:17, 229:3, 229:4, 229:6, 229:15, 229:24, 233:15, 233:19, 234:3, 234:5, 234:7, 234:10, 234:25, 237:1, 239:12, 244:4, 244:5. 268:20. 269:3. 274:9. 274:14. 275:2, 275:18, 275:22, 297:11, 299:19, 300:4. 303:12 cover [1] - 300:16 covered [1] - 270:25 crazy [1] - 203:24 creating [2] - 268:13, 296:1 criteria [8] - 226:25, 233:3, 238:17, 247:3, 263:23, 270:9, 298:14, 300:9 criterion [4] - 236:12, 236:21, 236:22, 266:17 cross [2] - 230:13, 240:8 current [4] - 228:2, 240:22, 249:12, 264:13 D

**Dade** [4] - 246:3, 246:7, 247:23, 250:10

data [38] - 222:19, 222:22, 230:24, 230:25, 232:8. 233:4. 233:6. 233:7. 234:20. 239:15. 239:18. 251:9. 258:17. 264:3. 267:2. 270:11. 272:25. 273:2. 276:5. 279:7, 281:12, 281:19, 281:25, 282:14, 283:16, 283:22, 283:25, 285:23, 287:10, 287:15, 290:17, 292:5, 294:8, 294:19, 297:20. 298:18. 300:10. 303:8 data-wise [1] - 283:22 day's [1] - 302:20 days [4] - 255:10, 255:12, 287:16 deaf [1] - 280:25 deal [1] - 253:23 dealing [2] - 262:2, 262:5 debate [2] - 236:25, 278:8 decent [1] - 262:1 decide [4] - 226:3, 246:5, 277:18, 297:10 decided [3] - 205:17, 225:17, 294:4 deciding [1] - 224:10 decimal [1] - 233:22 decision [14] - 208:25, 224:12, 233:3, 238:23, 264:17, 267:8, 267:15, 269:24 295:13. 297:25. 298:19. 298:24. 300:23. 303:9 decisions [7] - 290:10, 297:12, 298:22,

301:22, 302:2, 303:6, 303:14 decline [1] - 231:14 decrease [1] - 253:11 decreased [2] - 208:15, 289:12 decreases [1] - 202:25 define [1] - 204:12 defined [1] - 288:23 definition [3] - 203:13, 204:4, 288:7 degree [4] - 242:20, 243:9, 243:11, 301:3 delving [2] - 215:3, 216:16 demographic [1] - 209:10 demographics [1] - 247:25 DEPARTMENT [2] - 199:1, 199:16 dependent [2] - 241:4, 264:13 Deputy [1] - 199:16 describe [1] - 223:5 desirable [1] - 264:19 determined [1] - 273:24 developing [1] - 249:23 developmental [4] - 260:5, 260:7, 260:16, 260.24 deviates [1] - 202:15 dichotomous [3] - 219:25, 225:24, 289:16 differ [9] - 200:12, 201:6, 201:17, 233:21, 237:19, 243:4, 243:12, 266:13, 295:1 difference [40] - 202:1, 211:22, 220:16, 229:9, 229:13, 231:3, 232:4, 232:18, 234:14, 234:23, 236:7, 236:10, 238:5, 238:6. 238:21. 250:9. 250:11. 252:2. 254:21, 254:25, 255:13, 255:14, 255:15, 255:16. 255:17. 258:2. 258:3. 259:25. 263:3, 266:2, 280:16, 281:5, 286:6, 286:8, 286:9, 286:22, 287:25, 288:3, 289:5 differences [17] - 201:14, 202:2, 228:8, 229:23, 231:13, 232:15, 234:1, 236:2, 240:11, 240:12, 245:12, 249:3, 256:3, 265:25, 269:22, 272:5, 272:12 different [62] - 210:2, 210:19, 211:12, 212:6, 213:1, 217:4, 223:5, 223:16, 228:10, 232:14, 233:2, 233:24, 235:5, 235:23, 236:19, 236:22, 237:16, 237:23, 238:17. 239:8. 241:22. 243:14. 244:11. 244:21, 244:22, 245:11, 246:8, 249:1. 249:2. 249:17. 249:25. 250:17. 250:19. 250:22, 251:20, 252:11, 252:17, 255:11, 255:20, 257:23, 263:11, 265:14, 277:1, 280:18. 281:11. 284:19. 285:21. 285:24. 289:1, 290:3, 290:7, 290:14, 290:15, 292:20, 293:8, 296:1, 297:21 Different [1] - 236:23 differentially [1] - 243:7 differentiate [1] - 212:14 differentiated [1] - 246:7 differentiation [3] - 246:12, 267:21, 295:4 differently [1] - 216:24 differs (11 - 219:17 difficult [4] - 216:20, 227:22, 277:9, 303:17 dimension [2] - 218:22, 218:23 diminishing [3] - 228:24, 229:17, 233:21 direct [1] - 266:10 direction [2] - 250:3, 250:4 Director [1] - 199:17 disabilities [2] - 230:10, 263:12 disability [3] - 281:15, 285:19, 287:3 disabled [1] - 260:17 discuss [2] - 275:3, 278:3 discussed [2] - 292:25, 297:18 discussing [2] - 270:24, 292:15 discussion [17] - 271:4, 273:20, 273:22, 274:12, 275:21, 282:19, 290:25, 291:20,

299:21, 299:24, 299:25, 300:4, 301:16, 301:19, 302:13, 302:21, 303:20 disorders [2] - 258:15, 293:5 disrupted [2] - 299:2, 299:11 distinct [1] - 271:2 distinguish [2] - 254:19, 257:1 distribution [1] - 248:1 district [12] - 239:20, 240:9, 241:20, 242:17, 243:1, 243:2, 245:13, 247:7, 276:5, 292:7, 295:2 district-wide [1] - 276:5 districts [14] - 220:8, 242:20, 243:9, 243:12, 245:11, 247:16, 248:6, 248:11, 248:23, 249:9, 249:14, 250:3, 291:23, 292.8 diverse [1] - 286:11 diversity [1] - 246:12 diving [1] - 303:6 DO [1] - 305:8 doable [1] - 296:22 done [10] - 220:5, 230:23, 247:12, 265:11, 270:8, 273:21, 276:12, 282:15, 291:24, 302:1 DORAN [52] - 199:19, 200:11, 200:20, 201:2, 201:9, 201:13, 201:16, 201:22, 202:14, 203:4, 203:20, 204:6, 215:2, 215:6, 216:14, 226:22, 231:10, 232:7, 232:25, 235:1, 236:11, 238:10, 238:25, 239:16, 240:1, 242:18, 243:1, 243:4, 244:1, 245:8, 246:13, 246:20, 262:14, 262:19, 263:19, 266:20, 267:3, 267:10, 268:5, 268:25, 269:9, 269:17, 269:20, 270:7, 287:20, 287:24, 288:5, 288:9, 288:19, 290:12, 298:11, 300:6 dot [1] - 265:22 double [1] - 231:6 down [25] - 219:22, 219:23, 220:12, 226:18, 239:20, 239:21, 239:23, 248:14, 250:18, 250:21, 258:24, 268:15, 271:16, 271:19, 282:22, 282:23, 296:5, 296:10, 296:24, 296:25, 298:9, 302:15, 303:10, 303:24 downside [1] - 251:6 DR [133] - 200:11, 200:20, 201:2, 201:9, 201:13, 201:16, 201:22, 202:14, 203:4, 203:5, 203:20, 204:6, 206:14, 207:16, 208:5, 208:19, 209:24, 212:3, 212:12, 212.25 214.7 215.2 215.4 215.6 215:8. 215:12. 215:17. 215:25. 216:4. 216:14, 217:22, 218:13, 218:20, 221:5, 222:13, 222:18, 222:20, 225:3, 225:8, 225:19, 226:5, 226:10, 226:16, 226:22, 231:10, 232:7, 232:25, 235:1, 236:11, 237:12, 238:10, 238:25, 239:16, 240:1, 240:2. 240:15. 240:20. 241:25. 242:14. 242:18, 243:1, 243:4, 244:1, 245:8, 246:13, 246:20, 248:21, 251:8, 254:8, 254:12, 254:18, 256:24, 257:5, 257:13, 257:16. 258:7. 258:10. 258:19. 259:1. 259:9, 259:13, 259:17, 260:4, 261:3, 261:11, 261:14, 261:21, 262:7, 262:14, 262:19, 263:19, 266:20, 267:3, 267:10, 268:5, 268:25, 269:9, 269:17, 269:20, 270:7. 272:17. 276:24. 277:8. 277:12. 279:4. 279:7. 280:9. 280:20. 281:7. 285:15, 286:18, 287:14, 287:20, 287:24, 288:5, 288:9, 288:19, 288:21, 289:10, 290:12, 291:14, 292:4, 292:19, 293:2, 296:23, 297:19, 298:4, 298:11, 299:7, 300:6. 301:15. 302:9. 304:7 draw [2] - 220:23, 249:18 drive [2] - 203:8, 222:14 drive-by [1] - 203:8

 $\label{eq:second} \begin{array}{l} \text{driven}_{\{1\}} = 219:23 \\ \text{drives}_{\{1\}} = 221:12 \\ \text{driving}_{\{1\}} = 219:22 \\ \text{drop}_{\{1\}} = 255:3 \\ \textbf{DS}_{\{1\}} = 289:14 \\ \textbf{DSS}_{\{2\}} = 261:8, 289:5 \\ \textbf{dual}_{\{10\}} = 254:4, 254:17, 262:10, 278:18, 279:9, 279:18, 280:23, 281:3, 284:12, 284:21 \\ \textbf{due}_{\{8\}} = 206:22, 208:24, 210:4, 210:9, 257:6, 257:8, 257:24, 279:13 \\ \textbf{dump}_{\{1\}} = 227:7 \\ \textbf{duplicated}_{\{1\}} = 212:6 \\ \end{array}$ 

F

early [1] - 237:14 easier [3] - 246:10, 246:16, 288:17 easiest [1] - 272:4 easy [3] - 213:21, 247:19, 292:6 EBD [1] - 280:8 Ed.D [1] - 199:19 EDGECOMB [1] - 209:12 education [1] - 231:5 EDUCATION [2] - 199:1, 199:16 Educator [1] - 199:16 effect [101] - 200:7, 200:18, 200:21, 200:25, 201:8. 202:6. 202:8. 202:10. 202:21. 202:24, 203:14, 203:17, 203:19, 204:3, 204:5. 204:11. 204:18. 204:25. 205:7. 205:8, 205:14, 205:17, 205:19, 205:20, 205:21, 205:22, 206:12, 207:10, 207:12, 208:1. 208:15. 209:7. 212:7. 212:8. 213:23, 215:1, 215:11, 216:9, 216:13, 217:4, 217:5, 219:20, 222:8, 223:7, 223:8. 223:24. 224:3. 224:9. 224:11. 224:18, 225:11, 251:19, 253:5, 253:6, 253:22, 254:1, 254:2, 254:14, 255:2, 255:8. 255:24. 259:6. 259:7. 262:17. 262:19, 262:20, 262:22, 262:23, 263:1, 263:3, 263:4, 263:6, 263:16, 264:25, 273:18, 273:19, 273:21, 278:12, 278:17, 278:19, 279:16, 279:17, 284:23, 286:5, 286:21, 286:25, 287:5, 287:18, 291:11, 291:12, 292:6, 296:20, 297:4, 297:5, 297:16, 301:23, 302:24 effective [7] - 208:17, 214:5, 214:16, 271:13, 281:21, 282:5 effectively [1] - 282:16 effects [39] - 200:13, 200:14, 201:5, 201:10, 203.14 204.9 204.17 206.17 215.10 215:13, 216:2, 216:11, 216:12, 217:1, 217:2. 217:6. 218:4. 218:19. 219:13. 220:11, 222:6, 224:6, 226:13, 227:11, 227:16. 228:7. 231:14. 231:18. 233:12. 237:15, 238:11, 244:10, 262:2, 267:6, 269:23, 294:12, 294:13, 294:24, 301:17 efficiencies [1] - 251:24 efficient [2] - 255:9, 293:4 efficiently [1] - 301:4 efficients [1] - 249:15 effort [3] - 209:16, 211:21, 213:4 efforts [1] - 215:20 eight [1] - 257:20 either [9] - 214:2, 219:16, 222:15, 223:11, 237:7, 238:22, 287:6, 296:18, 299:5 elegant [1] - 227:20 element [2] - 243:24, 244:1 eliminate [1] - 267:5 ELL [10] - 250:6, 250:9, 250:10, 250:12, 255:25, 261:15, 269:3, 274:10, 275:2,

293:15 emotional [5] - 258:14, 259:11, 280:3, 280:4, 293:4 emotionally [1] - 276:20 employed [1] - 305:16 end [7] - 224:10, 243:21, 263:14, 297:13, 300.11 300.18 300.22 enormously [1] - 224:7 enrolled [2] - 287:16, 288:6 entertain [1] - 235:12 entire [2] - 212:20, 263:15 entirely [2] - 210:5, 219:14 entitled [1] - 305:8 equal [4] - 212:16, 213:3, 213:4, 261:16 equalize [1] - 222:9 equally [4] - 209:5, 224:9, 227:15, 271:6 equate [1] - 262:17 equates [1] - 289:6 equitably [1] - 214:7 error [9] - 257:7, 262:14, 264:20, 266:19, 267:22, 268:3, 268:4, 268:6, 268:14 errors [11] - 261:23, 264:16, 265:17, 265:23, 266:3, 266:7, 268:9, 268:12, 269:10. 269:13. 269:25 ESE [1] - 231:6 especially [1] - 287:8 Especially [2] - 231:5, 278:17 essentially [5] - 200:23, 227:18, 254:22, 270:8. 283:1 Essentially [1] - 234:15 establish [1] - 291:4 established [1] - 290:3 estimate [6] - 206:20, 225:10, 225:12, 226:8, 267:14, 280:9 estimated [3] - 277:1, 286:21, 296:7 estimates [4] - 231:13, 236:2, 239:6, 266.21 estimating [3] - 227:10, 250:22, 267:6 et [1] - 296:13 etc [1] - 211:17 evaluate [2] - 227:1, 247:3 evaluating [2] - 298:13, 300:8 evaluation [4] - 281:22, 290:5, 302:15, 303:23 evaluations [3] - 220:7, 220:9, 220:20 eventually [1] - 250:21 evidence [2] - 264:18, 276:6 exact [5] - 212:5, 241:21, 265:18, 280:14, 287:5 Exactly [3] - 224:22, 251:2, 293:25 exactly [16] - 200:11, 202:14, 203:6, 206:14, 206:25, 208:5, 219:11, 219:19, 241:7. 242:22. 243:2. 243:11. 251:2. 268:25, 283:12, 294:10 example [14] - 217:24, 234:4, 234:11, 242:10, 246:25, 249:25, 250:6, 262:21, 279:10, 280:25, 292:5, 293:16, 294:23, 296.9 examples [7] - 210:1, 222:23, 224:24, 225:6, 226:1, 226:12, 291:15 exclude [1] - 226:3 excluding [1] - 238:8 Executive [1] - 199:18 exercise [1] - 225:13 exist [1] - 269:20 exists [1] - 282:14 expect [5] - 240:12, 248:21, 258:3, 281:13, 293:8 expectation [11] - 202:11, 223:10, 256:6, 256:7. 260:21. 278:20. 288:25. 289:7. 289:11, 289:18, 289:20

expectations [12] - 233:2, 256:3, 260:13, 290:3, 290:7, 290:14, 295:20, 296:1, 297:21.298:19.301:10.301:12 expected [11] - 202:2, 202:4, 255:1, 255:4, 255:24, 257:18, 257:19, 258:21, 258:23, 287:25, 289:25 experience [1] - 235:19 Expires [1] - 305:24 explain [12] - 227:22, 230:16, 241:7, 246:10, 246:17, 247:4, 253:2, 276:17, 277:19. 285:10. 287:12. 292:2 explained [3] - 240:21, 249:5, 252:10 explaining [3] - 241:5, 259:6 explanation [1] - 285:18 explanations [1] - 235:3 explanatory [1] - 250:7 explore [2] - 217:18, 267:11 expressed [1] - 202:1 extensive [1] - 261:8 extent [2] - 227:22, 240:3 extra [2] - 214:25, 268:15 extreme [2] - 291:10, 291:11 F facilitate [1] - 270:12 fact [6] - 201:4, 233:16, 233:21, 238:18, 249:3. 265:17 factor [5] - 268:5, 275:1, 278:19, 279:1, 282:15 factors [9] - 213:2, 213:6, 232:5, 268:12, 269:5. 269:7. 275:24. 276:1. 276:20 fair [9] - 212:20, 216:1, 221:17, 222:5, 222:11, 272:3, 272:8, 275:7, 282:21 fairly [1] - 300:25 fairness [1] - 293:24 fall [1] - 245:1 false [1] - 247:13 families [1] - 218:3 far [4] - 238:5, 251:16, 270:10, 270:13 favor [13] - 264:18, 272:16, 273:15, 274:5, 274:13, 274:24, 275:13, 278:2, 282:8, 295:14, 298:16, 300:3, 300:5 FCAT [5] - 240:23, 240:24, 249:13, 260:7, 261:9 FEILD [24] - 225:16, 245:20, 246:18, 251:2, 266:23, 267:9, 267:17, 268:19, 269:2, 269:15, 269:19, 272:13, 273:5, 273:12, 284:7, 285:5, 294:6, 294:11, 294:21, 295:10, 297:9, 297:15, 298:2, 299:23 few [7] - 223:5, 223:16, 241:2, 250:12, 254.9 262.9 fewer [4] - 233:19, 251:9, 252:18, 254:12 fewest [2] - 234:6, 234:10 field 131 - 222:17, 230:19, 290:6 fifth [1] - 267:11 figure [2] - 226:10, 282:15 fill [2] - 296:24, 302:14 final [6] - 205:14, 205:18, 206:3, 238:22, 278:4, 294:23 finalize [1] - 291:20 finally [1] - 240:13 financial [1] - 305:17

fine [3] - 202:11, 245:6, 284:10

 $\textit{first}_{[5]} \textit{-} 233:9, 253:4, 253:21, 272:4, \\$ 

fit [4] - 237:22, 241:9, 253:18, 256:2

fine-picking [1] - 284:10

finish [2] - 299:5, 299:10

finer [1] - 283:12

fitting [1] - 241:9

302:21

five [11] - 227:14, 229:3, 240:17, 240:18, 245:1, 246:2, 255:4, 255:5, 255:6, 261:17, 289:12 fix [1] - 279:6 fixed [4] - 228:6, 233:12, 238:10, 269:22 flaws [1] - 220:25 flip [1] - 302:10 FLORIDA [2] - 199:1, 305:3 Florida [4] - 199:7, 199:9, 305:7, 305:23 FLORIDA'S [1] - 199:4 focus [1] - 271:14 FOERSTER [59] - 200:4, 200:16, 200:23, 201:7, 201:11, 201:14, 201:19, 201:23, 202:17, 203:7, 203:21, 205:4, 206:2, 212:11, 221:17, 222:22, 223:4, 224:21, 224:23, 225:5, 226:21, 247:9, 248:16, 249:19, 256:19, 270:20, 272:15, 272:18, 273:6. 273:9. 273:13. 273:15. 274:5. 274:19, 274:24, 275:9, 275:13, 277:7, 277:13, 278:1, 278:5, 278:14, 282:20, 283:18, 285:4, 285:7, 289:21, 290:18, 291:9, 291:17, 291:25, 295:12, 295:22, 298:6. 299:12. 299:18. 300:1. 300:3. 304:4 folded [1] - 272:7 follows [1] - 236:17 FOR [1] - 199:2 forces [1] - 218:2 foregoing [1] - 305:11 form [1] - 234:8 forming [4] - 246:24, 247:1, 247:6, 264:24 formula [5] - 249:24, 250:2, 250:8, 250:23, 250:25 formulas [2] - 249:25, 250:22 forth [3] - 203:5, 227:23, 298:22 forward [3] - 216:24, 221:2, 300:14 foul [2] - 238:7, 238:18 four [11] - 226:17, 245:1, 247:24, 253:10, 253:12, 255:5, 260:18, 281:2, 281:3, 286:9. 286:12 fourth [1] - 267:6 FRAKES [1] - 231:5 front [1] - 303:16 frustration [1] - 209:25 fully [1] - 207:5 fun [1] - 273:16 function [2] - 202:23, 250:1 FURTHER [1] - 305:15 G general [5] - 252:21, 276:25, 281:6, 281:8, 282:4 generate [1] - 223:20 generates [1] - 223:17 gentleman [1] - 213:17 gentlemen [1] - 270:20 gifted [5] - 213:20, 214:15, 269:3, 274:10, 275:2 GINN [5] - 213:16, 214:11, 214:23, 215:15, 221:25 Gisela's [1] - 250:5 given  $_{[7]}$  - 204:25, 236:21, 270:12, 274:12, 278:20, 301:1, 301:2 glad [1] - 282:20 goal [1] - 301:6 grade [37] - 239:22, 240:7, 240:8, 240:14, 240:16, 240:17, 241:1, 241:13, 242:5, 260:12, 266:24, 266:25, 267:6, 267:12, 267:22, 267:23, 268:11, 268:18, 269:6.

284:19. 284:22. 292:5. 295:4. 295:11. 296:8, 296:11, 296:12, 296:13, 296:19, 303.11 graded [1] - 222:7 grades [11] - 268:7, 277:4, 277:17, 283:18, 284:23, 285:9, 285:21, 295:8, 296:21, 297:3. 303:18 granularity [1] - 284:15 graph [5] - 200:7, 208:16, 231:20, 242:16, 244.3 graphs [1] - 256:18 grasp [1] - 207:22 gratified [1] - 271:6 great [8] - 210:7, 211:8, 219:8, 221:11, 239:19, 278:14, 283:15, 292:1 greater [3] - 239:25, 259:25, 279:12 greatest [3] - 296:19, 297:4, 297:5 group [7] - 204:8, 210:14, 213:25, 263:25, 267:3, 271:3, 285:16 groups [2] - 290:15, 297:22 growth [22] - 201:12, 201:13, 201:18, 202:3. 202:4. 205:9. 205:25. 207:13. 223:2. 223:9. 223:18. 223:21. 224:17. 257:19, 280:12, 286:10, 289:12, 289:25, 291:2, 291:4, 293:9, 301:12 GROWTH [1] - 199:5 guarantee [1] - 268:10 guess [3] - 220:17, 248:18, 289:21 guessing [1] - 280:17 guilty [2] - 299:1, 299:11 guys [8] - 213:18, 251:21, 252:7, 271:5, 271:17. 283:8. 291:18. 292:7

## Н

half [8] - 203:16, 203:17, 204:3, 204:14, 204:15, 224:5, 224:6, 300:16 half-hour [1] - 300:16 hand [7] - 215:8, 221:25, 224:8, 272:17, 274:6, 290:18, 299:16 handing [1] - 283:8 hard [13] - 207:22, 207:24, 207:25, 208:4, 209:6, 209:14, 209:22, 217:11, 223:20, 244:19, 276:9, 288:19, 298:5 harder [5] - 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 230:16, 285:10 harm [9] - 238:7, 251:7, 251:8, 251:10, 276:16, 278:16, 278:24, 286:17, 286:18 harm/no [1] - 238:18 HAROLD [1] - 199:19 Harold [11] - 214:8, 217:22, 222:21, 226:18, 237:12, 247:9, 249:23, 282:25, 285:11, 287:12, 303:2 head [2] - 260:2, 284:6 headache [1] - 285:25 heading [1] - 298:8 health [2] - 257:18, 261:6 hear [1] - 215:16 heard [1] - 305:9 hearing [1] - 276:19 heavier [1] - 292:16 HEBDA [1] - 199:16 held [2] - 256:9, 294:2 help [5] - 222:16, 241:11, 246:11, 269:23, 276:3 helped [1] - 207:15 helpful [4] - 224:14, 290:4, 296:4, 296:14 helping [1] - 264:17 helps [1] - 228:1 HEREBY [1] - 305:8 herein [1] - 305:9

American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

277:6, 279:5, 279:8, 280:11, 280:13,

hereunto [1] - 305:19 herself [1] - 219:20 high [19] - 204:9, 205:1, 208:2, 212:7, 214:15, 216:11, 217:3, 217:5, 218:14, 218:16, 219:6, 220:14, 222:15, 224:18, 228:16, 243:16, 254:3, 255:17, 291:5 higher [6] - 222:7, 228:23, 253:8, 258:22, 259:12, 267:23 highlight [1] - 252:8 highlighted [12] - 256:11, 256:14, 256:15, 256:17, 256:22, 256:25, 257:10, 257:12, 259:18, 259:23, 260:1, 261:24 highly [8] - 211:15, 231:19, 236:3, 237:18, 244:11, 251:12, 258:12, 281:21 hijack [1] - 217:24 hogs [1] - 214:19 hold [7] - 225:22, 240:6, 241:19, 243:10, 272:17, 280:20, 293:7 Hold [1] - 212:25 holistic [1] - 266:5 home [1] - 275:14 Homogeneity [2] - 253:20, 269:17 homogeneity [6] - 230:11, 269:12, 269:16, 286:2. 289:3. 294:16 homogenous [1] - 287:3 honing [1] - 274:25 honor [1] - 271:2 hope [1] - 271:5 hoping [2] - 200:4, 275:16 hour [7] - 217:14, 217:16, 221:2, 290:25, 291:16, 300:16, 302:21 hour-plus [1] - 290:25 HOVANETZ [18] - 199:19, 212:3, 215:4, 215:8, 215:17, 216:4, 218:13, 221:5, 222:20, 226:16, 260:4, 272:17, 288:21, 289:10, 299:7, 301:15, 302:9, 304:7 Huge [1] - 278:19 huge [11] - 225:9, 231:1, 234:14, 245:4, 250:9. 252:1. 255:13. 260:23. 290:25. 293:20. 301:18 human [3] - 229:12, 243:24, 244:1 hundreds [1] - 280:12 hurt [1] - 238:22 hypothesize [2] - 235:15, 242:7 hypothetical [2] - 222:23, 224:24 hypothetically [1] - 212:6 hypotheticals [2] - 216:16, 224:13 Ī

idea [3] - 240:1, 244:19, 283:15 identical [1] - 242:17 if's [1] - 217:19 ignore [1] - 257:5 ignoring [1] - 224:8 illustrations [1] - 250:15 imagine [1] - 276:10 impact [20] - 201:18, 214:6, 220:11, 231:16, 232:16, 243:20, 245:4, 245:17, 268:24, 269:25, 280:10, 289:14, 293:16, 297:19, 297:24, 298:18, 301:23, 302:11, 303:7 impacted [5] - 215:11, 224:17, 276:18, 292:24, 302:25 impacts [1] - 221:3 impaired [10] - 252:16, 254:17, 257:18, 261:6, 276:19, 278:19, 279:10, 279:19, 280:23 IMPLEMENTATION [1] - 199:5 implemented [1] - 245:16 implicated [1] - 214:17 implication [6] - 212:8, 216:7, 216:12,

278:15.289:22.291:8 implications [3] - 226:14, 275:4, 298:1 implies [1] - 223:16 imply [2] - 223:21, 223:23 importance [1] - 210:3 important [3] - 227:21, 277:7, 302:2 impossible [1] - 285:10 impression [1] - 276:25 improve [2] - 237:22, 256:2 IN [1] - 305:19 Inaudible [1] - 212:1 incident [1] - 280:1 incidents [1] - 254:3 include [45] - 200:14, 205:17, 227:14, 229:15, 230:1, 231:14, 231:24, 231:25, 232:24, 233:15, 234:3, 234:4, 235:5, 235:7, 235:9, 245:23, 251:14, 252:3, 252:18, 256:10, 264:5, 264:8, 264:11, 267:4, 268:1, 272:25, 273:18, 273:19, 274:8. 274:9. 277:24. 282:24. 282:25. 283:23, 283:24, 284:12, 284:13, 284:14, 290:1. 294:15. 294:24. 295:24. 297:11. 299:19 included [6] - 217:1, 217:2, 245:25, 252:7, 275:22. 284:2 including [16] - 218:2, 229:15, 230:15, 236:14, 238:8, 245:2, 246:23, 251:7, 257:25, 269:16, 274:14, 276:8, 293:11, 293:12, 295:2, 300:4 inclusion [1] - 242:11 inclusive [1] - 305:13 incorporating [1] - 276:6 incorrect [1] - 220:4 increase [3] - 208:14, 289:6, 289:7 increased [1] - 211:14 increment [1] - 289:13 incremental [2] - 289:4, 289:5 independent [4] - 213:2, 213:6, 254:6, 264:11 indicate [1] - 261:7 indicates [1] - 201:20 indicator [1] - 252:2 indicators [1] - 284:8 individual [12] - 206:11, 212:21, 218:10, 234:24, 237:18, 248:11, 248:14, 256:4, 262:5. 262:8. 302:25 influence [2] - 213:2, 269:6 inform [3] - 264:17, 291:19, 303:20 information [16] - 264:22, 264:25, 265:4, 266:9, 268:10, 268:16, 287:9, 300:7, 300:22, 301:3, 301:5, 302:14, 303:11, 303:13, 303:16, 303:20 injury [2] - 277:16, 277:21 insignificant [5] - 276:2, 278:10, 279:3, 296:21, 297:2 instance [1] - 261:5 instances [3] - 231:15, 280:2, 293:15 Instead [2] - 202:9, 243:20 instead [3] - 212:22, 265:11, 283:3 INSTITUTES [1] - 199:2 institutions [1] - 210:25 intents [1] - 262:18 interest [1] - 305:17 interested [1] - 262:21 interesting [1] - 245:14 interpret [1] - 287:18 interpretable [1] - 263:5 introducing [1] - 252:20 involved [3] - 211:15, 221:16, 243:25 involvement [1] - 211:15 issue [4] - 216:6, 245:21, 246:9, 283:11

issues [1] - 298:25 it'll [1] - 276:13 itself [3] - 206:1, 225:8, 250:1 J job [9] - 227:10, 227:15, 243:21, 246:21, 246:23, 247:1, 247:6, 264:24, 298:5 jobs [1] - 214:9 John [5] - 218:8, 237:13, 247:18, 248:17 John's [1] - 241:12 JON [1] - 199:18 Jon [11] - 215:9, 216:10, 222:6, 226:16, 260:4, 277:13, 279:6, 283:1, 285:11, 291:17. 301:17 Jon's [1] - 216:4 jot [1] - 303:24 Juan [2] - 245:8, 291:25 JUAN [1] - 199:17 judgment [7] - 229:12, 232:8, 233:5, 235:14, 236:1, 262:24, 266:6 judgments [2] - 236:20, 265:7 jump <sub>[1]</sub> - 271:20 jumping [1] - 278:6 June [1] - 305:21 Κ KATHY [1] - 199:16 KEARSCHNER [7] - 232:2, 232:10, 288:2, 288:8, 295:7, 299:14, 299:21 keep [17] - 214:2, 216:5, 221:23, 252:15, 252:25, 260:24, 271:15, 278:9, 279:1, 282:17, 283:9, 285:16, 286:15, 286:17, 293:23, 298:9, 302:3 keeping [8] - 232:19, 276:15, 278:2, 282:8, 285:12, 286:18, 286:20, 295:15 key [2] - 209:12, 247:7 kick [1] - 285:20 kid [6] - 209:22, 237:20, 256:5, 257:17, 257:20, 267:12 kids [27] - 201:10, 209:19, 210:14, 213:20, 213:21, 213:25, 214:4, 230:2, 254:12, 255:4, 255:20, 256:5, 256:8, 259:11, 261:14, 262:9, 269:11, 269:12, 280:7, 280:8, 280:16, 280:24, 287:2, 287:4, 290.4 290.7 290.15 kind [9] - 207:7, 217:10, 227:12, 229:16, 251:4, 260:24, 284:5, 285:1, 286:13 kinds [3] - 222:12, 248:20, 252:4 kitchen [3] - 253:24, 274:11, 275:6 knowledge [2] - 260:19, 277:14 known [1] - 243:20 KRISHNAIYER [2] - 222:2, 222:16 L Ladies [1] - 270:20 lag [4] - 267:8, 268:14, 268:23, 272:22 lags [17] - 236:13, 236:23, 237:7, 237:8, 237:9. 264:6. 265:14. 265:23. 266:3. 266:13, 267:4, 267:15, 267:16, 269:4, 272:24, 273:7 Lance 121 - 262:25, 283:21 language [3] - 206:15, 208:20, 252:16 laptop [1] - 292:5 Large [2] - 305:7, 305:23 large [9] - 242:21, 244:14, 255:1, 258:11, 262:3, 262:6, 262:12, 263:14, 278:18

232:23, 244:17, 263:23, 264:1, 271:13, 289:23, 290:9, 302:17 late [1] - 283:4 Laughing [1] - 277:10 Lawrence [1] - 248:16 Lawrence's [1] - 211:15 Leadership [1] - 220:15 leadership [3] - 210:3, 210:16, 219:2 learn [2] - 255:21, 260:14 learned [1] - 270:13 learning [12] - 205:24, 206:19, 206:20, 206:24, 208:21, 210:22, 215:19, 218:7. 219:22, 260:17, 263:12, 287:3 least [6] - 207:5, 221:20, 225:14, 270:16, 272:6, 298:15 leave [8] - 224:23, 252:23, 253:3, 270:17, 278:11, 294:4, 302:2, 302:15 leaves [2] - 273:17, 274:7 leaving [3] - 278:16, 278:24, 302:19 left [2] - 276:23, 276:24 LEMKE [1] - 199:20 less [13] - 208:22, 227:23, 228:22, 234:4, 239:18, 239:24, 251:9, 251:14, 254:13, 257:20. 266:19. 281:13. 282:11 LeTELLIER [28] - 207:19, 208:13, 209:2, 209:17, 239:14, 239:17, 240:13, 240:16, 244:16, 259:11, 259:15, 259:21, 266:18, 272:14, 274:4, 274:23, 275:12, 277:14, 283:14, 283:20, 286:16, 288:12, 292:11, 292:21, 293:10, 293:25, 294:10, 294:14 level [32] - 202:11, 209:15, 209:23, 211:16, 212:12.212:16.214:15.217:10.222:4 222:11, 222:17, 231:24, 232:21, 238:19, 238:21, 239:20, 239:21, 239:22, 240:7. 241:17, 241:20, 241:21, 245:6, 246:7, 247:12, 248:10, 260:9, 260:10, 266:25, 290:5, 296:19 leveling [1] - 230:19 levels [5] - 211:14, 241:15, 266:12, 266:24, 284:19 Liberty [2] - 250:11, 250:13 liberty [1] - 265:12 life [1] - 249:4 lifetime [1] - 220:6 likely [7] - 236:14, 247:16, 254:13, 254:23, 254:24, 279:10, 279:15 Linda [1] - 299:13 line [3] - 202:16, 223:10, 259:14 lines [1] - 241:9 lining [1] - 254:4 list [5] - 271:23, 272:21, 275:16, 275:17, 296:17 listening [1] - 207:21 literally [1] - 302:23 literatures [1] - 237:1 live [1] - 218:5 look [58] - 205:11, 218:14, 218:16, 221:7, 222:24, 224:17, 227:25, 228:2, 228:6, 228:12, 229:7, 230:13, 230:20, 231:3, 233:25, 236:4, 236:12, 238:3, 240:9, 242:17, 242:22, 243:2, 243:11, 245:6. 245:14, 248:9, 248:23, 249:2, 249:8, 251:21, 254:4, 254:20, 258:16, 259:21, 261:13, 264:1, 264:2, 264:3, 264:4, 264:15.264:18.266:8.270:11.275:17. 277:15, 278:18, 279:14, 282:4, 284:16, 291:7, 292:7, 292:10, 294:22, 295:7, 297:24, 301:9, 303:3, 303:13 looked [9] - 230:3, 231:17, 232:17, 232:23, 251:19, 252:8, 261:5, 265:16, 276:4 looking [43] - 222:8, 227:3, 227:13, 227:18,

American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

largest [1] - 233:17

last [12] - 211:16, 217:14, 225:23, 232:12,

### 228:13. 228:22. 229:10. 229:11. 229:16. 230:25, 231:1, 233:10, 234:20, 236:15, 236:21, 236:22, 238:1, 238:8, 239:9, 239:15. 239:17. 239:24. 240:18. 242:7. 245:5, 260:11, 262:16, 263:10, 263:15, 265:7, 265:9, 265:20, 275:15, 282:10, 283:17, 284:8, 284:9, 288:16, 296:16, 303:5, 303:7, 303:18 looks [1] - 266:18 Looks [1] - 266:20 losing [1] - 243:21 lost [2] - 212:4, 216:14 lousy [2] - 210:8, 211:4 love [1] - 272:15 low [15] - 204:15, 211:7, 212:8, 216:11, 218:14, 218:17, 219:10, 220:13, 222:6, 224:19, 243:16, 249:14, 254:6, 280:1, 291:6 lower [8] - 204:24, 219:9, 249:5, 261:8, 261:17. 264:20. 293:9. 295:20 lowest [1] - 272:5 luck [1] - 220:22

Μ

MAB [2] - 239:1, 239:2 Madison [1] - 247:23 magnitude [1] - 280:15 majority [1] - 289:17 marching [2] - 271:19, 298:9 marginal [1] - 261:25 MARSALA [8] - 230:22, 234:19, 258:5, 258:8, 258:18, 258:20, 258:25, 259:8 MARY [1] - 199:20 Mary [6] - 217:25, 218:9, 218:15, 219:11, 219:17, 226:17 materials [2] - 211:17, 290:20 math [9] - 242:3, 255:14, 265:25, 266:22, 277:6. 280:18. 295:8. 296:8. 296:13 matter [13] - 210:21, 217:21, 231:24, 233:5, 236:16, 236:23, 237:1, 247:14, 247:15, 276:13. 284:2. 293:18. 305:11 matters [8] - 218:21, 219:5, 235:13, 237:21, 244:8, 248:4, 248:9, 273:22 mean [28] - 200:23, 203:21, 205:7, 221:6, 221:18, 222:9, 222:23, 223:4, 225:7, 241:2, 242:10, 243:23, 250:22, 256:20, 257:4, 257:15, 261:1, 267:5, 271:3, 273:3, 274:15, 277:8, 280:1, 282:23, 284:14, 285:8, 296:5, 298:8 meaning [2] - 217:11, 253:6 meaningful [2] - 203:2, 266:15 means [13] - 200:10, 201:5, 203:22, 214:25, 256:25, 257:7, 257:17, 259:1, 264:12, 268:2, 276:2, 279:15, 281:10 measure [3] - 211:18, 214:7, 286:14 measured [2] - 223:9, 255:9 measurement [3] - 263:7, 268:3, 268:6 meeting [2] - 299:25, 304:10 MEETING [1] - 199:6 MEMBER [7] - 209:13, 214:21, 214:22, 224:15, 279:21, 297:14, 300:2 MEMBERS [16] - 199:18, 211:25, 212:24, 215:24, 221:9, 225:21, 239:13, 248:15, 270:6, 273:8, 274:18, 275:8, 277:10, 277:25, 292:3, 299:17 mentioned [2] - 249:23, 300:20 metric [1] - 262:23 Miami [4] - 246:3, 246:7, 247:23, 250:10 Miami-Dade [4] - 246:3, 246:7, 247:23, 250:10

microphone [2] - 215:8, 270:17 middle [1] - 299:4 might [22] - 206:5, 221:10, 231:15, 232:24, 234:13, 238:21, 240:10, 241:22, 245:14, 250:7, 252:23, 259:19, 276:17, 286:14, 288:15, 292:16, 292:23, 296:4, 296:14, 297.7 301.19 303.16 mind [2] - 222:10, 290:10 minimal [2] - 214:3, 279:22 minimum [1] - 260:21 minor [1] - 261:19 minus [3] - 202:6, 257:22, 263:11 minute [3] - 200:17, 206:16, 214:22 minutes [1] - 303:22 missing [1] - 222:25 misunderstand [1] - 293:14 mobility [2] - 285:2, 289:10 Mobility [1] - 255:3 modal [2] - 254:21, 285:2 model [98] - 208:2, 209:7, 213:5, 213:13, 218:9, 218:23, 218:24, 219:4, 221:6, 223:22, 225:10, 225:12, 227:5, 227:8, 227:19. 228:20. 229:19. 229:22. 230:6. 230:8. 230:16. 230:17. 232:22. 234:5. 234:9, 234:11, 234:13, 235:10, 235:14, 235:15, 235:25, 237:22, 239:2, 240:11, 241:5. 243:10. 244:3. 244:4. 245:10. 245:15, 245:23, 246:2, 246:5, 246:9, 246:11, 246:16, 246:24, 247:2, 248:5, 248:8. 249:16. 252:15. 253:25. 254:18. 255:22, 256:3, 257:22, 257:25, 258:23, 259:4. 264:8. 264:19. 264:23. 265:23. 265:24, 267:14, 267:24, 268:20, 269:8, 272:5. 272:12. 275:7. 276:23. 278:11. 278:12, 278:25, 282:17, 282:23, 283:13, 283:25, 285:13, 290:2, 292:9, 293:23, 296:5, 296:10, 296:12, 297:8, 297:10, 297:20, 297:23, 298:19, 298:23, 301:18, 303:1 Model [31] - 225:10, 226:24, 228:6, 228:7, 228:18, 228:19, 229:1, 229:3, 234:4, 234:6. 253:25. 261:7. 268:22. 269:4. 272:4. 272:11. 273:10. 273:17. 273:19. 274:2, 274:8, 274:15, 274:21, 275:10, 275:15, 294:9, 299:19, 303:7, 303:10 models [50] - 208:14, 212:22, 226:8, 227:1, 227:4, 228:4, 228:10, 228:17, 228:25, 231:18, 233:14, 233:15, 233:17, 234:1, 234:16, 236:19, 236:21, 237:6, 237:17,

238:2, 239:5, 239:8, 240:6, 242:11, 244:6, 244:11, 245:12, 250:17, 252:11, 255:8, 255:23, 256:25, 263:12, 265:12, 265:13, 266:11, 270:10, 270:13, 272:1, 272:22, 277:1, 285:21, 286:3, 296:7, 296:16, 298:14, 298:16, 300:8 moment [2] - 238:25, 245:9 MOREHOUSE [1] - 243:19 morning [5] - 270:23, 288:22, 298:13, 302:4, 302:18 Most [1] - 274:25 most [8] - 233:19, 234:5, 234:9, 240:24, 247:16, 279:10, 287:2, 291:1 motion [12] - 273:7, 273:9, 274:1, 274:19, 275:9, 299:3, 299:6, 299:8, 299:15, 299:16, 299:18, 299:19 move [12] - 207:6, 209:22, 213:22, 216:20, 216:24, 225:1, 226:23, 226:24, 251:17, 271:16, 277:23, 300:14 moved [5] - 272:13, 273:5, 274:3, 274:22, 275:11

Moved [1] - 278:1 moved" [1] - 273:6 movement [1] - 260:23 moves [2] - 208:7, 289:14 moving [5] - 202:9, 203:25, 213:24, 221:2, 221:23 MR [112] - 200:4, 200:16, 200:23, 201:7, 201:11, 201:14, 201:19, 201:23, 202:17, 203.7 203.21 205.4 206.2 207.19 208:13, 209:2, 209:17, 212:11, 221:17, 222:22, 223:4, 224:21, 224:23, 225:5, 226:21, 239:14, 239:17, 240:13, 240:16, 243:19, 244:16, 247:9, 248:16, 249:19, 249:22, 256:19, 259:11, 259:15, 259:21, 261:19, 262:4, 262:11, 262:15, 263:8, 266:18, 270:20, 272:14, 272:15, 272:18, 273:6, 273:9, 273:13, 273:14, 273:15, 274:3, 274:4, 274:5, 274:19, 274:23, 274:24, 275:9, 275:12, 275:13, 277:7, 277:13. 277:14. 278:1. 278:3. 278:5. 278:7, 278:14, 278:17, 279:6, 279:22, 282:7, 282:20, 283:14, 283:18, 283:20, 285:4, 285:7, 286:16, 288:12, 289:8, 289.21 290.18 291.8 291.9 291.17 291:25, 292:11, 292:21, 293:10, 293:25, 294:10, 294:14, 295:12, 295:22, 296:2, 296:3, 296:14, 297:1, 298:6, 299:1, 299:9, 299:12, 299:15, 299:18, 300:1, 300:3, 301:25, 304:4

MS [114] - 205:12, 206:3, 207:12. 209:9. 209:12, 209:14, 211:11, 212:1, 212:10, 212:23, 213:16, 214:11, 214:23, 215:15, 218:18, 220:3, 221:8, 221:10, 221:25, 222:2, 222:16, 223:3, 224:16, 224:22, 225:16, 225:22, 225:25, 226:1, 226:9, 226:12, 226:20, 230:22, 231:5, 232:2, 232:10, 234:19, 236:4, 237:25, 238:18, 241:12, 242:6, 242:15, 242:24, 243:3, 243.17 245.20 246.18 248.13 249.21 251:2, 251:4, 254:1, 254:10, 254:15, 256:11, 256:21, 257:3, 257:9, 257:14, 258:5, 258:8, 258:18, 258:20, 258:23, 258:25, 259:8, 261:4, 261:12, 261:18, 266:23, 267:9, 267:17, 268:19, 269:2, 269:15. 269:19. 272:13. 273:5. 273:12. 274:22, 275:11, 277:23, 279:23, 280:2, 280:17, 280:21, 281:16, 281:24, 282:2, 284:7, 285:5, 287:12, 287:18, 287:23, 288:2, 288:8, 290:24, 291:22, 293:22, 294:4. 294:6. 294:11. 294:21. 295:7. 295:10, 295:18, 297:9, 297:15, 298:2, 299:14, 299:21, 299:23, 302:5, 304:6 muddled [1] - 223:8 multiple [3] - 262:9, 270:9, 288:10

Ν

nail [1] - 283:4 name [1] - 305:20 narrowed [3] - 282:22, 296:5, 303:9 natural [3] - 262:19, 263:1, 263:6 nature [2] - 266:24, 267:24 navigate [1] - 205:3 necessarily [5] - 204:13, 206:10, 234:8, 260:8. 267:5 need [35] - 206:5, 209:18, 212:14, 214:4, 214:14, 214:20, 214:21, 217:20, 221:8, 222:4, 222:10, 222:22, 226:12, 227:8, 229:20, 235:22, 263:2, 275:3, 275:9, 282:9, 286:5, 286:9, 294:8, 294:19, 294:22, 296:24, 297:12, 299:5, 299:7, 299:9, 299:15, 299:18, 300:22, 301:7, 302:6 needed [1] - 283:2

next [10] - 217:16, 226:23, 226:24, 251:18, 258:18, 262:15, 263:22, 272:22, 290:13, 300:16 night [1] - 290:20 noise [1] - 253:23 none [1] - 213:23 None [1] - 253:17 Notary [2] - 305:7, 305:23 notepad [1] - 296:25 nothing [1] - 253:16 Nothing's [1] - 222:13 noticeable [1] - 237:23 noticed [1] - 222:25 NOYA [9] - 220:3, 221:8, 221:10, 223:3, 224:22, 225:25, 226:20, 275:11, 304:6 number [20] - 205:10, 225:2, 229:8, 229:11, 236:9, 239:19, 243:22, 244:14, 256:16, 265:14. 269:11. 272:6. 277:15. 277:18. 278:10, 279:12, 280:14, 286:23, 287:15,

needlessly [1] - 229:20

negatively [1] - 284:3

negligible [1] - 293:19

net [1] - 224:4

needs [3] - 211:23, 227:19, 263:25

negative [20] - 203:19, 204:5, 224:7, 253:6,

256:12, 256:13, 256:15, 256:17, 257:4,

257:9, 257:11, 258:6, 258:20, 259:23,

259:24, 261:6, 279:17, 293:3, 293:7

288:5 **numbered** [2] - 305:9, 305:12 **numbers** [11] - 244:20, 254:3, 255:12, 256:20, 257:3, 257:14, 257:22, 262:12, 280:18, 295:23

0

### objectively [1] - 231:10 observation [1] - 270:2 observations [1] - 266:14 observed [1] - 266:22 obviously [2] - 209:22, 239:18 occurs [1] - 215:19 Oddly [1] - 253:20 odds [1] - 241:9 OF [5] - 199:1, 199:1, 199:16, 305:3, 305:4 offense [1] - 250:13 offer [1] - 301:25 offhand [1] - 261:21 often [1] - 230:5 old [1] - 208:19 older [1] - 289:20 Once [1] - 209:21 one [108] - 201:16, 201:20, 201:24, 207:24, 208:2, 210:15, 212:7, 212:22, 214:1, 214:2, 215:21, 216:1, 216:10, 216:11, 219:16. 219:17. 222:2. 226:8. 226:24. 226:25, 228:21, 231:3, 231:7, 233:18, 233:19, 235:10, 236:4, 236:8, 236:24, 237:7, 237:8, 237:9, 237:19, 238:20, 240:17, 242:16, 243:23, 244:23, 246:2, 246.14 246.15 247.7 250.4 250.23 251:12, 252:21, 253:19, 254:2, 254:21, 254:22, 254:23, 254:24, 258:10, 258:18, 258:23, 259:3, 259:15, 259:23, 263:21, 264:6. 264:8. 264:10. 265:15. 265:24. 266:4, 267:8, 267:13, 268:1, 268:5, 268:23. 271:9. 271:21. 272:4. 272:9. 272:20, 272:22, 273:3, 273:7, 274:8, 274:9, 276:18, 278:20, 280:3, 280:22, 282:23, 283:15, 286:3, 286:10, 286:15, 286:22, 287:6, 287:7, 287:13, 289:6,

289:18.290:16.290:19.291:10.293:5. 293:6, 296:3, 296:5, 296:10, 296:11, 297.4 One [10] - 202:20, 228:16, 228:25, 232:14, 232:25, 235:1, 245:9, 255:3, 273:8, one's [3] - 259:18, 291:5, 291:6 ones [12] - 236:7, 239:4, 252:9, 253:1, 270:14, 273:7, 275:4, 277:20, 282:11, 285:23, 285:24, 289:9 operates [1] - 249:16 operational [1] - 245:18 operationalized [1] - 245:16 opinion [1] - 276:14 opportunity [2] - 276:17, 301:1 opposite [2] - 219:11, 219:19 option [1] - 301:25 order [11] - 204:21, 216:25, 217:3, 225:11, 226:6, 226:7, 253:18, 260:14, 280:13, 293:23. 299:12 organization [1] - 246:4 Orlando [1] - 199:9 Otherwise [2] - 281:5, 281:7 outcome [1] - 305:17 outcomes [2] - 262:17, 276:8 outside [1] - 212:1 over-explaining [1] - 259:6 over-speaking [1] - 277:11 Over-speaking [8] - 211:25, 212:24, 215:24, 221:9, 225:21, 248:15, 292:3, 299:17 over-stepped [1] - 217:23 overall [4] - 207:14, 237:22, 261:12, 284:17 overly [2] - 227:6, 227:21 overnight [1] - 248:23 overwhelm [1] - 300:11 own [1] - 292:8 Ρ P-value [1] - 261:20 pace [1] - 300:17 pages [1] - 305:12 Pam [1] - 261:3 PANEL [22] - 209:13, 211:25, 212:24, 214:21, 214:22, 215:24, 221:9, 224:15,

225:21, 239:13, 248:15, 270:6, 273:8,

274:18, 275:8, 277:10, 277:25, 279:21,

292:3. 297:14. 299:17. 300:2

Parsimony [3] - 226:24, 226:25, 251:8

parsimony [3] - 227:2, 243:24, 248:4

240:2, 244:14, 244:16, 271:2

partially [2] - 207:5, 207:14

Particular [1] - 285:23

277:3, 279:1

party [1] - 299:1

per [1] - 242:16

parties [1] - 305:16

pattern [1] - 276:25

part [8] - 211:18, 211:19, 225:20, 239:9,

particular [7] - 229:11, 232:4, 235:15,

particularly [5] - 204:9, 262:9, 266:20,

people [8] - 223:19, 229:22, 230:4, 230:13,

path [3] - 271:17, 271:20, 298:9

230:17, 248:9, 271:8, 276:11

246:15, 281:25, 290:16, 294:22

paralleling [1] - 249:10

parentheses [1] - 288:15

parent [1] - 211:14

parents [1] - 220:17

Part [1] - 206:15

percent [2] - 228:2, 297:15 Percent [1] - 297:14 percentage [1] - 281:23 percentile [2] - 286:7 perfect [3] - 220:24, 220:25, 222:13 Perfect [1] - 291:17 perform [1] - 243:6 performing [15] - 204:1, 218:14, 218:15, 218:16, 218:17, 220:13, 220:14, 221:14, 222:6, 222:15, 224:18, 224:19, 249:14, 291:6 perhaps [5] - 235:19, 235:20, 283:6, 291:13, 296:17 person [1] - 253:13 perspective [1] - 260:23 **ph)** [1] - 239:1 Ph.D [1] - 199:18 phrase [1] - 201:17 pick [4] - 224:24, 246:11, 275:21, 285:25 picked [5] - 280:3, 294:6, 294:7, 294:12, 297:9 picking [2] - 284:10, 302:12 picture [1] - 298:11 piece [4] - 263:23, 281:23, 281:25, 291:3  $\textbf{pieces}_{[3]} \text{ - } 211\text{:}13\text{, } 226\text{:}7\text{, } 297\text{:}17$ pinpoint [1] - 256:13 pitch [1] - 220:18 place [3] - 233:22, 249:20, 271:4 plan [1] - 304:5 plausible [2] - 235:3, 235:18 play [1] - 271:15  $\textbf{playing}_{[3]} \text{ - } 222{:}17,\,230{:}19,\,269{:}10$ plays [1] - 268:6 plot [3] - 242:16, 244:5, 265:19 plots [2] - 265:16, 266:6 plotted [1] - 233:23 plus [5] - 202:7, 207:8, 237:9, 263:11, 290:25 point [49] - 209:21, 211:16, 214:8, 220:3, 220:18, 223:15, 224:25, 225:3, 228:24, 229:17, 233:20, 234:23, 237:13, 242:10, 247:9, 248:7, 250:5, 254:25, 255:15, 255:16, 255:19, 255:24, 258:3, 259:25, 260:1. 260:18. 261:2. 261:19. 263:10. 270:16, 270:22, 274:13, 276:15, 277:7, 278:14, 280:10, 280:16, 280:21, 283:12, 285:7, 286:8, 286:9, 289:5, 289:21, 290:8, 292:1, 299:12, 302:10 points [22] - 224:1, 250:14, 253:10, 253:12, 255:4. 257:20. 259:12. 260:5. 260:14. 260:16, 260:18, 260:21, 260:22, 261:8, 261:17, 280:12, 280:13, 281:13, 286:12, 289:9, 289:12, 303:9 policy [5] - 217:20, 245:15, 260:23, 267:14, 289:22 political [1] - 232:16 politically [1] - 276:22 pooled [1] - 279:25 poor [1] - 221:10 pop [2] - 277:4, 285:24 population [11] - 209:10, 214:17, 242:20, 243:14, 254:7, 263:14, 279:11, 281:6, 281:8. 281:20. 282:4 populations [1] - 217:8 portion [5] - 205:20, 205:24, 206:5, 206:12, 228:16 positive [7] - 203:17, 224:6, 256:18, 258:6, 258:21, 279:16, 293:6 positive/negative [1] - 284:18 possible [5] - 234:22, 238:14, 248:19, 248:20, 248:22

possibly [2] - 268:8 potential [4] - 208:17, 238:20, 263:11, 279:23 potentially [1] - 278:24 power [2] - 250:7, 302:10 practical [1] - 263:19 pre [1] - 237:3 Pre [1] - 237:4 pre-test [1] - 237:3 Pre-test [1] - 237:4 precise [3] - 251:15, 264:24, 266:22 precisely [1] - 243:19 precision [4] - 264:21, 265:2, 265:5, 272:6 predict [1] - 276:7 predicting [2] - 227:15, 246:21 predictions [5] - 234:9, 234:18, 246:24, 247:1, 247:6 predictive [1] - 276:3 preface [1] - 247:20 prefer [2] - 219:12, 228:20 preparation [1] - 290:21 prepared [2] - 290:23, 291:19 prescribed [1] - 283:10 present [6] - 232:7, 255:10, 267:24, 285:11, 300:13, 301:17 PRESENT [1] - 199:18 presentation [2] - 302:10, 303:25 presenting [4] - 238:16, 296:8, 303:10, 303:13 President [1] - 199:18 pretty [6] - 240:6, 240:9, 247:17, 247:19, 262:1, 298:7 preview [1] - 303:4 primary [1] - 210:3 Principal [1] - 199:19 principal [8] - 203:23, 210:5, 210:7, 210:8, 210:10, 210:20, 219:21, 221:10 Principals [1] - 221:12 principals [8] - 210:20, 210:23, 213:18, 214:12, 218:2, 221:13, 221:14, 221:15 principals' [1] - 220:6 problem [6] - 206:15, 243:20, 251:15, 266:23, 279:5, 285:19 problematic [5] - 224:7, 224:9, 290:2, 290:6, 292:2 problems [2] - 259:12, 298:10 proceedings [2] - 305:11, 305:14 process [1] - 205:2 progress [3] - 225:9, 260:15, 301:22 progression [1] - 223:10 pronounced [1] - 266:1 properly [1] - 282:16 proportion [9] - 205:16, 228:5, 228:23, 229:7, 233:17, 238:13, 240:5, 241:4, 249:5 propose [1] - 226:18 Pros [1] - 278:7 prove [1] - 297:2 proven [2] - 271:10, 279:2 provide [1] - 222:18 PTA [1] - 211:15 Public [2] - 305:7, 305:23 pulled [2] - 280:18, 282:20 purposes [2] - 260:21, 262:18 put [12] - 220:13, 253:18, 257:21, 271:21, 272:9, 272:23, 278:11, 281:22, 282:2, 283:11, 288:12, 293:18 putting [3] - 260:8, 260:10, 297:7

quality [1] - 271:4 Quality [1] - 199:16 questions [6] - 270:25, 302:16, 302:19, 302:22, 303:24, 304:2 quick [1] - 301:16 quickly [3] - 215:3, 249:18, 271:17 quite [1] - 254:9 R R-Square [6] - 228:5, 233:11, 248:24, 248:25, 250:1, 256:7 R-Squares [2] - 250:2, 250:19 RACE [1] - 199:4 raise [1] - 274:5 random [2] - 278:13, 278:22 range [4] - 218:18, 255:18, 256:19, 261:9 ranges [1] - 280:11 ranking [1] - 218:11 rare [1] - 254:8 rate [3] - 219:7, 219:8, 271:19 rather [4] - 278:18, 296:15, 301:20, 303:18 rating [3] - 218:10, 219:9, 219:16 react [1] - 242:11 read [1] - 259:13 reading [12] - 233:10, 260:12, 260:13, 265:24, 266:2, 266:21, 266:25, 267:18, 280:19, 295:11, 296:8, 296:13 ready [2] - 270:15, 270:16 real [7] - 214:18, 215:3, 215:12, 217:11, 249:18, 293:20 realize [2] - 243:23, 292:12 really [22] - 203:2, 206:4, 208:10, 212:18, 213:14, 213:16, 217:10, 219:24, 221:19, 225:23, 229:13, 235:2, 244:6, 250:20, 250:24, 268:22, 271:3, 275:5, 278:22, 284:9, 297:7, 303:5 Really [1] - 281:9 reason [9] - 211:1, 232:12, 232:16, 232:18, 232:24, 248:7, 263:8, 279:24, 285:15 reasonable [2] - 224:12, 265:6 reasonably [1] - 255:1 reasons [3] - 232:14, 252:4, 252:5 recalculate [1] - 202:7 recap [1] - 302:20 recapping [2] - 302:22, 304:1 recent [1] - 240:24 recognize [1] - 208:20 recommendation [3] - 291:21, 294:23, 300:24 recommending [1] - 246:15 reconvene [1] - 302:4 rectify [1] - 216:5 reduce [1] - 269:23 refer [1] - 233:13 refinements [1] - 294:9 reflect [1] - 215:13 reflection [1] - 283:6 reflects [1] - 212:18 regardless [2] - 218:11, 263:17 regression [2] - 227:8, 230:6 reins [1] - 282:21 related [3] - 205:25, 257:11, 305:15 relative [11] - 202:2, 202:10, 202:12, 202:15, 203:1, 204:24, 209:15, 228:21, 229:15, 265:24, 266:22 Relative [1] - 203:20 relatively [2] - 233:25, 266:16 relevant [1] - 264:17

Q

reliably [1] - 301:4 remains [1] - 273:24 remember [10] - 204:6, 233:14, 237:6, 238:15, 268:5, 268:25, 277:1, 285:10, 288:2, 292:24 Remember [6] - 233:13, 233:20, 252:10, 262:2. 264:9. 272:17 remind [1] - 299:2 Reporter [1] - 305:6 representative [3] - 242:21, 243:9, 247:17 represented [1] - 292:13 represents [1] - 206:18 requests [1] - 290:22 requires [1] - 217:4 RESEARCH [1] - 199:2 Research [2] - 199:17, 199:19 residual [1] - 203:15 residuals [1] - 205:15 resources [1] - 211:16 respect [4] - 219:17, 238:23, 272:1, 276:1 responding [1] - 302:18 rest [2] - 262:1, 303:2 rests [1] - 205:19 result [4] - 214:10, 215:20, 235:19, 235:20 results [5] - 214:3, 234:15, 250:18, 250:25, 296:12 retained [1] - 254:24 retainees [1] - 231:7 retire [1] - 208:12 retract [1] - 299:7 retracted [1] - 299:6 returns [2] - 228:24, 229:18 revamped [4] - 220:8, 220:9, 220:19, 220:20 review [1] - 302:17 revisit [1] - 298:25 rid [1] - 252:25 rising [1] - 203:23 road [2] - 250:18, 250:20 robbing [1] - 266:9 roll [2] - 221:18, 225:1 Ronda [2] - 236:11, 263:5 room [4] - 210:20, 271:25, 281:20, 300:19 rotten [1] - 219:21 rule [3] - 205:5, 247:22, 281:24 rules [4] - 204:12, 204:19, 204:23, 204:25 ruling [1] - 271:14 ruminate [1] - 284:5 run [15] - 221:13, 221:15, 244:18, 244:19, 244:20, 245:11, 245:12, 247:20, 247:24, 247:25, 292:6, 292:20, 292:22, 294:19, 303:8 running [1] - 292:25 S sake [1] - 266:9 Sam [9] - 206:25, 226:22, 263:24, 270:3, 277:12, 290:12, 298:4, 299:3, 300:20 Sam's [3] - 250:5, 270:11, 286:16 sample [6] - 242:21, 243:10, 258:11, 262:3, 262:6, 281:12 sampling [1] - 257:6 saw [1] - 234:11 scale [18] - 207:7, 207:14, 231:1, 231:4, 238:19, 253:12, 260:7, 260:16, 260:18, 260:24, 261:2, 262:20, 263:6, 263:10, 263:16, 280:11, 287:25 scaled [1] - 253:10 scales [1] - 260:5

scatter [1] - 244:5

281:16 scenarios [3] - 213:1, 223:16, 291:9 school [155] - 200:7, 200:14, 200:24, 201:5, 201:9, 201:15, 202:5, 202:6, 202:12, 202:15, 202:24, 203:1, 203:9, 203:12, 203.14 203.15 203.16 203.18 203.20 203:22, 204:1, 204:3, 204:4, 204:8, 204:9. 204:11. 204:14. 204:18. 204:24. 205:6, 205:16, 205:19, 205:20, 205:22, 205:23, 205:25, 206:6, 206:9, 206:10, 206:12, 207:1, 207:2, 207:6, 207:24, 207:25, 208:1, 208:3, 208:4, 208:15, 208:21, 209:3, 209:4, 209:6, 210:3, 210:7, 210:16, 211:3, 211:4, 211:9, 211:17, 212:7, 212:8, 212:12, 212:16, 212:19, 213:8, 213:19, 213:22, 213:23, 213:24, 213:25, 214:15, 215:10, 215:11, 215:12, 215:14, 215:20, 215:21, 216:9, 216:10. 216:11. 216:25. 217:1. 217:3. 217:5, 217:6, 218:3, 218:11, 218:14, 218:15, 218:17, 218:21, 218:25, 219:2, 219:4, 219:6, 219:10, 219:21, 220:11, 221:12, 222:5, 222:7, 223:7, 223:13, 223:24, 224:3, 224:4, 224:5, 224:9, 224:11, 224:18, 224:19, 225:11, 226:13, 239:21, 239:22, 240:17, 241:20, 246:8, 255:12, 255:21, 259:8, 259:9, 260:9, 260:10. 260:20. 273:18. 273:19. 273:20. 280:24, 287:17, 287:22, 289:11, 291:3, 291:6. 291:7. 291:11. 291:12. 291:13. 294:12, 294:13, 294:24, 297:15, 301:17, 301:23. 302:24 schools [25] - 200:12, 200:17, 200:20, 200:25, 201:1, 201:6, 201:17, 201:20, 201:24, 204:8, 210:24, 211:2, 212:7, 213:3. 217:21. 219:16. 220:13. 220:14. 221:13, 221:15, 222:12, 222:15, 229:24, 245:3. 291:5 Scientist [1] - 199:19 score [30] - 206:3, 206:4, 210:15, 211:7, 212:9, 212:20, 213:4, 219:22, 224:20, 228:3. 240:22. 240:23. 240:24. 249:13. 250:16, 251:25, 253:10, 253:12, 255:4, 255:25, 257:19, 258:3, 259:12, 260:16, 261:15, 264:13, 267:13, 268:24, 281:13 scores [26] - 213:20, 214:6, 233:12, 234:2, 234:17, 234:21, 237:3, 237:4, 237:5, 239:7. 239:11. 240:23. 242:13. 253:8. 256:1, 261:10, 264:6, 264:9, 264:12, 264:14, 269:18, 269:19, 273:1, 273:2, 281:17 scoring [1] - 209:20 scratch [2] - 271:22, 272:20 seal [1] - 305:20 second [6] - 246:14, 253:21, 259:22, 268:18, 299:3, 300:1 Second [8] - 272:14, 273:13, 273:14, 274:4, 274:23, 275:12, 277:25, 300:2 seconded [1] - 278:1 security [1] - 247:13 see [44] - 201:4, 214:12, 221:8, 224:7, 225:5. 226:1. 226:14. 233:25. 239:1. 239:2, 239:6, 240:12, 241:25, 244:22, 245:12, 246:1, 247:25, 248:19, 249:3, 252:12, 254:13, 255:19, 256:12, 257:10, 262:11, 263:10, 265:21, 266:2, 271:8, 271:9. 280:18. 283:12. 289:15. 289:24. 290:23, 291:19, 293:1, 294:19, 295:10, 295:22, 296:12, 296:16, 298:10, 301:15

scenario [4] - 207:23, 210:9, 276:10,

253:7. 297:23 sees [1] - 271:10 selecting [1] - 210:24 sense [4] - 202:21, 247:13, 272:2, 300:18 sensory [9] - 254:5, 254:17, 278:18, 279:9, 279:18, 280:23, 281:3, 284:12, 284:22 sent [1] - 234:22 separate [1] - 210:11 series [1] - 238:16 served [1] - 301:19 set [4] - 204:20, 270:14, 287:11, 305:9 shape [1] - 271:1 share [1] - 296:10 shared [1] - 301:12 sharing [1] - 302:13 sheet [1] - 233:13 short [1] - 270:19 show [12] - 226:12, 231:20, 233:1, 233:6, 233:7, 244:9, 251:24, 252:12, 270:2, 290:13, 297:19, 301:23 showed [2] - 266:7, 284:23 showing [7] - 200:7, 200:24, 232:14, 246:22, 265:22, 280:5, 298:17 shown [2] - 231:19, 244:2 shows [1] - 291:15 side [2] - 268:15, 278:7 sifting [1] - 285:8 significance [4] - 263:19, 263:20, 276:21, 279:14 significant [43] - 200:9, 202:20, 243:22, 248:6, 250:8, 252:1, 252:9, 252:13, 252:19, 252:23, 253:1, 253:5, 253:15, 253:17, 253:21, 254:5, 254:14, 254:16, 255:7. 257:2. 258:10. 259:19. 261:1. 262:1. 262:13. 263:13. 263:18. 275:19. 275:20, 277:4, 277:17, 277:22, 279:25 280:5, 280:23, 281:9, 282:11, 285:17, 285:24, 286:3, 286:4, 296:18 similar [8] - 211:21, 233:25, 235:21, 239:1, 239:2, 250:15, 255:8, 281:14 Similar [1] - 234:18 similarly [1] - 242:11 Simple [1] - 227:20 simple [4] - 222:24, 246:9, 248:5, 259:25 simplistic [1] - 242:10 single [5] - 230:25, 267:12, 289:18, 290:15, 297:5 sink [3] - 253:25, 274:11, 275:6 sit [2] - 226:18, 284:21 situation 131 - 210:6, 210:12, 219:19 six [4] - 253:15, 253:16, 280:7 size [14] - 230:11, 253:4, 262:17, 262:23, 263:1, 263:16, 278:12, 278:17, 278:19, 285:2, 287:18, 296:20, 297:4, 297:5 sizes [1] - 262:22 slide [9] - 225:2, 226:23, 251:17, 251:23, 251:24, 253:18, 263:22, 275:16, 288:12 slides [3] - 296:6, 300:14, 303:3 sliding [1] - 207:7 slightly [2] - 253:8, 276:24 slower [1] - 300:17 small [12] - 231:15, 231:16, 240:10, 253:5, 253:6, 253:13, 253:22, 262:13, 268:11, 279:21, 286:13, 286:23 smaller [6] - 202:21, 253:7, 259:10, 265:22, 266:3. 268:8 solely [1] - 205:19 someone [2] - 211:19, 245:22 something's [1] - 256:24 Sometimes [1] - 287:7 sometimes [2] - 214:8, 287:8

somewhere [2] - 236:17, 238:6 son [1] - 277:21 sorry [4] - 211:9, 259:13, 279:17, 295:18 sort [4] - 203:8, 262:23, 298:11, 301:6 sound [1] - 206:7 space [1] - 296:9 speaking [10] - 211:25, 212:24, 214:13, 215:24, 221:9, 225:21, 248:15, 277:11, 292:3, 299:17 special [1] - 231:5 specific [8] - 203:12, 240:7, 260:17, 263:12, 287:2, 290:22, 293:16, 302:16 specifically [2] - 259:2, 260:25 specifics [1] - 291:18 spectrum [1] - 247:24 spend [2] - 217:15, 302:21 spent [3] - 207:19, 217:14, 298:12 spooled [1] - 205:6 spread [1] - 208:16 spreadsheet [1] - 291:15 Square [6] - 228:5, 233:11, 248:24, 248:25, 250:1, 256:7 Squares [2] - 250:2, 250:19 staged [1] - 215:9 stakeholders [1] - 267:20 stand [2] - 215:15, 217:25 standard [22] - 202:2, 203:12, 206:8, 261:23, 262:14, 264:15, 264:20, 265:17, 265:23, 266:3, 266:7, 267:21, 268:4, 268:6. 268:9. 268:12. 268:13. 269:10. 269:13. 269:25. 293:8. 294:2 standardized [1] - 263:4 standards [1] - 256:9 standpoint [1] - 290:5 start [14] - 221:3, 230:13, 240:3, 242:3, 251:5, 251:11, 270:21, 272:2, 272:3, 285:17, 298:17, 301:20, 302:18, 303:25 starting [1] - 303:14 State [13] - 234:20, 239:15, 239:18, 240:10, 241:17, 243:10, 243:13, 247:12, 248:10, 249:11, 249:24, 305:7, 305:23 STATE [2] - 199:1, 305:3 state [15] - 216:23, 229:21, 230:8, 230:24, 231:9. 239:16. 242:21. 246:4. 247:2. 247:8, 263:15, 279:19, 292:18, 293:12 statement [4] - 232:11, 242:19, 269:5, 275:7 statewide [7] - 202:4, 202:12, 203:11, 242:2, 245:6, 245:10, 250:23 statistic rol - 227:25, 228:1, 228:11. 228:14, 231:11, 233:9, 246:22, 249:8, 265:9 statistical [6] - 208:9, 249:17, 263:20, 264:23, 276:21, 279:14 statistically [29] - 227:9, 230:14, 230:25, 232:3. 232:15. 247:5. 247:17. 250:8. 252:9, 252:13, 252:19, 252:22, 253:5, 253:14, 254:14, 257:2, 259:19, 262:12, 263:13, 263:18, 275:19, 275:20, 276:2, 277:22, 278:21, 279:2, 281:9, 283:22, 293:20 Statistically [1] - 228:4 statistician [1] - 281:18 statisticians [1] - 230:5 statistics [4] - 230:23, 231:8, 237:15, 264:16 status [1] - 245:18 stays [1] - 258:8 step [2] - 236:11, 239:23 stepped [1] - 217:23 STEWART [4] - 251:4, 261:4, 261:12,

American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

seeing 131 - 232:15, 234:15, 262:21

seem [6] - 200:12, 203:2, 236:16, 237:4,

261:18 still [15] - 204:6, 205:1, 205:2, 206:11, 212:23, 220:15, 255:17, 267:13, 268:11, 276:12, 279:8, 279:15, 286:11, 300:10, 303:23 stimulation [1] - 302:24 stop [1] - 302:4 stopped [1] - 275:15 straight [1] - 258:2 straightforward [1] - 266:16 strategy [1] - 271:13 strong [1] - 293:3 struggle [1] - 271:9 struggling [1] - 291:2 STUDENT [1] - 199:5 student [44] - 201:11, 201:13, 201:18, 202:3, 202:11, 205:9, 205:15, 206:18, 206:20, 206:24, 208:8, 208:11, 208:21, 209:23, 210:22, 215:19, 217:7, 218:6, 223:2. 223:9. 223:18. 224:17. 228:8. 234:2, 237:5, 240:4, 243:13, 247:1, 247:6, 248:24, 249:1, 249:10, 260:12, 260:17, 276:7, 278:20, 281:14, 287:16, 287:21, 288:6, 288:24, 289:18, 289:25, 298:21 student's [2] - 205:24, 205:25 students [29] - 209:10, 215:1, 231:6, 234:17, 239:24, 241:2, 242:2, 242:5, 243:6, 246:7, 246:21, 247:2, 250:11, 250:13, 253:9, 253:11, 258:14, 261:9, 264:9, 279:19, 281:1, 281:2, 281:3, 282:3, 288:10, 291:5, 293:4, 297:21 students' [2] - 207:13, 233:12 stuff [8] - 221:21, 244:19, 251:16, 252:4, 294:12, 294:18, 301:4, 301:24 subject [7] - 266:1, 285:22, 288:11, 292:7, 296:11, 296:19, 303:11 subjects [7] - 277:5, 283:19, 285:9, 288:9, 296:22. 297:3. 303:19 Subjects [1] - 288:8 subscribed [1] - 305:20 substantially [1] - 246:25 substantive [1] - 252:6 subtracted [1] - 219:23 suggest [1] - 276:6 sum [2] - 223:13, 224:4 summary [1] - 297:8 summer [1] - 234:22 support [1] - 220:16 Suppose [5] - 210:2, 210:21, 228:24, 244:3. 267:11 suppose [5] - 204:7, 210:20, 230:8, 235:8, 267:3 supposing [1] - 245:11 surprising [1] - 203:2 surrounded [1] - 218:22 suspend [1] - 301:16 sustained [2] - 272:4, 272:11 SUZETTE [1] - 305:23 Suzette [1] - 305:6 SW-13 [1] - 259:21 SW-14 [1] - 259:22 SWD [19] - 252:16, 252:17, 252:22, 258:1, 258:5. 258:7. 261:25. 269:3. 274:10. 275:2, 277:3, 277:15, 284:12, 284:17, 285:1, 285:16, 295:5, 295:7, 295:24 SWDs [1] - 257:25 sweat [1] - 214:19 swing [1] - 260:17 swings [1] - 221:19 switched [1] - 238:25

switches [1] - 231:22 system [2] - 209:15, 260:2 systematically [1] - 243:12 systems [1] - 210:2

table [9] - 271:8, 295:19, 299:8, 299:9, 299:14, 299:15, 299:18, 299:23, 299:24 tabled [1] - 299:6 tabling [2] - 299:21, 300:4 teach [1] - 268:18 teacher [93] - 200:13, 200:18, 200:21, 201:7, 202:8, 202:10, 202:21, 202:24, 203:13, 203:15, 203:17, 203:19, 204:3, 204:17, 204:22, 205:8, 205:10, 205:14, 205:16. 205:21. 206:3. 206:12. 206:19. 206:24, 207:9, 207:10, 207:12, 207:16, 208:17, 208:23, 208:24, 209:3, 209:5, 209:18, 209:23, 210:11, 211:8, 211:21, 212:5, 212:21, 213:11, 213:19, 214:18, 215:1, 215:14, 216:3, 218:1, 218:19, 219:3, 219:5, 219:14, 219:15, 221:7, 222:7, 222:8, 223:6, 223:7, 223:12, 223:14, 223:17, 223:22, 223:24, 227:10, 227:16, 229:25, 231:3, 231:6, 231:9, 231:11, 231:13, 231:17, 231:24, 235:8, 237:15. 237:19. 238:20. 244:8. 244:10. 253:9, 254:16, 256:4, 264:24, 267:12, 269:6. 277:23. 280:6. 281:1. 281:17. 286:21, 290:4, 291:3, 292:6, 298:20 teacher's [5] - 205:18, 206:4, 212:2, 216:13, 230:25 teachers [52] - 203:16, 203:18, 203:24, 204:4. 204:10. 204:13. 204:14. 204:24. 205:1, 206:22, 207:2, 207:6, 210:22, 210:24, 211:1, 212:15, 212:19, 214:9, 214:13, 214:14, 215:13, 215:21, 216:8, 216:10, 217:25, 219:8, 222:12, 222:14, 224:6, 234:20, 234:24, 235:18, 236:3, 237:24, 243:21, 244:14, 245:25, 248:14, 250:16, 253:7, 254:16, 256:4, 267:1, 267:7, 267:20, 267:22, 276:17, 285:19, 286:23, 286:24, 297:22, 302:25 Teachers [2] - 268:7, 268:11 teachers' [1] - 220:8 Teaching [1] - 199:8 teaching [3] - 213:19, 217:7, 234:25 technical [2] - 252:3, 252:5 temperature [1] - 271:25 tend [2] - 237:16, 287:4 tentative [1] - 298:15 tentatively [1] - 270:4 term [1] - 205:5 terms [34] - 201:7, 201:9, 201:16, 201:17, 202:1, 205:9, 217:8, 217:20, 223:5, 227:9, 231:22, 234:1, 234:16, 236:13, 238:13, 239:7, 239:10, 243:13, 243:15, 245:15, 247:4, 248:1, 255:10, 259:25, 264:21, 265:1, 265:5, 265:14, 266:13, 267:10, 268:13, 284:11, 286:20 terrible [1] - 237:20 test [10] - 228:3, 237:3, 237:4, 239:11, 240:23, 242:13, 264:6, 264:9, 264:12, 267:13 testing [1] - 268:18 THE [2] - 199:4, 305:3 themselves [1] - 257:15 theory [2] - 215:4, 241:23 Therefore [2] - 205:24, 238:7 therefore [1] - 256:8

thinking [3] - 207:22, 284:6, 284:20 third [1] - 233:22 thoughts [1] - 290:11 three [13] - 228:25, 244:21, 247:24, 248:22, 252:11, 253:16, 255:5, 256:5, 264:12, 266:11, 274:7, 292:25, 293:19 threw [1] - 295:19 throw [3] - 230:5, 271:24, 295:4 throwing [2] - 281:6, 281:7 thrown [1] - 282:3 Thursday [1] - 199:12 tide [1] - 203:22 tiny [1] - 286:4 tired [1] - 283:5 TO [1] - 199:4 to-wit [1] - 200:2 today [9] - 264:4, 271:5, 283:4, 288:14, 301:7, 301:21, 302:1, 302:20, 304:2 together [1] - 206:21 TOMEI [21] - 261:19, 262:4, 262:11, 262:15, 263:8. 273:14. 274:3. 278:3. 278:7. 278:17, 279:6, 279:22, 282:7, 289:8, 291:8, 296:2, 296:14, 297:1, 299:1, 299.9 299.15 tomorrow [13] - 224:25, 283:11, 288:13, 290:23, 297:13, 299:24, 300:23, 301:20, 302:4, 302:6, 302:7, 303:5, 304:1 tomorrow's [2] - 291:19, 299:25 tonight [6] - 283:7, 284:4, 301:4, 302:17, 303:3, 303:25 took [6] - 247:23, 248:7, 251:18, 261:22, 261:23, 265:12 top [2] - 220:12, 221:14 TOP [1] - 199:4 toss [1] - 270:3 tossed [1] - 223:4 total [3] - 233:18, 238:13, 242:1 totally [2] - 209:5, 211:11 toward [1] - 300:18 towards [2] - 300:11, 300:24 trade [1] - 286:25 trade-off [1] - 286:25 trading [1] - 287:7 train [1] - 212:5 training [1] - 210:25 trait [1] - 289:19 transcribe [1] - 305:10 transcription [1] - 305:13 transition [2] - 255:3, 289:11 transitions [1] - 255:5 transparency [1] - 247:4 transparent [2] - 227:23, 232:22 traumatic [2] - 277:15, 277:21 tremendous [1] - 298:12 trigonometry [1] - 240:25 true [5] - 206:11, 209:1, 241:19, 269:7, 305:13 truly [1] - 220:16 truncate [3] - 240:3, 249:4, 249:12 truncates [1] - 248:13 truncating [2] - 242:3, 242:8 try [11] - 211:3, 215:2, 216:15, 216:21, 216:23, 216:24, 217:24, 243:23, 249:22, 283:2. 300:15 Try [1] - 226:21 Trying [1] - 220:24 trying [6] - 212:4, 216:5, 241:12, 242:9, 283:4. 296:15 turn [2] - 259:7, 266:6 twenty [1] - 270:18 Two [1] - 283:15

237:9, 244:21, 248:22, 251:12, 256:5, 257:22, 260:16, 260:22, 261:23, 263:11, 264:6, 264:8, 264:10, 264:11, 264:14, 265:13. 265:23. 266:3. 266:10. 266:19. 267:4, 267:15, 267:16, 267:25, 268:23, 269:4, 272:24, 273:1, 273:2, 280:10, 286:9, 286:23, 286:24, 292:25, 293:19 tying [1] - 223:1 types [1] - 250:15 typical [3] - 253:9, 279:11, 280:12 U ultimate [1] - 286:21 un-spooled [1] - 205:6 unanswerable [2] - 243:8, 243:16 uncomfortable [1] - 271:18 under [12] - 204:7, 210:6, 210:13, 213:4, 218:23, 219:7, 219:8, 244:10, 255:24, 284:9, 297:23, 302:25 Under [2] - 210:8, 218:13 under-rate [2] - 219:7, 219:8 underneath [1] - 259:24 uninterrupted [1] - 200:1 unique [4] - 206:19, 206:24, 208:22, 210:11 unit [1] - 289:4 University [1] - 199:7 unknown [1] - 243:5 unless [2] - 286:19, 293:13 unresolved [1] - 304:2 unusual [1] - 286:13 unwound [1] - 205:7 up<sub>[41]</sub> - 200:8, 203:25, 204:20, 204:22, 207:23, 209:21, 213:21, 217:25, 218:21, 220:12, 221:25, 224:10, 224:25, 225:22, 231:2, 236:14, 243:21, 246:11, 251:10, 252:12, 253:15, 254:4, 256:12, 262:12, 267:16, 268:7, 272:17, 275:17, 275:21, 277:4. 283:11. 283:24. 285:18. 285:24. 288:12, 289:15, 290:8, 296:25, 298:10, 299:10, 302:12 useful [3] - 263:17, 276:22, 283:25

valuable [1] - 230:7

253:8, 264:8, 267:6

239:4. 239:6

302.13

values [2] - 256:12, 256:16

279:11

value [16] - 204:15, 205:1, 208:2, 209:7,

210:15, 212:9, 217:3, 217:5, 236:25,

250:16, 253:8, 261:20, 264:8, 267:6,

value-added [11] - 204:15, 208:2, 209:7,

210:15, 212:9, 217:3, 217:5, 236:25,

variability [6] - 201:5, 237:2, 237:5, 239:3,

variable [15] - 241:4, 246:2, 250:6, 264:11,

264:13, 288:22, 288:24, 289:14, 289:16,

289:17, 293:11, 293:12, 294:3, 302:11,

variables [47] - 221:16, 223:11, 227:5,

228:4. 228:9. 228:11. 231:8. 236:5.

236:6. 236:7. 238:12. 240:22. 245:3.

245:24, 246:20, 246:23, 247:14, 251:7,

251:11, 251:13, 251:21, 252:3, 252:6,

252:17, 252:22, 257:16, 258:1, 259:3,

272:6, 277:3, 282:9, 282:14, 282:16,

282:24, 285:13, 285:16, 287:6, 289:1,

289:2. 289:13. 292:15. 295:2. 296:17.

two [53] - 210:1, 212:6, 213:1, 217:24,

220:2, 223:14, 226:7, 228:17, 232:14,

233:16. 236:5. 236:8. 237:7. 237:8.

# 37 of 38 sheets

they've [1] - 214:10

$\begin{array}{c} 200;21,\ 200;24,\ 201;20,\ 201;25,\ 202;20,\\ 202;24,\ 228;3,\ 228;16,\ 228;19,\ 228;20,\\ 228;21,\ 228;22,\ 228;23,\ 229;1,\ 229;2,\\ 229;5,\ 233;18,\ 238;2,\ 238;6,\ 238;9,\\ 238;14,\ 238;24,\ 239;7,\ 239;10,\ 239;19,\\ 240;3,\ 240;5,\ 240;21,\ 241;3,\ 241;6,\\ 241;18,\ 241;21,\ 242;1,\ 242;2,\ 242;4,\\ 242;13,\ 246;1,\ 248;2,\ 248;24,\ 249;1,\\ 249;4,\ 249;5,\ 249;13,\ 273;18,\ 278;22,\\ 303;7\\ \textbf{variances}_{[5]}-\ 228;6,\ 239;25,\ 248;6,\\ 252;10,\ 262;16\\ \textbf{variants}_{[1]}-\ 274;7\\ \textbf{variate}_{[1]}-\ 274;7\\ \textbf{variate}_{[1]}-\ 269;21\\ \textbf{variation}_{[6]}-\ 228;7,\ 233;11,\ 234;2,\ 234;12,\\ 234;17,\ 249;10\\ \textbf{variation}_{[6]}-\ 374;14\ 201;0\\ \end{array}$	wonder $[1] - 203:17$ wonder $[1] - 203:17$ WOODHOUSE $[5] - 256:11, 256:21, 257:3, 257:9, 257:14 WOODHOUSE-YOUNG [5] - 256:11, 256:21, 257:3, 257:9, 257:14word [2] - 201:25, 208:15words [2] - 222:10, 234:7works [1] - 213:14word [20] - 210:1, 210:15, 210:19, 211:2, 213:7, 213:14, 215:10, 215:12, 216:7, 216:13, 218:5, 218:13, 218:15, 218:19, 219:18, 219:24, 223:14, 225:17, 225:19, 249:16 worry [1] - 231:10worse [1] - 297:23worst [1] - 281:16worth [4] - 260:15, 260:19, 260:20, 297:7Wow [1] - 203:21$
various [1] - 217:18 vary [4] - 201:20, 201:24, 250:25, 256:9	write [4] - 208:11, 296:24, 296:25, 302:15
vector [1] - 223:13	Y
235:10, 246:2, 246:8, 267:23, 268:23, 289:1 viable [1] - 250:20 Vice [1] - 199:18 Vice-President [1] - 199:18 view [13] - 210:15, 210:19, 211:12, 215:10, 216:7, 216:13, 218:13, 218:15, 218:19, 224:1, 225:17, 225:19, 233:5 views [3] - 210:1, 219:25, 223:14 virtually [1] - 286:6 visual [1] - 284:13 visual [1] - 276:19 Volume [2] - 199:13, 200:2 vote [10] - 271:22, 272:9, 278:4, 288:13,	$\begin{array}{r} \textbf{year}_{[10]} - 228:3, 236:8, 240:23, 254:22, \\ 254:23, 254:24, 261:9, 285:22, 285:23 \\ \textbf{year's}_{[4]} - 260:14, 260:19, 260:20, 261:15 \\ \textbf{years}_{[9]} - 220:6, 220:23, 236:9, 241:2, \\ 266:19, 267:25, 268:23, 286:10 \\ \textbf{yell}_{[1]} - 215:18 \\ \textbf{yellow}_{[6]} - 252:8, 254:2, 257:7, 259:17, \\ 261:24, 280:5 \\ \textbf{YOUNG}_{[5]} - 256:11, 256:21, 257:3, 257:9, \\ 257:14 \\ \textbf{yourself}_{[2]} - 219:3, 219:6 \\ \end{array}$
[10]	
299:2, 299:4, 299:5, 299:10, 299:22, 300:25	zero [8] - 200:19, 200:22, 212:15, 213:5, 244:7, 257:17, 281:11, 293:6
299:2, 299:4, 299:5, 299:10, 299:22, 300:25	zero [8] - 200:19, 200:22, 212:15, 213:5, 244:7, 257:17, 281:11, 293:6 "
299:2, 299:4, 299:5, 299:10, 299:22, 300:25 Wait [1] - 214:22	zero [8] - 200:19, 200:22, 212:15, 213:5, 244:7, 257:17, 281:11, 293:6 " "so [1] - 273:6