THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Moderator: Kathy Hebda
May 25, 2011
4:30 p.m. ET

Operator: Good afternoon. My name is (Misty) and I will be your conference operator today. At this time, I would like to welcome everyone to the Student Growth Implementation Committee Meeting.

All lines have been placed on mute to prevent any background noise. If you should need assistance during the call, please press star then zero and an operator will come back on line to assist you.

Thank you. Ms. Kathy Hebda, you may begin your conference.

Kathy Hebda: Thank you and welcome everyone. Welcome committee members to the Student Growth Implementation Committee Meeting Webinar on May 25th. And we appreciate very, very much your attendance this evening and thank you again as we said at the face-to-face meeting for the great work that you've done so far.

I would like to welcome also our audience participants, folks that are listening and calling in with their lines muted. You can listen to the entire committee meeting. It is an open meeting, but you will not have the ability to participate. This is the work of the committee so they will be the ones participating in the actual committee deliberation, et cetera.

With that, I'm going to turn over to Juan and he'll take role.

Juan Copa: Good afternoon. First order of business, let's – for the record, I'll take attendance. (Stephanie Hall)?

(Stephanie Hall): Here.

Juan Copa: Lisa Maxwell?

Lisa Maxwell: Here.

Juan Copa: Nicole Marsala?

Nicole Marsala: Here.

Juan Copa: Eric Hernandez? (Gisela Field)?

(Gisela Field): Here.

Juan Copa: (Sandi Acosta)?

(Sandi Acosta): Here.

Juan Copa: Tamar Woodhouse-Young?

Tamar Woodhouse-Young: Here.

Juan Copa: Lavetta Henderson? Anna Brown?

Anna Brown: Here.

Juan Copa: (Doretha Wynn Edgecomb)? (Lori Westphal)? Joseph Camputaro?

Joseph Camputaro: Here.

Juan Copa: Gina Tovine?

Gina Tovine: Here.

Juan Copa: Stacey Frakes?

Stacey Frakes: Here.

Juan Copa: John LeTellier?

John LeTellier: Here.

Juan Copa: Latha Krishnaiyer?

Latha Krishnaiyer: Here.

Juan Copa: Lawrence Morehouse?

Lawrence Morehouse:Here.

Juan Copa: Ronda Bourn?

Ronda Bourn: Here.

Juan Copa: Arlene Ginn?

Arlene Ginn: Here.

Juan Copa: Linda Kearschner?

Linda Kearschner:Here.

Juan Copa: Sam Foerster?

Sam Foerster: Here.

Juan Copa: Pam Stewart?

Pam Stewart: Here.

Juan Copa: Maria Cristina Noya?

Maria Christina Noya:Here.

Juan Copa: (Lance Tomei)?

(Lance Tomei):   Here.

Juan Copa: Cathy Cavanaugh? (Jeff Murphy)?

(Jeff Murphy):   Here.

Juan Copa: Julia Carson?

                  OK. We can now start with the slide presentation.

                  If you turn to slide two that provides an overview of today's agenda, we will
                  focus again continue discussion on the impact of school effects. AIR has a
                  presentation providing more concrete examples of the impact of this school
                  effects discussion to help us – help the committee inform any decisions they
                  may reach regarding the issues of school effects. We also aim to finalize, as
                  part of this discussion for us, to finalize our recommendation – the
                  committee's recommendation to the commissioner by the time we adjourn
                  today, and we are scheduled to adjourn at 6:30 this evening.

Kathy Hebda: (Why don't you) mention to (Mary Anne) (inaudible)?

Juan Copa: And just housekeeping note, (Mary Anne), if you would please advance the
                  slides to now slide three.

(Mary Anne):   Yes. I'm sorry. I am stuck. I am trying to move it along.

Juan Copa: OK. No problem. All right. Our slide three contains our meeting goal,
                  which, of course, is to confirm the recommendation that we'd discussed and
                  voted on at the meeting last week regarding a model to measure student
                  learning growth on FCAT for the Commissioner's decision by next June 1st
                  and to review the impact of the school effects measure based at 50 percent
                  attribution as mentioned at the meeting, but also looking at other variations of
                  that with real impact data.

                  So I've mentioned that on slide four again that is the focus of this
                  conversation, looking at that school effect. As part of that discussion, there
                  were some discussions at the meeting last week about the relationship
                  between the school effect and other measures of school performance such as
                  our school grading system that we have data showing those comparisons as

well that AIR will go over. We will, again, and I have now said this for the third time but it's a very important point.

We will be confirming and making that final recommendation by the conclusion of this meeting. And we will also have one additional discussion point just to make sure all issues are on in the committees before the committee's attention and that is an issue that we did not get to discuss last week but it's a very important point that we want to discuss here this evening. And that is the issue of negative growth expectation, the issue of the value added model producing expectations of student actually regressing points and what are the implications of that in terms of any policy decision going forward.

And with that, for those following along on PowerPoint, we're now onto slide five, and at this point, I will turn it over to AIR and Jon Cohen to guide us through the presentation.

Jon Cohen: All right. Great. Hi everybody. This is another housekeeping. (Mary Anne), are you still stuck there?

(Mary Anne): I am completely stuck. I'm not sure what's the best thing to do.

Jon Cohen: Is there a way for you to pass control over to me so I can flip through the slides?

(Mary Anne): I think that you can. You were set up for the panelist. I think that you can. But if you can't, let me know.

Jon Cohen: Do you know how I would? I don't have to use a software?

(Mary Anne): I think you could literally should just be able to click ahead. Do you see the buttons to "Click Ahead"?

Jon Cohen: Look. I just hit "Page Down." It's working. All right. So we're on – we're on slide five. Let me just back up and reiterate the three things that we're going to do today on the three pieces of information.

One and the major reason for this call, if you look at some real world example just to make sure there's no confusion about what adding the school component and the teacher component together in various measured (inaudible) a little bit of confusion around the mathematics around that.

So we have some – we have some just real data. We just took a few examples of (teachers) and so we'll show that.

Kathy Hebda: Jon?

Jon Cohen: Yes.

Kathy Hebda: Jon, this is Kathy. I think I think that you're advancing the slides but we're not actually seeing them. I just want you to know that.

Jon Cohen: Yes, I just got a text from (Christy) saying the same thing. Yes. OK. So it's advancing on my screen. So I wonder – I wonder… So can everyone advance their own screens?

Female: Yes.

Female: Yes.

Female: This is (inaudible) and I can't seem to advance my screen.

(Mary Anne): This is (Mary Anne). If you – I can log back out, but I'm afraid it's going to kick everybody off. I'm completely – I can't do anything.

Female: (Mary Anne)?

Juan Copa: OK. Before we – before we proceed, let me just ask one question. Each of the committee members should have received a hard copy of the presentation, electronic copy of the presentation.

Female: Correct.

Juan Copa: Does everybody have access to that copy right now?

Maria Christina Noya: Yes, I do. This is Noya.

(Gisela Field):   Field has a hard copy in front of her also.

Male: OK. (Sam). I'm hearing that everybody has the copy in front of them. We may need to proceed just following along our own copies while (Mary Anne) speaks to correct the WebEx issue.

Jon Cohen: Yes, (Mary Anne). I was on the WebEx before…

Male: Let me know for those listening on our public line, the PowerPoint presentation can be accessed on our Website. That's www.fldoe.org/committees/sg.asp and there will be a link there to the PowerPoint presentation actually labeled "Materials" under the Wednesday, May 25th meeting. OK. With that, I'll turn it back over to Jon.

Jon Cohen: OK. As I was saying, there are three pieces of information we're going to try to impart to you. One is to look at the school and teacher effects and look at some real examples of that there and unambiguous to everybody. The second thing we're going to look at is the – I believe, second, we go into school grades, during the conversation there was some discussion about the relationship between high value added schools and school grades, and there's some speculation about it. We actually grabbed some data and so we'll be able to show you some interesting results there so you'll be able to see how they relate.

                    Finally, a point in summary in the previous meeting, remember when we talk about student expectation, really we're talking about historically what has happened, the historical expectation. And in some cases, it does not predict growth on the – on the developmental scale score. Some of the – sometimes for some student it will predict negative growth and in some cases they wouldn't predict enough growth for students even to maintain their proficiency level. We're going to show you some of that data and you can talk about it and we'll also talk about what that may have to do with that has to do with how you may think about defining effectiveness and recommending cut points along the value added scale.

So are there questions there or should I jump right into topic one? I would jump right into topic one.

Start up with some definition. As you see on your screen, breaking the teacher effect into two components. One is the school component or what we have been calling the school effect, which is a typical amount of growth seen amongst students at a given school, above what you'd expect given the prediction model. There's also a unique teacher component, the amount above and beyond that that a teacher in his or her own classroom increases growth.

And then – then we're going to talk of the teacher value added score, which is the amount of learning above and beyond that, which is typical given the prior history and the control variables we're using that is attributed to the teacher and it may be a combination of the unique teacher component and the school component. And the amount of school component to get that that's in there and gets included in there is up to the committee.

OK. I'm now turning down next to page six. Did someone have a question?

Sam Foerster: Jon, this is Sam. On the unique teacher component, can you run over that definition one more time, please?

Jon Cohen: Yes. Let me page back up. So I'm looking at – I'll get into page five. The unique teacher component is the amount above and beyond the school effect that is unique to the teacher within the school, the amount above the typical school effect or below the typical school effect that the teacher contributes.

Sam Foerster: So it is expressed relative to the school effect.

Jon Cohen: It is expressed relative to the school effect.

Sam Foerster: OK. Thank you.

Jon Cohen: Right. That – which is why we've been using the term "component' instead of effect because I don't want to imply causality there.

Sam Foerster: OK.

Jon Cohen: All right.

(Gisela Field):   Jon, this is (Gisela). Let me ask another question the same as Sam. The definition on the slide says that which is typical beyond similar students in the state where you just said it's beyond the school. So I'm a little bit confused. Which one is it?

Jon Cohen: It's for similar – the expectation for – you're right. It's not clear the way it's worded on the slide now. The expectation for the student, the student expectations are established statewide. So it's true that the amount of learning above and beyond that which is typical for the state, but it is measured relative to the school component as well. So the definition of typical is typical, you know, given all the background variable s and prior achievements that we control for, that's based on statewide averages.

                  We then decompose the overall teacher component into two pieces. One is the school component and one is the deviation from the school component that is unique to teachers.

(Gisela Field):   So the teacher – is the school – is the teacher component ever – it's only tied into the school when you're looking at the school effect, but otherwise the expectation is always based on the state distribution or the expectations of similar students in the state?

Jon Cohen: The expectation for a student is always based on similar students within the state. Then there's the amount of the student – that the average student in a classroom achieve above that statewide expectation. Right. Each student may be above or below that that which is expected.

                  And if you were to average that out within a school – I'm speaking approximately, it's not exactly how the math works. Your average stand out within the school, then you would have an estimate of the school component or the common component. Right? Now, each teacher teaching, their kids might be above or below that school component, right? So the average above or below that school component for individual teachers is what's the teacher component.

(Gisela Field):   OK. So could we say that it's a (hierarchical) model with state, school and student?

Jon Cohen: With school and student and then state encompasses everybody.

(Gisela Field):   OK.

Jon Cohen: Wait. Yes, school, teacher and student.

(Gisela Field):   OK. Thank you.

Jon Cohen: Yes. OK. All right. Are there any more questions on the slide before we step forward?

OK. And now I'm just going to recap the discussion – the decision or the recommendation – tentative recommendation out of the discussion in our last important meeting. And we decided to choose a model that we have labeled Model 3c. That was the one with the most controlled variables and two prior years of student achievement control (for). And the proposal is on the table to define the teacher's value added score as the unique teacher component plus one-half of the school component.

And we think this is an important decision as are most of the decisions you guys are making, and we wanted to make sure everyone was clear as to what that meant. And the suggestion that was made – I don't remember who originally made it – was to go back to the data and look at some examples with some real live teachers. And so what we did was we did – we identify – the first thing we did was we identified three example schools. They're not representative of anything, they're just examples.

One is a school with a high average growth. One is a school with low average growth and one is right in the middle, it's a typical – you know, it's an average school. With any school, we identified higher growth teacher and a lower growth teacher and an average teacher. So we got three different kinds of schools – high effect, medium effect, low effect and three different kinds of

teachers within each school – high growth, medium growth, low growth for a total of nine teachers.

And then we look at some individual value added scores for those teachers. We don't know what their names are, but they all have names, they all have schools they're working – they're real people. And we look how their scores would vary if we attributed none of the school component to the teacher if we attributed 50 percent of the school component to the teacher or if we attributed 100 percent.

And that's what we're going to show you on the next three slides. I'm flipping the page now to slide eight. And on slide eight, we show the chart for the high growth school. The three bars, in each cluster of bars – there are three clusters of bars. For those of you looking at it in colors, that's the blue bar, the ones farthest to the left in each cluster. It's what the score looks like if you include 100 percent of the school component added to the unique teacher component.

The green middle bar in each cluster is the bar that results if you add 50 percent of the school – of the school component, and if you include none of the school component as the yellow bar or the bar on the far right of each cluster. And the three clusters represent three different – the three different teachers within the school. So lower growth teacher, the average growth teacher and the high growth teacher.

What you'll see is in every case, the blue bar is higher implying a higher value added score than the green bar which in turn is higher than the yellow bar. The more of the – in the high growth school, the more of the school component you attribute to the teacher, the higher the teacher's implied value added score.

Female: Jon, can I ask a quick question?

Jon Cohen: Please.

Female: Is this only seventh grade data? Are these…

Jon Cohen: Oh, yes. The same effects will hold true. This is seventh grade math. I should have said that at the outset. The same principle holds true all the time. This is just an example so that people can get a visual on this.

Female: OK. So as you said you run these on real teachers, when you're looking at the school effect component, are you doing that for all the grade levels at a particular school or are we still only talking seventh graders?

Jon Cohen: Only seventh grade. And given the way the FCAT data works, we're doing all the analysis by grade and subject because there's no – there certainly no guarantee of comparability of what the developmental scale scores mean across subject and the extent of comparability across grades is at least subject to question.

               Does everyone follow the graph? Does anyone have any questions about this first graph?

(Mary Anne):   This is (Mary Anne). Can you all see this now because I – I can't tell if I'm actually clicking the slides now.

Female: No.

Male: No.

(Mary Anne):   OK. Thanks.

Jon Cohen: OK. I will move on to the next slide. And the next slide shows you what happens in an average value added school. The average value added school, the unique teacher component average is to about zero. And what you see is all three bars consist school component is about zero. It doesn't matter how much of it you add in because anything times zero remains zero, so you wind up with all the bars the same height.

               So to an average school, it just doesn't matter. Does everyone follow that? All right. And now we'll go to the low value added school and here we see exactly the opposite pattern in the high value added school. In the low growth

school, the more of the – the more of the school component that you attribute to the teacher, the lower that teacher score.

Female: So that's what we have said previously when we met.

Jon Cohen: Right. And we're just trying to make it clear so that everybody is on the same page.

                 So if you include 100 percent of the school component attributed to the teacher, they had 100 percent of that in and the teacher is going to have their lowest score, the score will be in the middle if you add half of it and then they get their highest score if you include none of the school component and attributed to the teacher.

John LeTellier: Jon, this is John LeTellier.

Jon Cohen: Hey, John.

John LeTellier: Hey. I just want to make clear when Stacey was talking about this as far as wanting 100 percent, so this would be if we have 100 percent school effect?

Jon Cohen: Right.

John LeTellier: OK. So because she was concerned with the schools that were lower in general that if we had anything else than 100 percent that that would be negative for the school, but in fact what you're showing us is completely the opposite.

Jon Cohen: Right. And I think some of that is in the – people were talking about it from different starting points in the committee meeting so there was – there was some confusion there.

John LeTellier: Yes.

Jon Cohen: I think that – is Stacey on the line? I guess Stacey…

Stacey Frakes: I was muted.

Jon Cohen: Oh. Hi. So, Stacey, are you clear on this now?

Stacey Frakes: I'm still working through it. I'm still – I'm still making sense of it, but I'm getting there.

Jon Cohen: OK. I'm here. It's my job to answer your questions. You know that, right?

Stacey Frakes: Yes. Yes.

Jon Cohen: OK.

John LeTellier: So when we were voting originally – I remember throwing out the 80/20 with 20 percent school effect that would actually be more than – towards the 100 that would help the lower schools, the lower that we vote for that. And if we make it higher, it will hurt the lower schools but it will help the higher schools.

Jon Cohen: As you move towards the 100 percent, as you move – let's say as you move from zero percent to 100 percent, bigger numbers will cause lower value added scores at low growth schools and higher value added scores at high growth schools.

(Mary Anne), I think you just did something.

(Mary Anne): Yes. There's a tab at the top. And, (Christy), I think now should be able to control it. People may see two different tabs at the top. If you click to the other tab you can probably see the moving slides.

Jon Cohen: All right. (Christy), can you page down?

(Christy Hovanetz): Jon, are you seeing the chart?

Jon Cohen: No.

(Christy Hovanetz): OK.

Jon Cohen: And…

Kathy Hebda: This is Kathy. We're not seeing what you're seeing. So I think if you just continue the presentation with everybody looking at their own slides, I think that might be the best way to go.

Jon Cohen: Yes. We can do that. That's great.

Kathy Hebda: Thanks.

Jon Cohen: All right. So we're on slide 10. We just spoke about the low growth school and the estimates. John, are you clear in which direction the numbers move?

John LeTellier: I think I am. If we were to take the word "component" out and put effect, that would be the same thing?

Jon Cohen: Yes. I like – it was my idea to move away from the word "effect" because it implies causality.

John LeTellier: Yes. I just want to be sure because we had spent…

Jon Cohen: Yes.

John LeTellier: … time at that that's the same direction.

Jon Cohen: Yes. That's the same thing. That's right.

John LeTellier: OK. So I understand. Yes, I think I'm clear.

Jon Cohen: Excellent.

Sam Foerster: Jon, this is Sam.

Jon Cohen: Yes.

Sam Foerster: Just so that we don't hang up on vernacular here, I think I understand where the point of confusion was at the meeting and (inaudible). In which of these scenarios they include 100 percent or they include zero percent, is the school factors or school component type of model becomes essentially identical? I understand not completely identical, but essentially identical to the result that would be estimated by a model that includes no school effect whatsoever.

Jon Cohen: One hundred.

Sam Foerster: OK. To me that's the confusing part.

Jon Cohen: Yes…

Sam Foerster: If we're saying that we're going t include 100 percent of school effects and at that point that model actually emulates a value added model that has no school effect whatsoever.

Jon Cohen: It does. In the interest of the scientific specificity, they're not exactly the same especially when you have multiple teachers teaching each kid. But in principle they are. The numbers – and the answer is yes.

Sam Foerster: OK. Thank you.

Jon Cohen: All right. I'm going to page down now to page 11 where you see a big chart and what you have in this chart is you have the data in which the prior three graphs were based. So if folks are more comfortable algebraically than graphically, you can look at the numbers and see how they change together.

Female: So, Jon, would you walk through one of those on a low growth and a high growth school to show people what you're talking about?

Jon Cohen: Sure. The low growth school is at the top and if we're – and we'll look at the columns, the first column from the right, it says "School Component." The school component or what we have in column School Effect is minus 10. And if you include 100 percent of the school component, you'll see two columns over for this low effect teacher. You see their value added score will be minus 24.

                   If you include – not the last column, if you include none of it, it drops by the amount of the school component 10 points – or it rises by the amount negative 10 points to minus 14. And if you include 50 percent of it, it's right in the middle.

High effect (based) at the high effect school, you'll see school component is also 10 but it's positive. So if you include all of it, let's go to the bottom row for your highest effect teacher in that school, their value added score would be 37. Contrast this to if you include none of the school component in the teacher value added score, it drops to 27 and 50 percent gives you a number right in the middle.

Sam Foerster: Jon, this is Sam again. To be really clear here, in your vernacular, in the way it's being presented right here, when you say include 100 percent of the school effect or school component, what you're implying is that 100 percent of the school component is a result of the teacher.

Jon Cohen: Absolutely.

Sam Foerster: So it is being added back to the teacher's score and you are implying that the teacher owns everything. There is no accommodation for a school component.

Jon Cohen: Right. That's right. The school component nearly reflects the average of the teacher. The teachers are causing it.

Sam Foerster: And that is the case if we include 100 percent of the school component.

Jon Cohen: Yes.

Sam Foerster: OK.

Jon Cohen: (Inaudible).

Sam Foerster: Again, I'm (inaudible). I'm saying this out loud because I don't want the community members to get confused. I find that and I think maybe (that it's too counterintuitive).

Female: I…

Sam Foerster: Because I'm saying we're going to recognize, if you will, 100 percent of the school component that in fact what we're doing is the opposite. We're saying

100 percent of this component that you could attribute to the school was in fact going to attribute to the teacher.

(Sandi Acosta): Sam, this is (Sandi).

Sam Foerster: Yes.

(Sandi Acosta): This is an issue we had at the meeting, which is that you're working from the opposite (formularies).

Sam Foerster: Yes, ma'am. Absolutely. Absolutely. And I think they reconcile is my point.

(Sandi Acosta): Yes. Absolutely. They do.

Sam Foerster: Great.

Stacey Frakes: And this is Stacey. I think thank you for clarifying that because I think this is the opposite of how we looked at it at the meeting.

Sam Foerster: It is and they're both the same thing, Stacey.

Stacey Frakes: Yes. But we're just – yes.

Sam Foerster: That's why I don't want people to lose (inaudible)…

Stacey Frakes: Yes. Thank you so much.

Sam Foerster: … to stay in the same thing.

Stacey Frakes: Because I'm clear now. I was confused when I thought I was clear. But now I really – I understand that.

Sam Foerster: OK.

Female: For the purpose of clarification, can we clarify one more time the difference between Column one, two and three?

Jon Cohen: Yes. Column one, it's titled Include 100 Percent of the School Component. That means the common component gets attributed 100 percent to the

effective teachers and gets added to the unique teacher component. So in a low growth school, it will have a negative effect. In a high growth school, it will have a positive effect.

In Column three, the last one is exactly the opposite. We say that whatever is common at the school has nothing to do with the teachers, we're not going to attribute or add any of that back into their unique teacher effect. And the teacher's score in a low growth school will be higher than if you'd included 100 percent. And the scores in a high growth school will be lower than if you'd included 100 percent.

The center column attributes 50 percent of the school component of the teacher, essentially saying about half of the effect – half of that which is common at the school is really being caused by the teacher and belonged as part of that teacher effect.

(Lance Tomei): Jon, this is (Lance Tomei). Can you hear me?

Jon Cohen: I can hear you.

(Lance Tomei): OK. I'm in an airport and I need to do – I want to get (weighed in) on this conversation we're having because we just spent a lot of time talking about this. And I guess I want to – I want to kind of set a foundation for my question first.

I think we all collectively understand that what we describe as a teacher effect is that unique effect that a teacher has in his or her classroom. The discussion about school effects has largely focused in one way or another. I think we all recognize there is a school effect.

The discussion has been is that school effect totally independent of the teachers or is that really a compound factor where teachers also to some degree have influenced on the school effect that is doing things that's different from what they're doing uniquely in their own classroom. So – and this is why we've looked at different apportionment between of this school effect, trying to recognize how much do teachers individually and collectively impact on school effect.

So given that that's what I think we've been discussing and that's where the focus is. When I looked at the numbers you've shown, it appears to me – and this is my question, you can tell me whether this is true or false – if we pick either zero percent or 100 percent at the same time that we do philosophically believe that teachers do contribute to the school effect, then either of those models is going to either – and the second assumption here is that there are some things embedded in school effect that are independent of teachers. OK?

So if we go to zero or 100, one of two things is going to happen. We are either going to under allocate or over allocate school effects to the teachers. So somewhere between zero and 100, if all of those assumptions are correct, there is a – there is a right number or that right number is probably different from schools to schools as we would expect. The question is if we go to either extreme, we're either going to over allocate or under allocate how teachers contribute to the school effect. Is that correct?

Jon Cohen: Yes. If you believe that teachers and independent factors both contribute to school effect, if you go to either extreme, you'll be off in one direction or the other. Correct.

(Lance Tomei): OK. Thank you.

Jon Cohen: OK. Well. I feel like there's a much greater – much greater clarity around this issue and the way the numbers work. And personally I feel – I feel way better about this conversation now. It's good.

Are there any other questions before we leave Topic One, which is the teacher and school effect?

All right. So let's turn the page to page 12, which is still labeled Topic One. It's supposed to be labeled Topic Two. Sorry about that.

We had talked sort of background for this conversation about the relationship between school grades and the unique school component or what we were calling as school effect. So what we did is we looked at one example. We took Grade Seven Math and we merge the school grades into that data and

looked at the average school component, the average school effect as schools earning each grade. And we display that on the next slide. So we'll flip now to page 13.

And – there's one thing really what I personally expected to see, but it speaks well of your school grading system. There is a noticeable difference. The schools that have – that receive an A grade also tend to have higher average growth above expectation. So the A schools are doing well. And remember most of your schools are A schools. And the F schools are (building) noticeably worse than everyone else on these value added measures.

So the estimated school effect for the F schools is low. The estimated school effect for the A schools on average is higher. Just thought you'd like to know.

(Gisela Field): Jon, let me ask a question. This grade distribution A to F, is this only of the middle schools that you pulled the seventh grade data from?

Jon Cohen: This is only from the middle schools where we uses the Seventh Grade data and these averages are just Seventh Grade Math.

(Gisela Field): So we're comparing a grade for a school that's based on Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Reading, Math, Writing and Science, and showing the relationship to one grade, one value added for Math. Right?

Jon Cohen: That's correct.

(Gisela Field): And – OK.

Jon Cohen: We thought it would be helpful contextual information point.

(Gisela Field): Well, my only concern is it could be somewhat misleading because a school could be an A for other factors, you know? The may have made points in proficiency or something else. So it's – I'm not sure the relationship makes a lot of sense. That's all. And how many F schools did we have? I can't imagine we have but a few.

Jon Cohen: Not very – not very many. That was your least populous category.

Male: (Gisela), those are excellent points and just to re-emphasize what was already stated. This is the average. A couple of things you would note. It's relatively speaking from a magnitude standpoint not a huge impact. We're talking two points or three points example.

               And one thing to note, it's an average. It does not necessarily means that every A school would be a high growth school on this value add because, (Gisela), you're exactly right. (The greatest) combination of many factors, schools can reach that A threshold in many different ways. Some based primarily on proficiency. Some based primarily on growth. Some based (inaudible).

               So like Jon said, this is just additional information that helps provides some context discussion but it does have the limitations that you (inaudible).

Female: Yes. I think the concern I had actually was that in essence when you add all the different grades, if you do the value add and you may see the chart change a bit and you may not see a negative growth for the B or C schools, it may – it may flip when you had Sixth, Seventh or Eighth Grade added. That's all.

Jon Cohen: Yes. We can take a look at that. We didn't have time to do all of these analysis in the – what it has been – two days since we last saw you.

Female: Anna has a question.

Anna Brown: Thank you. It's Anna. I just wanted to echo what (Gisela) is saying because it concerned me even when we're looking at averages, but the comparison is – it's worrisome to me because we're looking at value added calculate only on Seventh Grade Math, when in reality the school grade – the A grade could even be at a school that had very low growth in Seventh Grade. So I'm just concerned about what that might imply, so I want us all to be cautious.

Jon Cohen: Good caution. Good caution. OK. Are we ready to leave this and we get to the decision point.

The question that the committee has looked at is should we – should all or some of the school component be added to the unique teacher component in the calculation of a teacher value added score? If so, how much?

The committee's most recent recommendation, at least tentative recommendation was 50 percent. And I think, Sam, maybe you want to take over from here?

Sam Foerster: Sure. I got the questions whether or not we want to revisit that decision. And I guess I would open the floor for someone to make a motion and a second to reconsider the committee's decision about allocating 50 percent of the school effect to the value added score.

And I'll point out just this motion point of clarity, if there is no motion and a second, then I would imply that the committee is still good with the decision as it stand. There's no need for discussion and then we'll move forward.

With that, I'll open the floor for anyone who would care to make the motion and the second.

Arlene Ginn: This is Arlene Ginn. Can you hear me?

Male: Yes, ma'am.

Arlene Ginn: I would like to place the motion that we revisit the 50 percent.

Female: I'll second that.

Sam Foerster: What is the motion, Arlene?

Arlene Ginn: That I move that we reconsider and revisit the 50 percent school effect.

Sam Foerster: OK. You would like to revisit the 50 percent.

Arlene Ginn: Yes.

Sam Foerster: And I heard a second?

Female: Yes, you did.

Sam Foerster: OK. Any discussion on this point or should we go right to the question?

Kathy Hebda: Sam, this is Kathy real quick. Excuse me for interrupting, but could the person who seconded to say who they were for the record.

(Stephanie Hall):   (Stephanie Hall).

Kathy Hebda: Thank you.

Sam Foerster: Thanks, (Stephanie). OK. Any discussions on the motion to reconsider the 50 percent allocation?

(Gisela Field):   Sam, this is (Gisela). I wanted to ask a question on that. We don't really have data other than the 50 percent and I thought that we're going to look at a 20 or 25 percent. But how this – the chart with the school grade and the relationship that's based on just 100 percent of the school component, is that what that average is?

Sam Foerster: That is what that is. Remember that. That's looking at school effect, not a teacher effect for that chart.

(Gisela Field):   Right. But the school effect is all would be tied back into the teachers.

Sam Foerster: OK.

(Gisela Field):   But we're working on average for Seventh Grade. We had a 2-point – I'm not sure I'm understanding the data so I'm not clear.

Juan Copa: (Gisela), let me take – this is Juan. Let me take a stab at the question.

(Gisela Field):   OK.

Juan Copa: If you refer to slide 11 and let's just take the top row where it's a low growth school and the school's impact is negative 10 points. So if you do not – like if you do not include any of that component, the teacher's score is negative 14. If you include all of that component which is 10 points, the score is negative

24. If you include half of negative 10, you're not adding negative five, the score is 19 – negative 19.

So basically whatever different variations, whether it's 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, it would be that percentage of the school component. So, for example, (you're into) a 20 percent factor, we'd be adding negative two to that score, the teacher would be at negative 16 instead of negative 14.

(Gisela Field): Juan, I think I understand that part. I think what I was having some confusion is when I look at slide 13, which is looking at the relationship between school grades and school component, and I'm trying to look at the overall impact of school component and then how would that tie into the teacher to determine if I have to (inaudible) whether I would want that amount of impact to be 20 percent, 25 or 50. But that's the question at hand? Correct?

So when I was looking at slide 13, I was trying to understand. The (inaudible) is that – the average value for school that's an A middle school was positive school component. Is that what we're trying to say here?

Female: A positive three or something like that, that's average, right?

Jon Cohen: The purpose of slide 13 was basically there was a conversation that took place last week about – when we were talking about high performing schools or low performing schools, what we really mean are high value added schools which are high growth schools or low value added schools, which are low growth schools.

So I believe somebody asked the question, was there a relationship between that distinction and the school grade. And so what slide 13 is doing is trying to demonstrate that relationship between of the school that is based on separate set of criteria identified as an A school, for example. If you took all the A middle school and average their value add school effects, you would get on average for that group of A middle school in 2010 about – I don't know – 2 1/2 or three points positive direction.

It doesn't mean that if you are in an A school, a model would automatically add two points to a teacher effects model. It's really just a graph to try to

address the question that was raised about is there a relationship between our other measures of school performance and what would be produced in the school effect were value added, which is truly based on growth and growth expectations.

Female: OK. Well, then let me rephrase my statement and see if I'm accurately understanding the graph. If this was – if Seventh Grade was the only data we had and we were – we were (inaudible) right now, is this graph indicating that any school that was B, a C, a D or an F would have a negative school effect value added to every teacher in their school, and by this graph every school that was an A would have a positive school effects value added – average value added to each teacher.

Jon Cohen: No. Not at all.

Female: OK. So could somebody clarify this for me then? So there's no relationship between that?

Jon Cohen: No, no, no. This has nothing to do with the calculation. There was some speculation in the room and mostly in some side conversations about do we see the most growth at the – I don't know – C and D schools, or do we see more growth at the A schools. If school growth in some way compounded with overall school, how well the school was doing proficiency levels or whatever else.

This is a way to look empirically at that. It's just background information. It doesn't affect the calculations in any way.

John LeTellier: Jon, this is John.

Jon Cohen: Hey, John.

John LeTellier: Is this – basically the question that I was raising then whether or not the higher graded schools would be handicapped if you were being there or working there as a teacher?

Jon Cohen: Yes. That was – that was one of the conversations. Yes.

John LeTellier: Right. So I understand what you're saying with that. Maybe…

Jon Cohen: So on average the answer is, again, not really.

John LeTellier: So that's good because I think that's one of the points that I have brought up and I was concerned about and maybe that will help. (Gisela), if you can recall that conversation that I kind – kind of parted where that came from.

(Gisela Field):   No, I understand. I guess what – I recall the comment that was made either by (Harold or John) that the nature of the way the school effects will happen is because you're going to be above the average or below. Half of the schools will have a positive school effect and the other half were having negative. Right?

Jon Cohen: Right.

(Gisela Field):   OK. So the question that I think I was asking for was if we were to run this data right now, what schools would fall on the negative and what schools would fall on the positive? Are the schools that are going to fall above the average, meaning positive all of our D and F schools and the ones that are going to fall below the average, would be negatively impact our A, B and C schools?

Jon Cohen: No.

(Gisela Field):   (Inaudible) somewhat this is, so…

Jon Cohen: No. That's not the way to… What it does say is that the A schools are probably slightly more likely to be positive and the F schools are probably slightly more positive – more likely to be negative. But it's not – it is not a big effect here.

(Gisela Field):   So what I'm saying is that's the opposite of what we expected based on the conversation we had on Friday.

Female: Correct.

(Gisela Field): And the concern that I have now is, is that because we are only looking at one grade level? Or – and it's only Math?

Jon Cohen: I would be – I would be very surprised if (there's) – if it's only (accord) in Seventh Grade. I mean, we can go back and look at more stuff. I'd be very surprised if that were the case, because most of the patterns we've seen in the data have been consistent across grades and subjects.

Female: But I think (Gisela)'s point is maybe that we talked about the fact that where you – there was a relationship between kids who were – lower achieving kids being able to show more growth and that looks like that's not what's happening here.

Jon Cohen: That's not what shows up as the school component. That's true.

Female: And that's – and that's very well said, actually. It's what I wanted to say. And then, of course, what that does to me is it even makes me more concerned about putting a 50 percent weight on something that's based on what we've talked about last Friday, we had one expectation running one grade level, the expectation is totally the opposite.

So putting a weight of 50 percent on what I think still is a very unknown is very frightening for me.

Jon Cohen: Yes. And in some sense I would expect it to be a (substantive) decision. If school wide on average is between higher or lower than expected growth, what do you think is causing that? Is that being caused by what the teachers in the school are doing or it's being caused by something else.

John LeTellier: And the problem – I'm sorry. This is John. The problem I see that if we do anything other than 50 percent, then we're handicapping one area. If we do zero percent on school component, that negatively affects the high growth schools. If we do 100 percent that negatively affects that low growth. And the only one there is the median that would work to be the closest to an average I guess.

Or do I have that wrong? I want to make sure I understand that as well.

Sam Foerster: Your interpretation is (inaudible), John.

John LeTellier: OK.

Sam Foerster: Is there any further discussion before we put the motion on the floor to a vote, which is simply to reconsider the 50-50 allocations? OK. Hearing no further discussion before we proceed to a vote, Juan, as a point of order, would you like a voice vote or do you want a roll call?

Juan Copa: Let's do a roll call and I'll go ahead and read the names.

Sam Foerster: OK.

Juan Copa: If you so choose.

Sam Foerster: OK.

Female: One second, Juan, do you want to say anything about any of the comments that (Jon) has made or are we just going to take a vote? Are you good?

Juan Copa: Just to characterize what I heard, (John's) concern was that if you – for example, include a 100 percent school effect, you would be negatively impacting the teachers at a low effect on school.

                  And if you had zero percent of school effects, (inaudible) interpretation was that if you did that, you would be negatively impacting the teachers at a high performing – high growth school. Is that correct, my statement?

Sam Foerster: Yes. OK. Are we ready for a vote, Juan?

Linda Kearschner: Sorry. This is Linda. I just want to make sure the vote we're taking right now is to reconsider the original vote that we took last week. I haven't heard the reason why some – any discussion around why we want to reconsider it. We've been talking about what the information means.

Male: Yes. That's a great point, Linda. And I think the way this vote is shaping-up if the motion fails, then essentially the committee will be conveying that we're

satisfied with the 50-50 allocation. If the motion passes, then we are going to have to open the process up again to discussion of what the appropriate number is and arrive at, you know, consensus per one (inaudible) or another.

Linda Kearschner: Very good. I just want to make sure we understood what we were voting for. Thank you.

Sam Foerster: Yes, ma'am. Any additional discussion before we go to a vote?

Maria Christina Noya: This is Mrs. Noya. And I think we should go with Anna Brown's suggestion and (Gisela). We have to be very careful to just agree on the 50 percent, so I would motion to reconsider. I think the slide on 13 is kind of erratic at this point and kind of puts – puts the (inaudible) ease at this moment on how we will impact the teachers.

Sam Foerster: So discussion in favor of reconsidering. Any further discussion before we vote? OK. To be absolutely fair, the motion on the floor is to reconsider the 50-50 apportion, not that it has already been decided on by the committee. If you're voting in favor of those motions, that implies that you want to have further discussion and likely you would recommend a different apportion.

If you vote no on those motions, you were saying that you are good with the 50-50 decision that's already been made and you do not wish to reconsider.

So with that having been said, Juan, if you run through the names, we'll do a roll call. And as your name is called, both in the affirmative or the negative, please.

Juan Copa: (Stephanie Hall)?

(Stephanie Hall): No.

Juan Copa: Lisa Maxwell?

Lisa Maxwell: Yes.

Juan Copa: Nicole Marsala?

Nicole Marsala: Yes.

Juan Copa: (Gisela Field)?

(Gisela Field):   Yes.

Juan Copa: (Sandi Acosta)?

(Sandi Acosta):   No.

Juan Copa: Tamar Woodhouse-Young?

Tamar Woodhouse-Young: Yes.

Juan Copa: Anna Brown?

Anna Brown: Yes.

Juan Copa: Joseph Camputaro?

Joseph Camputaro: Yes.

Juan Copa: Gina Tovine?

Gina Tovine: Yes.

Juan Copa: Stacey Frakes?

Stacey Frakes: No.

Juan Copa: John LeTellier?

John LeTellier: No.

Juan Copa: Latha Krishnaiyer?

Latha Krishnaiyer: No.

Juan Copa: Lawrence Morehouse?

Lawrence Morehouse: Yes.

Juan Copa: Ronda Bourn?

Ronda Bourn: Yes.

Juan Copa: Arlene Ginn?

Arlene Ginn: Yes.

Juan Copa: Linda Kearschner?

Linda Kearschner: No.

Juan Copa: Sam Foerster?

Sam Foerster: No.

Juan Copa: Pam Stewart?

Pam Stewart: Yes.

Juan Copa: Maria Cristina Noya?

Maria Christina Noya: Yes.

Juan Copa: (Lance Tomei)? (Lance Tomei)? (Jeff Murphy)?

(Jeff Murphy): No.

Juan Copa: Can you repeat that?

(Jeff Murphy): Yes.

Juan Copa: OK. Thank you. Give me a second to tally.

Female: I have 12 yes and eight no.

Juan Copa: I have the same.

Male: Great.

Juan Copa: Twelve yes, eight no's.

Sam Foerster: All right. Motion carry, which means that we are now reconsidering the 50-
                   50 apportionment, and I will open up the floor for suggestions as to how we
                   proceed from here.

Pam Stewart: Sam, this is Pam Stewart. Can I ask Juan a question and maybe get a little
                   clarification.

Sam Foerster: Of course.

Pam Stewart: OK. Juan…

Juan Copa: Yes?

Pam Stewart: Help me to understand that – and I'd like us not to use a zero and a hundred.
                   But if we could look at the possibility of a, the impact of a 20 percent school
                   effect being considered, added to the teacher's component. Or as we move
                   from one extreme to the other from the 50. And I'll go to my statements
                   earlier, ca highly effective teacher is going to look less effective in a low
                   growth school if we consider a higher school effect. Is that correct?

Juan Copa: That is correct. And if you look on the table on slide 11 – slide 11, the high
                   effect teacher at a low growth school. The highest effect teacher, the low
                   growth school is row three. She go to the far right column, you see her affect
                   when you do not include any of the school effects. And remember, the school
                   is a low growth school. When you do not consider any of the school
                   component, her value add score would be 10 points. So on average, her kids
                   grow 10 points above expectation.

                   If you factor in the school effect, any level because the school effect is
                   negative. That by definition we'll drop that 10 points down to the extreme of
                   zero if you did 100 percent, because the school effect in this example is 10
                   points.

And if you did any variation thereof, if you did 20 percent that would be a 2 percent deduction from her score and her score would be reduced to eight points instead of 10.

Pam Stewart: And I have to say then I have a real concern that I will (dis-incentivize) a teacher, a high performer from wanting to go to a low growth school, because they – that is going to negatively impact them, the more school effect we include or school component we include for that teacher. Is that an accurate statement?

Juan Copa: Yes, I would – that – that's accurate.

Arlene Ginn: Arlene Ginn. I have a question please on a comment.

Sam Foerster: Yes, ma'am. Go ahead, Arlene.

Arlene Ginn: My question – my question is – and I want to piggyback along on what my colleague just said. If you'll remember, I did say and (you've asked me) that I do believe that even though there is a school (inaudible), I do believe that the (bonus, the gonus, the onus) or whatever you want of a child's growth does mesh with the teachers, and I am still a teacher.

However, that's why I could have gone with the 20 percent, but the reason I said 25 percent is because most of my experience as a teacher, it's a school that has high growth. But my colleague that was sitting to the left of me, I have never dealt – I've never (inaudible) of a school that has had to go through some of the benefit she has, even driving out in a truck to even get a parent to sign so that she can (pass) her child.

So my point is because of this I don't know to completely just cast out what she says. Fifty percent, I do not agree. I like the 20 to 25 percent. I still like those, but I still believe that since we have not walked in those shoes – and also, this may not be important to the rest of you guys, but me, we want a piece, we want a tool that we can take to the (commissioner) to use up would be useable. I'd hate for us to go so far out that he will (tell you) and say my goodness, does the teachers think they have zany impact on student growth? I

want to give them something that they can use and say, well, that I can consider.

And because of that, 50, no, I don't agree with it, but I also believe that we should take some consideration of what these are the schools that going through. Thank you very much.

Male: No, Arlene, I think – I think – just let me make sure that you're saying exactly what you intend to say. What I heard is that you would like most of the responsibility to be on the teacher, and you equated that with less than 50 percent.

I believe that as the numbers get higher, you're putting more responsibility on the teacher and less on things that are outside the teacher's control. So I think maybe what you meant was 75 percent, so that it would be mostly the teacher's responsibility. And if what you…

Arlene Ginn: That is, my friend, what I am basically saying. Thank you very much.

Male: Yes. Your intent was clear, just the numbers were backwards, I think. So I think you're looking at 75 percent rather than 50 percent.

Arlene Ginn: Oh, 75 percent (what)?

Male: Seventy-five percent of what's happened in common at the school being attributed to the teacher, the teacher being responsible for most of the learning.

Arlene Ginn: Yes, indeed. That's correct.

Juan Copa: (Inaudible). This is Juan. No, I believe the point here is the higher the number on the school effect, you're attributing that common component of the school more so to the teacher, and that is not – I believe, Arlene, that is not the point you're trying to make because you thought 50 percent was too high. You want to place more of the impact on what happens in the teacher's classroom, the teacher's unique component.

Arlene Ginn: That is absolutely what I am saying. OK? Am I good?

Male: You're great.

Arlene Ginn: Thank you.

Female: I think Anna has a question or a comment also.

Anna Brown: Thank you. I just want to echo this because this is so confusing because we flipped the terms from the original way we were at our committee meetings. So I really wanted to reiterate what Pam said that a highly effective teacher will look less effective in a low growth school the higher percent we contribute to school effect. However that all works out (inaudible)…

Arlene Ginn: It's also what I was saying too, thank you.

Anna Brown: Yes, I know, and that's why I wanted to clarify that. And it's really important, I think, that we understand Stacey's comment I think that she made at our committee meeting when she spoke so eloquently about, you know, a lot of times we attribute low growth school in a different way, but you can potentially be a low growth school that is also struggling in many other ways. And so we do want to make sure we keep incentives for highly effective teachers to work in these struggling environments.

It is true that a low growth school could also be a very high performing, high proficient, low growth because they're already so high. But what's Stacey was speaking to was so important about a sense where we want some of our very best teachers to work in some of our most needy schools. And, in this case, we have to be careful because if we want that very effective teacher in the most needy schools, in front of those children, then we need to be careful with the school effect.

We want to make sure we keep that lower in the range of whether it's currently being spoken of, but definitely lower than 50 percent because the other thing is we want that teacher to stay there because if all highly effective teachers go to these needy schools, then hopefully they will no longer be a low growth, they will suddenly become high growth. So we don't want them to then be incentivized (for these).

Stacey Frakes: This is Stacey. Can I speak?

Male: Sure.

Stacey Frakes: When I fought for one – for the 100 percent, when I fought for that at our meeting, we were speaking about it in a different – we were speaking about (it flip flopped), and I just want to make that clear.

Male: Yes, you were. Absolutely.

Stacey Frakes: And I'm having a hard time today deciding on what should I vote on because I – you know, I'm still thinking about it the way we are at the committee meeting, and I happened to flip it back. But I just wanted to make sure that I made it clear, because I think I'm upside down and backwards today.

Sam Foerster: So – and I'm – I apologize for the role I played in this. I presented it in as simple a fashion as I could at the meeting, but it is – it is not the way in which the specifics are calculated and certainly not the way that sounds comfortable and sort of codifying it, which I completely respect. But the extent that I can, I'm going to – I'm going to break it down into as simple a term as we can so that we can all be speaking with the same vocabulary.

                 In this case, the information is presented (today). The closer to 100 you are, the more you believe that teachers are responsible for everything, and the less (inaudible). The closer we are to zero, the more we believe that the school effects should (inaudible), that is the value added score for the teachers at the school is going to be substantially handicapped, for better or worse, by whatever the school effect is.

                 So any vote closer to zero from fifty means that you believe the school effect is enormously important, not tied to the teacher so much, or at least (decide in part) outside the teacher and we want to give greater weight to it. The closer to 100 you are, the more you believe I don't want to count the school effect. I want to add it all back into the teacher and make it (inaudible).

Male: So, Sam, that would mean if we wanted to go with Stacey's original nothing less than 100 percent vote, we would actually vote zero percent.

Sam Foerster: That is correct. (Inaudible) less than 100 would be nothing more than zero.

Female: Yes.

Male: OK. Any additional discussion on which side of the 50 percent (stance) we should be on but fully entertain (motions) to pick a different number.

Female: I'd like to ask AIR whether they actually ran some of the charts, like charts eight, nine and 10, using other than zero, 50 and 100? Did they run 25 percent or 30 percent on the school effects?

Male: No, but you – it's just a linear interpolation. It's – that – it just stays right on that line. You can do – you can do it in your hear on this – on this chart, on page 11. So it's – the number – the numbers are really easy to work with. The school component is either zero, minus 10 or 10, so 20 percent of 10 is two points, so if you include 20 percent, you add negative 20 percent of – 20 percent of negative 10 is minus two, add that to minus 14 on that first line, and you wind up at minus 16. If you want 30 percent, you take 30 percent of minus 10 is minus three and that gives you minus 17.

Male: Any other discussions? Before we proceed to considering the motion.

(Gisela Field):   Let me ask one other question and I wouldn't ask any more. Do – and I'm asking this to the – to the DOE. Do we have some (pipe off) to recommend – let's say we recommended that as (inaudible) 25 percent.

Male: OK.

(Gisela Field):   And (inaudible) it with the ability that once the data is on (inaudible).

Male: (Gisela), just hold on.

Male: (Inaudible).

Male: We're hearing some background noise on the call. Please, if you're not speaking, please put your phones on mute. Thank you.

Go ahead, (Gisela).

(Gisela Field): I guess what I'm asking is that it's very difficult for us to (inaudible) (number). I'm getting the background noise.

Male: Please put your phones on mute if you're not speaking right now. Please. Thank you.

Male: If you think it is on mute, mute it again.

(Gisela Field): This is a question, I guess, for Cathy. It's very difficult, in my opinion, to pick a number out of a hat, a percent, with not understanding total impact. I know that (we've got) data here, but it's only seventh grade, so the question that I have is if we pick a percent, is it possible to do that sort of with the condition that we would like to further analyze the data when we receive the data in the summer and the option to allow us to reconvene and revisit that percent if for some reason we find out that that would negatively impact all the low-performing schools or the high-performing school, et cetera? Is that an option?

Cathy Cavanaugh: Thanks, (Gisela).

One of the things we've committed to from the very beginning is to look at these data at every year and determine how the calculation affects everybody. We – when you – when you get your data this summer, certainly, if there are any (inaudible) anybody has about their district's data, then the committee will meet again when – after the data's distributed. We can discuss anything you need to discuss.

I think the commissioner has to make a recommendation June 1, but certainly we've said we've committed to doing this the best way possible. If major concerns arise, then we'll certainly want to address those.

(Gisela Field):   So, Cathy, just to make sure I'm clear, if we pick whatever, 50 percent or 25 percent, and you give us the data, and as I think we spoke (inaudible) our last meeting, the districts will be setting the cut scores on what's going to be considered effective, ineffective, et cetera. If when we receive the data, based on a model of 50 percent, whatever this committee chooses, and we find out let's say in Miami Dade that even with decent cut scores that we've set we are negatively impacting either all our high performing schools or our low performing schools, are we going to be able to appeal that?

Cathy Cavanaugh: (Gisela), I don't think you'll need an appeal, because, as you rightly said, for (11, 12) districts are setting their cut points and their standards. So one of the reasons for – that you'll – one of the things you'll be able to do with your data this summer is look at the results of the model using the historical data that you'll get and you'll be able to determine what best suits your county for (11, 12).

(Gisela Field):   But that will be requiring that we use whatever model we've agreed to, meaning if we decide that 50 percent of the school effects is not valid for us, that's not an option. We'll just have to set cut scores that mitigate our problem, right?

Cathy Cavanaugh: I think that's – at this point, (Gisela), answering off the top of my head, I know everybody has to use the same (state) model. That is true.

(Gisela Field):   OK.

Cathy Cavanaugh: Your cut points will be one avenue for your district to make this work for your unique situation if you should find one in the data. Having said that, though, certainly, as I said, we're committed to doing this in the best way possible so if some unforeseen anomaly comes up in the data that nobody could have predicted, then certainly we'll try to address that.

(Gisela Field):   OK. Thank you, Cathy.

Male: Any other discussions on this point before we attempt to start a new allocation or apportionment? OK, hearing none, I will take a motion from the floor for a

new apportionment of the school components to the independent teacher component.

And, to be clear, if the number goes closer to 100, you believe that the school component should be (respective last) and that more of the school component should be added to that features, which is the opposite of the way that it was described on the meeting on Friday. If you propose to move the percentage closer to zero, you are saying that the school important – the school component is even more important and should play a larger role in handicapping the value-added scores for the teachers in that school.

So, that having been said, we arrived at 50 before. Would anyone like to make a motion for a different allocation?

Arlene Ginn: This is Arlene Ginn. I move – I hope I'm doing this correct – I move to have an allocation of (23) percent school effect and whatever's left – what is it? – 77 percent of (teach).

Male: Could you say that again, Arlene, please?

Arlene Ginn: (Twenty-three) percent school effect and 77 percent teacher.

Male: OK. Arlene...

(Christy): (Inaudible). I think the last way we did it there was clear intent that 100 percent of the teacher affect is (always heart) of the teacher's score calculation and we were just determining what percentage of the school effect would be added to that on teacher effect. So the way we set it last time was (inaudible) school effect would be added to the teacher effect to determine the teacher's value added (inaudible).

Female: So, (Christy), then what you're saying is that to clarify that she would really be adding 23 percent of the school effect to the teacher effect? Is that right?

(Christy): Yes.

Male: OK. The motion on the floor is that we include 23 percent of the school component to the teacher component, which implies that we are moving closer

to a large school handicap and farther away from believing that teachers are completely accountable for the performance in their classroom. If that is the intent, then the motion on the floor is that we include 23 percent of the school component (inaudible).

Anna Brown: This is Anna. Can I have a point of clarification?

Male: Absolutely.

Anna Brown: Because I've tried really hard not to weigh in and confuse the situation, but the way that we are proposing – like (Christy) just said – the way that we're talking about like what is on the floor, 23 percent school effect added back into the teacher. The way that it's being presented and the way that I'm hearing you say this, that means we're really saying that we're putting a heavier weight on the school. That is not linear to me, and I do not believe that we all understand what we're voting on.

Female: I totally agree. Thank you. Because I'm confused myself. I'm…

Anna Brown: Because what I'm saying is is that…

Female: (Inaudible) understood it, Anna.

Anna Brown: OK. So what – this is what I think we need to be clear. It's not about – this is really, really, really important, and I think we need even our AIR, Jon, to weigh in. Let's get back to the basic and let's use really common language because we all agreed as a committee that the school has an impact. What we thought we were voting for is what percent of that school's impact should be added back in to the teacher effect, which already stand alone – this is not a divided calculation. The teacher effect is the teacher effect, but we're going to bonus it or handicap it, depending on how much the other things in the school might be contributing.

So, in this situation, it's really important to understand, and the way I understand school effect to be – and I am OK if I'm corrected – the way I understand it is in having the lower percentage that we say will be the – if we say 23 percent school effect added back in, that is a situation which will help

highly effective teachers in low growth schools. That was the issue we were all worried about.

Female: Yes. That's precisely what I understand. And, intuitively, that makes much more sense to me that you (are believing) the teacher effect is higher if you add less of the school effect back in.

Now, I might be saying it backwards, and someone can correct me, that I think intuitively the less school effect handicap you add back in, the more you are saying it is the teacher impact that (inaudible)…

Female: OK, (inaudible) I am not schooled in the statistic (like I wish) Anna has really taught me a lot about it as we've been on this committee, and (inaudible) what you said. But my (great onus) is this. You say I think that the bulk of – the bulk of a child or student's growth rests on the teacher. Now, the percentage that I'm seeing may be incorrect with what you guys know…

Female: No. You're fine with what I'm saying.

Female: So I agree with what you're saying, and whatever that comes out to, the onus is the smaller to me that we continue to say the school effect. That would mean that teacher effect is higher and that's just about it. Thank you.

Female: Right, and this…

Male: Actually, let me…

Male: Anna, Pam and Arlene, that has the correct interpretation.

Female: OK, so this is really important because if that is my correct interpretation, I want to be clear about these percentages because, if I'm correct, then voting for anything closer to 50 and to what – or loser to 100 percent would actually hurt a highly effective teacher in a low growth school, which is…

Male: That is absolutely correct. Yes.

Female: OK. So that was – that was what Stacey was most worried about when we were in our committee meeting, and I think it's only fair that we're carefully

and clearly representing how including the school effect will affect the teacher's value added score. We want that highly effective teacher that is busting their behind in a low growth school that may have a lot of issues they're dealing with to get a fair shake. So what we're saying, if we vote for something around 20 percent, we're saying, yes, you teacher, what you do in that classroom matters and everything that you do should count for you, and we understand that there's a part of the school that's out of your control, and we want to give you a little credit for that too.

But we've got to be careful, because if we say 100 percent school effect or 80 percent school effect, we're actually hurting and decreasing the value added score of that highly effective teacher in that school. And that's what I want to be clear about.

Female: And the way I understood it at the committee, when we met face to face, we were actually subtracting it out.

Female: Correct. So we're looking at…

Female: And maybe (inaudible) negative, then you're actually adding it back in. So it was flip flopped, and…

Female: Right.

Female: … and I appreciate you saying that. And I want to say that I think that Ms. Stewart actually understood the correct way to do it.

Female: Right.

Female: And I didn't understand, you know, the comments that she made until today. And…

Female: OK. Yes.

Female: And that makes sense.

Female: So, in that respect, what I can say to our colleague that made the motion is that, you know, really, my personal opinion is less than 50, somewhere down

in that range, because we want – we want to respect the school effect, but a little bit lower so we're not handicapping highly effective teachers in low growth schools.

Female: Correct.

Female: And so, to me, it's irrelevant whether it's 18, 20, 23, 25, it really makes no difference. I don't know if anyone else have a stronger (inaudible).

Male: It's not the number so much as if you look at – if you include – we'll just say zero percent on school effect, which would be Stacey's original 100. I go back to that just to help us to put in our head that the closer you get to zero percent then, conversely, you affect the high growth school and they have a negative value added.

(John): Yes. This is – this is (John). Let me just add one thing to the conversation so that people understand it. As the – as the – as you approach the zero number, the average teacher effect within school gets closer and closer. So as you – as you choose a percentage near zero, that's like saying, OK, well, our teacher – our teachers are already pretty much evenly distributed across schools, and it's not – and so every school is just as likely to have highly effective teachers or low effective teachers.

As you move towards 100, you start to say the reason the schools differ in their effectiveness is that – is the teacher effect. And I still – listening, think Arlene is saying the opposite. I this she's saying you could put that teacher out in the field with the stick and she'd still be able to teach just as much.

Arlene Ginn: That's what I'm saying.

(John): But you wanted – this is the thing, Arlene – this is (John) – that I want to make sure that you understand. You want that if you're in a low performing school, you – or a low growth school, I should say, you want it to be considered that that job is more difficult and there's factors that are beyond your control that need to be taken into consideration, is that correct?

Arlene Ginn: It's exactly correct.

Male: OK. So she's actually – if I understand this correct, then she's wanting to include 23 percent – the way it's worded today, 23 percent of the school component, not 77 percent.

Arlene Ginn: That's absolutely correct.

Male: Did I get that right, (John)?

(John): Yes. It sounds like it's right. I guess I misunderstood.

Male: So you're attributing it, Arlene, more to the school effect – yes, more to the school and less burden on the teacher. We should put it that way. Less burden on the teacher.

Arlene Ginn: Actually, it's – actually, no. What I'm – what I'm saying is that I do believe that there is a school effect, and I do take in consideration what Stacey said, because she (inaudible). However, I still believe that a greater portion of student growth (inaudible) upon the teacher.

Male: OK. So a point of clarification here, (John), is philosophically you are aligned with the teacher is more important than the school effect. As you have (inaudible)…

Arlene Ginn: Absolutely.

Male: … effect, we should be recommending a percentage that is closer to 100.

Female: No.

Male: I think it's…

Male: No, that is – that is actually correct. If you believe that there is nothing that could happen in the school that a teacher can't overcome, then you're at zero. If you're – if you're…

Arlene Ginn: And, for me, I do not think that is – nothing that's – I do believe there's some thing that you cannot overcome, so (inaudible) would be out. But I do think

again – I was going through the same – I'm saying maybe 23 percent (in clear language) for me (inaudible) upon maybe the school that (inaudible) is the teacher, so that's that.

Female: So, the question is if the committee members said that they feel that the school's final – the teacher's final value added should be impacted by 23 percent of the schools, what is the motion that we should be making, 77 for the school effect or 23?

Male: Twenty…

Female: Twenty-three.

Male: I got 23.

Female: I know but…

Arlene Ginn: (Which is what I meant).

Female: I heard the – I thought I heard Sam say the opposite right now.

Cathy Cavanaugh: It's 23. This is Cathy. It's 23.

Female: (Inaudible). I – that's the way I see it, but I keep getting – keep getting a comment about asking (John) if we feel that it's less of a school impact then we should be getting closer to 100.

Male: Right.

Female: Contradicting the discussion. So I think we need clarification.

Male: Really, I don't mean to be – as Anna has pointed out, the – getting this right matters a lot. And it is important to remember that the way the information is being presented today is the opposite of the way it was discussed in the session on Friday.

Female: However, the decision is the same.

Male: The decision – well, let's be honest.

Female: That's correct.

Male: (Inaudible), 50-50, it would be a moot point.

Male: Exactly.

John leTellier: Yes. I mean, it would be absolutely a moot point. Deviating from 50-50 requires that we understand what we're doing when we move away from the 50 percent, and we have to be clear about what we're articulating when we specify a number. And my concern about going the direction that (Christy) suggested, which is putting it in the parlance of what we used Friday, which I thought was intuitive, is that it's not consistent with what's presented on the slides here. They are in fact reversed.

What we talked about on Friday as being a zero percent contribution of school effect, as Jon has presented it here today, implies that you're folding in 100 percent of the school component back into the individual teacher component. And I think technically that is correct, which is why I keep going back to Jon to make sure I understand this right. And I want everybody to understand before they consider a motion that if you're recommending, in today's numbers, the way – what we're looking at, on this (inaudible), if we're suggesting a number closer to 100, what we are actually doing is going more closely aligned to a teacher only kind of value added model. That is the clarification I made earlier in the conversation.

But when we include 100 percent of the school component back into the teacher effect or teacher component, what we're essentially doing is saying that the school component doesn't matter. And if we include zero percent of the school component into the teacher component, we're saying that school component is really important and that we shouldn't add any of it back to the teacher (inaudible).

And Jon, at this point, I'll rely on you to tell me, do I have it right or do I have it not right?

Jon Cohen: Perfect. John, your own words a little while ago – a wrote this down, under the include 100 percent school component, says teacher owns everything. Yes.

John leTellier: Right.

Jon Cohen: Right? So that I think that makes it – if you would write that down on your – on that 100 percent school component, if everybody writes down "teacher owns everything," and then on the zero percent "teacher owns nothing," then it will help you do…

Male: Nothing, Jon. Teacher owns none of the school component.

Jon Cohen: Correct. Nothing of the school component. Correct.

Male: Right.

Jon Cohen: Yes. And I think that would help maybe with the decision because everybody would be looking at the same verbage.

Female: Then (inaudible).

Female: Can you repeat that again please?

Female: That is 77 percent to teacher owned…

Jon Cohen: Sam, do you want to clarify what I just said, if you think that's a value?

Sam Foerster: I do think it's a value. Absolutely. If you say 100 percent, you'd think the teacher owns everything and that the school effect doesn't matter. And if you say zero percent, you're saying that the school component is very important and that we don't want to add any of it back into the teacher contribution. And the thing that is confusing is that this is the opposite of what we talked about on Friday.

Anna Brown: OK. This is Anna. Can I please ask a question?

Sam Foerster: Absolutely, Anna.

Anna Brown: OK, Jon, this is why I'm having a dilemma. It is flipped from before, but they – I'm really trying hard to keep it. It's hard (inaudible) on the phone.

So, based on what Sam just said, it would imply that we would be needing – if we believed that the school's effect should be considered, there's an implication that we need to have a higher percentage number. And my concerns is that in the full calculation – we're talking about teacher effect, adding back in school effect, I don't think it really works the way that we're talking here.

So I want to be clear. I don't want to vote about a philosophy thing and then find out later that what I really voted for was – totally screw the formula, because it's doing a flip flop.

Jon Cohen: That's where the 50 percent, I think, takes away the ambiguity. You don't – it's totally, to me the easier way to go.

Anna Brown: Well, this is the problem, is it may be easier. However, what we see is that clearly – you know, see this is what's counterintuitive. Forget all this philosophy stuff about who owns more. The bottom line is if we say close – you know, closer to 100 school effect added back in, then we have the potential to hurt a highly effective teacher in a low growth school.

It is counterintuitive. It's true that the closer to zero, there's a potential that in a high growth school that that situation may have a slight alter effect.

Again, according to some of the statistics that we've heard today, we're only talking about a different range, possibly, of a couple points here. But the point is if that's true, if we're looking at that, then I'm absolutely – and I pretty much understand this stuff – I am totally confused why we would even remotely look at something close to 70.

So this flip flop has really confused the issue for me, and it makes me frustrated and it makes me want to say we shouldn't be voting.

Female: I completely agree with you, Anna.

Female: I totally agree with you.

Maria Cristina Noya: And I agree. This is Noya, from St. Lucie. I'm totally confused at this
                    point as well.

Anna Brown: You know, if this is the truth, I would like to potentially make a motion that if
                    this is so confusing because of the way it's worded, maybe we need to have
                    Webinar, and I'll call in tomorrow, but it needs to be cleared up.

Female: So what is…

Jon Cohen: All right. Now it's – I got to weigh in here. There is no way to present you
                    the numbers in the other – in the other direction. And that's the – that's the
                    reason that it's presented this way.

                    When you estimate school effects and teacher effects together, then the – then
                    that, just through the estimation of the statistical model, remove the school
                    component fro the teacher component. It automatically creates a situation
                    where there's zero school component in the estimates. You then have the
                    estimates and you can add them back in, if you choose to.

                    However…

Female: Well…

Jon Cohen: However, if you don't estimate them, you don't have them to subtract off and
                    the numbers would come out differently because these models vary for lots of
                    different reasons.

                    So, if you estimated just the teacher effect, you don't have a school effect then
                    to subtract out, so I couldn't put together graphs to show you. It has to be
                    presented this way.

                    You can talk about it in a different way. You can start at the yellow bar. Yes,
                    let's all look at page 10. We're all concerned about the low value add
                    schools. We could start at the – at the yellow bar and say let's start at 100
                    percent of the school component attributed to the – attributed to the teacher.
                    How much do you want to subtract off? As long as you recognize that's not

really how the model's estimated, we can talk – we can talk about it that way and flip the numbers over.

Female: Well, Jon, if we go to slide 11 and have people look at the numbers and implications and ask which column are you most aligned with, we can start our motion from there. So looking at slide 11, we have a low average and high growth school, and then what the implication is if you include 100 percent, 50 percent or zero percent.

If you look at the column, which scenario is it that you support? The column that say 100 percent, the column that says 50 percent, or the column that says zero?

Female: I – would we want the column in between the last and the second to the last? The 50 and the zero. That's what we would be talking about, is that correct?

Female: If that's what you're interested in. If we put a column in there that said 23 percent or 25 percent, the number – the numbers would be essentially…

Female: Right.

Female: … (inaudible) and a half, two, you know, negative 1 ½ or two, 7 ½, negative nine, negative three, 18, negative 14 ½, negative 3 ½, and then 29. So if you added that column in there, it's just the difference between those two numbers.

So that's the column that you want see – that's the impact you want. We can add another column in there that's 25 percent.

(Stephanie Hall): I'd just like to say that – this is (Stephanie Hall). I'd like to say that after all this discussion, I've been completely confused throughout the entire discussion. But I think, in the end, looking at the impact of the teacher and the low growth school is where I would be most comfortable giving them the opportunity to make the least impact.

So the 50 percent, the 25 or somewhere in that column, I feel is going to be the less impact where the teacher that is truly working in a tough situation and trying to do the best that she can were key.

John leTellier: Sam?

Sam Foerster: Yes?

John leTellier: Can we do two simple motions? One, if you fall more between zero to 50 percent, the other if you fall more between 50 and – 50 and 100 percent, get that clarified, and then from there we can actually get a real number.

Female: And can we clarify this as presented on slide 11?

John leTellier: Correct. Would that help us?

Female: Would you repeat that last part? I don't know if (Susanna), who…

John leTellier: That…

Sam Foerster: You…

John leTellier: Go ahead, Sam.

Sam Foerster: No, please, John. You have the floor.

John leTellier: OK. I was just going to say, can we make two separate motions to kind of move this along, which is, you know, that we would make a vote for who falls between zero and 50 percent and who falls between 50 and 100 percent. Once we get that tallied up, then we can mess with the actual percent, and we are – I can't remember who just said the last part, which is in relationship as it is to slide 11, with today's understanding, that we're including the percentage of school component.

Sam Foerster: Well – OK.

Anna Brown: If that were the case, then – I don't know what the rules of order say – but, this is Anna, and I would move…

Male: (There's) a motion on the floor, I believe that need to be (inaudible).

Male: We do. Yes.

Female: That (inaudible) never seconded.

Anna Brown: It was never seconded.

Male: Oh, you're right. OK. So, if the…

Male: (Inaudible) motion but didn't identify themselves.

Male: I'm sorry?

Male: That's the one (who) second the motion but did not identify themselves.

John leTellier: John leTellier.

Male: OK. So the motion did have a second?

Male: (Inaudible).

Female: Yes, (inaudible).

Male: OK. Then it's been moved and seconded – and here's the point that we – that this train got off the tracks here, that those two numbers were thrown out – a 77 and a 23. And after much going around, I'm still not sure which of those numbers, relative to slide 11, (what's the intent).

                    Although, having listened to Arlene's philosophy – and Anna, forgive me, that's the way I get this – given her philosophy is that the teacher is more important than the school effect, then she could go on the field (inaudible) and still teach. I think, given that the way that the numbers are still presented or, I'm sorry, are presented in slide 11, she meant to move 77 percent.

Female: No.

Female: I don't agree with that.

Female: No.

Female: I don't either.

Female: That's not what – that's not (inaudible).

Male: Let me take one last stab at trying to clarify this situation.

Male: Please.

Male: What you're – there's an independent school effect or there's a separate school effect, there's a separate teacher effect estimated. The question at hand is how much of that school effect do you fold back into the teacher?

                The closer you get to 100 percent, the teacher is not only responsible for what is going on in her classroom, it is also impacted by everything that is going on around her in her school, so it…

Female: But gets no credit for it.

Male: You have – if you have a high performing teacher, the teacher that has high growth with her students, yet she is surrounded in (inaudible) school that is not exhibiting high growth. If 100 percent of that school effect is added back to her and attributed to her, her score would decline. She would have a lower score.

Male: Exactly. OK.

Male: So the farther you go to 100 percent (inaudible) you are putting on the school effect and attributing that back to the teacher, they do go to zero percent. (Inaudible) still exist, but you are not attributing that to the teacher. The teacher's impact is separated from the school's impact. So it places more on the teacher. So, closer to zero, the less impact you're going to put on the school.

                So, again, back to the table on slide 11, high effect teacher on a low growth school. If you don't attribute any of that negative impact to the school on her, she receives a 10 point score, which means her students grew, on average, 10

points more than expected. If you attribute 100 percent of that school effect onto the teacher – and again, she – her – not only is her growth now being defined by what happened in her classroom or what's happened around her at the school.

Male: She loses 10.

Male: She loses 10. She gets zero points. She looks less effective.

Maria Cristina Noya: So, going back – this is – this is Noya. Going back to where Anna was at, the closer you are – excuse me – the closer you are to zero, the less you're putting on the school effects on the teacher?

Male: Correct.

Maria Cristina Noya: OK.

Male: So what you're saying that – what you're saying is that the motion is that in the – in the last column, you close 23 percent of the school component.

Male: Correct.

Male: That's the motion? Remaining 77 percent goes to the teacher?

Male: The point – the point to keep in mind is not the remaining 77 percent. There is a teacher effect.

Female: Correct.

Male: The question at hand is what percent of the school do you put back on the teacher? Because 23 percent of the school effect is the motion on the floor.

Maria Cristina Noya: So let me – this is Noya again. Let me – let me repeat what you said to see if I understood it correctly.

If you look at a low growth school, with a higher effect – a higher effective teacher, and you apply the 100 percent school component, she loses the 10

points and get zero points, which you're – she will then not look as highly effective as she really is?

Male: Well that really is actually – that's a little bit misleading. You need to decide how effective she really is. Is that school – if all those schools – if all the teachers in the school are 10 points less effective than a typical teacher in the state, then, really, none of that – none of that is due to anything but the teacher, right? And so when you move her up to zero, and when you – when you move her up to 10, that's making a mediocre teacher seem more effective.

Maria Cristina Noya: Exactly. OK.

Male: Right? So it – really, you're – and probably that slide shouldn't be labeled teacher effect. It should be labeled teacher component, because you're deciding how much – how much comprises the effect of the teacher.

Maria Cristina Noya: Yes. OK.

Latha Krishnaiyer: This is Latha. Can you hear me?

Male: Yes.

Latha Krishnaiyer: Yes. I thought I understood, but I am getting confused as we go back and forth.

I just want to state, I think what I'm looking for and I think everybody is looking for is to be fair to all teachers. I know we've been talking about highly effective teachers and – but whatever number we come with, I think I personally need a reassurance that we're being fair to teachers all across, you know, the board. And so I'm just struggling with that because, you know, I'm not sure what number would even at – level the playing field for everybody.

Male: OK.

Female: Correct.

Sam Foerster: I'm going to make a suggestion here, because we seem to be on the same situation that we were in Friday. Lots of confusion, I feel like I get it but I'm

not sure. But I think everybody feels like that. We get it and think maybe we don't now.

I've heard a comment of no confidence in what we're (steering) at or confidence that we understand it at least sufficiently to vote. I understand the importance of getting to a vote. I'm not sure we're going to get there today.

So, is Kathy Hebda still on the line?

Kathy Hebda: Yes. I'm right here, Sam.

Sam Foerster: Kathy, is it fair to say that if we stayed with the 50-50 allocation as it was originally suggested – there's a couple of things first. First, it makes this discussion (inaudible) what 100 and what zero means (inaudible). Second, there has been the argument made that given an absence of information that would inform a decision going to one side or the other, to more heavily weight the school component or more lightly, that 50-50 seems (prudent).

If you are open or if the (state) would be open to specifically revisiting this issue after the data is run, after districts have an opportunity to see its impact on their futures, their school, when the Student Growth Implementation Committee will reconvene, I think – I think, and I will defer to the members of the committee to whether or not I'm accurately relaying the feelings here – I think everybody would be comfortable in coming up with a number so that we could move forward, knowing that we could revisit it in the middle of summer, after we've had an opportunity to see the effect.

Is that something that could be done or is this decision in concrete after it's made?

Kathy Hebda: Remember that your decision is a recommendation…

Sam Foerster: Yes, ma'am.

Kathy Hebda: … to the commissioner, and the commissioner does have to select a model on June 1. So one of the things I would ask or just to kind of think through what you just asked me, if you'll permit me to do that.

Sam Foerster: Sure.

Cathy Cavanaugh: Running additional data would mean that they would replicate the same thing that they did for seventh grade with the other grades. And I'll ask AIR to confirm this. What I've understood so far is although they're showing you seventh grade, that these results were similar across grades, so that what you have is you have a similar kind of impact, meaning for example the schools and the example how to – a 10 point low growth schools are minus 10 points on average and high growth schools were positive 10 points on average, those numbers could be slightly different.

But the charts will look essentially the same in that the closer you get to zero, you can see on the top row that the low effect teacher in a low growth school has – starts out when there's zero school component added back in, she gets minus 14. If you add all the school component back in, it's going to be 24.

Sam Foerster: Yes.

Kathy Hebda: If we change that negative 10 for a different grade to a negative 12, then it just means we'll change it from negative 14 to negative 26.

Sam Foerster: Right.

Kathy Hebda: So I think…

Jon Cohen: Also, I have to clarify, those are not representative numbers. Those are just example – teachers that made good examples. So it – that's not average. Yes. OK?

Kathy Hebda: Thanks, Jon. I appreciate that. I think – I think we – people know that these are – these are examples.

What I'm trying to do here – I know I'm not doing every single detail, Jon, but what I'm, trying to say is I appreciate the committee wanting to take some more time because they want to be sure that they're clear. And I think there have been points in the conversation, just listening, that the committee has

become clear. And then one additional comment is made that then makes people doubt themselves.

So, I'm wondering if that in fact additional data is really going to help or really the committee just feels like there's – they would even just benefit from another day or something to think about it and talk about it again and let us try to present it to you in a way that's not so confusing, or you may have committee members that feel like they're ready to vote.

I don't know that waiting all the way till July is going to help.

Sam Foerster: OK. Fair enough. All right, thank you, Ms. Hebda.

We have a motion on the floor, and my understanding is that it has been seconded. So I'm going to get out of the way here and assume that the interpretation that has been offered is that the motion on the floor was intended to be that we recommend inclusion of 23 percent of the school component, in the vernacular, as it is described in slide 11.

Let me start there. Is that the appropriate interpretation of the motion on the floor?

Kathy Hebda: Sam, if you're asking me, Kathy, then that is the appropriate interpretation of the motion on the floor. Adding that (inaudible)…

Female: Adding that may the motion – that what I intended. (Inaudible) what it is now, but that's what I intended. Thank you.

Sam Foerster: If that's what you intended, ma'am, then that's the motion on the floor. So we include 23 percent of the school component in the vernacular that is described in slide 11.

There's a motion and a second. If there is any further discussion, we will entertain it. If there isn't, I will look for a question and bring it to a vote. Is there a question?

Ronda Bourn: This is Ronda, and I have a point just to make.

Sam Foerster: Sure.

Ronda Bourn: That's I'm going to vote no, not because I'm philosophically opposed, but because I would like a number that's either 20 or 25.

Sam Foerster: OK.

Female: Sam, this is (inaudible). I had the same thought as well, Ronda. Thank you.

Sam Foerster: All right. Well, there is a mechanism by which you can amend the motion that is on the floor. Would someone care to amend the motion with (inaudible)…

Female: Since I made the original motion…

Sam Foerster: Yes.

Female: … may I go to then 25?

Sam Foerster: You may. And I'm sure we're supposed to take on that amendment, and we'll do that by voice vote. Is there a second for the move to amend the motion to 25 percent?

Female: Second.

Male: Second.

Sam Foerster: All those in favor of amending the motion to 25 percent, indicate by saying aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Sam Foerster: All opposed? Motions will then carry.

The motion now before the floor is that we include 25 percent of the school component, as indicated in the vernacular on slide 11. That motion has been

moved and seconded, and is there any further discussion? And, if there is none, if someone will call for the questions, we will proceed to a roll call.

Someone tell me to bring it to a vote, please.

(Gisela Field): I ask that we bring it to a vote. This is (Gisela).

Sam Foerster: Excellent. Thank you, (Gisela). Then, with that, Juan, if you will give us a roll call, all those in favor of the motion of including 25 percent of the school component, indicate by saying yes, and all those not in favor indicate by saying no.

Juan Copa: (Stephanie Hall)?

(Stephanie Hall): Yes.

Juan Copa: Lisa Maxwell?

Lisa Maxwell: Yes.

Juan Copa: Nicole Marsala?

Nicole Marsala: Yes.

Juan Copa: (Gisela Field)?

(Gisela Field): Yes.

Juan Copa: (Sandi Acosta)?

(Sandi Acosta): No.

Juan Copa: Tamar Woodhouse-Young?

Tamar Woodhouse-Young: I will have to abstain. I don't quite understand, to be honest.

Juan Copa: Anna Brown?

Anna Brown: Yes.

Juan Copa: Joseph Camputaro?

Joseph Camputaro: Yes.

Juan Copa: Gina Tovine?

Gina Tovine: (Yes).

Juan Copa: Stacey Frakes?

Stacey Frakes: Yes.

Juan Copa: John leTellier?

John leTellier: No.

Juan Copa: Latha Krishnaiyer?

Latha Krishnaiyer: No.

Juan Copa: Lawrence Morehouse?

Lawrence Morehouse: Yes.

Juan Copa: Ronda Bourn?

Ronda Bourn: Yes.

Juan Copa: Arlene Ginn?

Arlene Ginn: Yes.

Juan Copa: Linda Krishnaiyer?

Linda Krishnaiyer: No.

Juan Copa: Sam Foerster?

Sam Foerster: (No).

Juan Copa: Sam Foerster?

Sam Foerster: No.

Juan Copa: Pam Stewart?

Pam Stewart: Yes.

Juan Copa: Maria Cristina Noya?

Maria Cristina Noya: Yes.

Juan Copa: (Lance Tomei)? (Jeff Murphy)?

(Jeff Murphy):   No.

Juan Copa: Thirteen yays, six nays, and one abstention.

Sam Foerster: OK. Motion carries. We will include 25 percent of school components.

Arlene Ginn: Sam?

Sam Foerster: (Inaudible), (is that you)?

Arlene Ginn: Sam, (inaudible).

Sam Foerster: Ma'am?

Arlene Ginn: Hello?

Sam Foerster: Yes.

Male: Go ahead.

Arlene Ginn: This – I know we're pretty much clearing out. Anna and Sam and all of you guys, this is Arlene Ginn. Thank you very, very much for the teaching and the learning.

My husband has been transferred. He's an (aerospace) engineer at (Lockheed). So he's been transferred back home to (Maryland). So, as of

July 15th my tour of (Maryland) – I'm sorry, Orange County Public Schools in Florida will end.

I would like to thank (Juan and Kathy) for giving me the opportunity to work on this very, very important committee, for the opportunity to (inaudible). I hope, though, that as you guys go forward on new endeavors that you always think first of the students. (Well), as it comes in our class, when we – first of all, we have to teach, but also we remember that we teachers in the trenches are only human and we're doing the best we can with what we've got, and we will continue to do the best as teachers.

So, as you guys move forward, good luck, God speed, and I will be monitoring you from (Maryland).

Sam Foerster: Thank you very much, Arlene.

Kathy Hebda: Sam, this is Kathy.

Sam Foerster: Hi, Kathy.

Kathy Hebda: It is a little bit after 6:30, and that was the decision that the committee had as a goal for this meeting. The additional information is – information that we wanted to present to you, just for the committee's information but it doesn't impact your decision at this point, it would be something that you would want to know, especially in July, when you get the – we get the full set of data. So, with your permission, if everybody's OK with it, we could postpone the rest of the PowerPoint until a future date.

Sam Foerster: OK. Do I have a motion to postpone the balance of this presentation and so – on a future date?

Female: I motion…

Lisa Maxwell: This is Lisa Maxwell, and so move.

Sam Foerster: Did I hear a motion?

Female: Hi. I motion that…

Lisa Maxwell: (Inaudible).

Sam Foerster: OK. And do I have a second.

Female: Second.

Female: Second.

Female: (Inaudible).

Sam Foerster: All those in favor, indicate by saying aye.

Female: Aye.

Male: Aye.

Female: Aye.

Sam Foerster: All opposed? Motion carries. We will delay the rest of the (inaudible) to a later date.

                 Let's have the – is there any other business we should take on before terminating the call?

Kathy Hebda: No, I think, except to make sure that everybody understands – I think you iterated already or even reiterated the recommendation of the commissioner. It's model 3C, if I understand it correctly.

Female: (Inaudible).

Kathy Hebda: And you've already – you decided in your last meeting what the variable is for and everything else. The only decision you have left to confirm and – or decide was the school effect, which you've put at 25 percent. And so you have a complete recommendation now to the commissioner.

Sam Foerster: Excellent.

Kathy Hebda: And I – it is – I just want to say this to the committee members that are still on the phone how much appreciate it, that it is difficult work, and we appreciate all the time and the effort that you spend and all the diligent work and deliberative nature of your discussion. The department owes you a great debt.

(Gisela Field):   Kathy, this is (Gisela). Will we be notified as a committee once the recommendation is made to the commissioner and he either accepts it or modifies it what the final outcome is?

Kathy Hebda: Absolutely. In fact, since the recommendation is due by law to be made on June 1, we have scheduled time with the commissioner on May 31, the day before, to present all of the information to him that is a result of your deliberations, data, things like that. And then we will notify the committee as soon as his recommendation is made so that you all know the results.

(John):   Kathy, this is (John).

Kathy Hebda: Hi, (John).

(John):   Hi. How soon after that can we expect some sort of data in our hand to present to our schools' districts?

Kathy Hebda: Now, the full set of data, I believe, on the calendar – Juan, correct me if I'm wrong – is set to the end of July for schools to get their large data files of the nature they get for school grades and things like that. But we'll be working on communication materials between now and then.

(John):   OK.

Kathy Hebda: (And that) wouldn't be the next time you'll hear from us. You'll hear from us quite a lot, and we'll – I think (Maryanne) – and also (Maryanne Linkey) from AIR had also requested to be able to run some materials by the committee, so you'll probably be receiving things from us electronically for your input and consideration.

(John):   Thank you.

Kathy Hebda: Other questions? OK, thank you very much, AIR. Thank you very much, committee members and Mr. Chair. I think – I think we're done.

Male: Right.

Male: Yes, ma'am.

Male: All right. Thank you, everybody.

Kathy Hebda: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Male: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Female: Bye.

Male: Bye.

Female: Goodbye.

Operator: This concludes today's Student Growth Implementation Committee Meeting. You may now disconnect.

                            END