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1 (Whereupon, this is an uninterrupted
2 continuation from Day 2, Volume 2, to-wit:)
3 ** ** ** **
4 MS. BROWN: Sam, can we discuss from the
5 standpoint of what we have now, meaning class
6 size restriction defined under the current
7 legislation because as was pointed out probably
8 before we had that we would have seen more
9 deviation, more impact, right? So do we
10 consider just what we are under right now or
11 because we know we're moving to end -- of-course
12 exams, we know we're going to have more
13 differentiation and those classes may have
14 larger class size variation. Can we -- should
15 we consider that it's a changing landscape
16 because that would frame which way I'm -- I'm
17 leaning the other way, that class size should be
18 included because I've seen all of these things
19 we've been told are in the process of changing
20 now and are going to continue to change, and
21 because of that I think class size is important
22 and does matter even if with this particular
23 constrained example, it's not showing it.
24 MR. LeTELLIER: I agree.
25 MS. BOURN: So what I think you just said
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1 is if in fact this data looks as though there's
2 no effect because it was measured during a time
3 when all the courses under consideration had a
4 maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able
5 to apply it as even just next year, already next
6 year --
7 Is that what you're trying to say?
8 MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say
9 this, that I know there's a lot of debate around
10 class size and whether we should have that
11 restriction or not have it and so on. You could
12 look to other studies that have been done saying
13 whether you feel it does matter or doesn't
14 matter, but to people who are going to see
15 classes grow because we can't afford to have all
16 classes tiny and because we're going to be
17 assessing and using those assessments to grade
18 teachers that that piece should be in that
19 formula.
20 MS. BROWN: You convinced me when we
21 started because now I'm concerned that this data
22 is constrained by -- artificially by the cap
23 that exists.
24 MR. MOREHOUSE: That is precisely my point,
25 that here we don't know what the numbers are for
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1 this data set. What if the rule changes? It
2 goes up. Now what's the --
3 MS. KEARSCHNER: Aren't we going to be
4 revising this yearly? Can't we add it in at a
5 later date?
6 MR. LeTELLIER: I would rather start with
7 it and take it down if it's not necessary than
8 trying to add it in.
9 MS. KEARSCHNER: Even if it's not
10 significant?
11 MR. LeTELLIER: But it's not significant
12 only for those constraints that we're talking
13 about and we know it's going to change right
14 now. I mean, for next year.
15 MR. FOERSTER: Jon?
16 DR. COHEN: Let me make one technical point
17 and maybe -- you seem to be at a bit of an
18 impasse and let me make a suggestion to help get
19 you past it.
20 If you constrain the variation of your
21 dependent variable, say you're trying to
22 explain, then you know you're going to attenuate
23 your quote. We're talking about an independent
24 variable that has a strain. That probably
25 shouldn't have -- technically shouldn't have
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1 much of an impact of making it seem less
2 significant. If it hadn't affected, it would
3 have -- you would still likely see it, but what
4 you could choose to do is you might choose to
5 revisit -- because the situation is changing,
6 the world is changing, how class sizes are
7 determined will change, you could make a
8 recommendation that you maybe take it out now,
9 re-introduce it as a check into the model each
10 year to monitor how changing policy is changing
11 the value-added.
12 MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now
13 because as those things change that we're
14 talking about, those assessments, the potential
15 for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we
16 need to be able to measure and see the effect
17 and teachers are going to want to know as those
18 changes are made. And that's my argument.
19 MR. FOERSTER: I think that's a great
20 argument; I really do. I want to make sure I
21 understood what Jon was saying just so that we
22 see both sides of it. I think what Jon was
23 saying was that the way that this analysis was
24 done it has already taken into account
25 fluctuations in class size. So the situation
that you're contemplating about having more
classes that are bigger in his opinion likely is
not going to change what we see in these
numbers. That's a technical --
DR. COHEN: It typically does what you see,
but because of the change in policy the world
can change. The decisions people make about
class size could change. Constraining your
independent variables doesn't usually change the
effects on the on constrain, but the dependent
variable does. So we're constraining an
independent variable here but we're talking
about two things happening at the same time.
Removing that constraint is also going to change
how people form their classes and the kinds of
decisions they make with their resources. I
mean, Linda's approach is as good as the one I
suggested. You could leave it in and revisit it
next meeting.
MS. KEARSCHNER: Sam, I'm coming from a
policy standpoint.
MR. FOERSTER: Sure.
MR. MOREHOUSE: You want to motion it,
Linda?
MS. KEARSCHNER: So moved, keep it in.
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MS. BROWN: Second.
MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I
assume you're talking about keeping in all of
the class size parameters?
MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that
because --
PANEL MEMBERS: No.
MS. BOURN: Because the majority are
raising expectations as you get bigger. You
guys understand that?
MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two,
at the most fine.
MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda?
We're operating under a -- I think most of us
operate under the assumption that class size as
it increases results in lower expectations for
students, thereby helping teachers. What she's
pointing out is that isn't the case, at least
that's not what we see here. Where there are
effect sizes in many cases they are positive,
meaning that as the class gets bigger the
expectation for the teacher is going to go up.
So where we have a benefit in saying, yes,
teacher, it's in the model and it's accounted
for, we have a problem in that when they see the
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MS. KEARSCHNER: When we looked at that
initially, my instinct was to decide on one and
two because first of all those incidents are so
rare; that's why you're seeing that, if I'm
understanding correctly. When you get out to
six, if you have 51 numbers that's blown up
because that doesn't recur.
DR. HOVANETZ: Less than half of the
students in middle and high school have a single
course. Like five percent of elementary
students have a single course. So it's not that
only -- it's not that there's only just one
course at the impact negative, the distribution
of students in multiple courses, you're like,
how can a student have six courses? Remember
what we talked about yesterday? Students in
elementary school are enrolled in reading,
spelling, writing, language arts --
So if you're looking at class size four,
it's not statistically significant; and you
know, it's nominal marginal impact and so we're
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1 not just looking at it from the perspective that
everybody -- (inaudible).
PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)
MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational
way to figure out what we're keeping in and not
keeping in.
MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we
consider whether or not to consider parse out or
not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3?
DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse
out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because
just the way they're enrolled in the courses,
there's not a systemic way that we're saying
okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is
the first course is going to be a reading course
some kids it's their English course --
PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)
DR. HOVANETZ: -- it should be an all or
nothing, and just looking at the impact and
significance it's, you know --
MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we have a
technical guidance that we need to be taking
this on as agreeable; we either leave them in --
we either leave class size and homogeneity. Can
we take homogeneity out simultaneously or can we
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1 do class size and --
2 DR. COHEN:  Yeah, no reason to do them
3 separately.
4 MR. FOERSTER:  Okay, class size and
5 homogeneity for classes 1 through 6, leave them
6 in or leave them out is the technical guidance.
7 So I will take a motion either way.
8 DR. COHEN:  There's one more alternative.
9 You can calculate the average class size of
10 overall the class of overall the classes of kids
11 in it is another opportunity -- but it's another
12 reasonable approach.  When you have one class
13 size it would just be the average.
14 MR. LeTELLIER:  I would even think now
15 couldn't we just do that?  Just simple class
16 size?
17 MR. FOERSTER:  Harder to explain, to me.
18 You lose the granularity, you would have the
19 same counter-arguments that you have with SWD.
20 MS. GINN:  May I ask you a question?
21 Suppose you have a student in the 8th grade but
22 they're taking honors high school classes
23 wherein the class size is different, are we
24 taking that into consideration here?  For
25 example, our 8th graders, 45% of them are taking

198 1 data looked the same, I just thought that we
2 needed to know that.
3 DR. COHEN:  We have more numbers.
4 MR. FOERSTER:  Only if you notice something
5 markedly different from the --
6 DR. COHEN:  No, they're the same.  They're
7 small effects, there are a lot of them that
8 bounce back and forth.
9 MS. TOVINE:  We're coming up with a
10 formula, with a model to calculate the score for
11 a teacher.  Under the contention, I still don't
12 understand why we would include variables in
13 there that aren't even making a difference, just
14 for comfort level.  I mean, we're talking about
15 a statistical application here, not the other
16 side of it.
17 MS. KEARSCHNER:  I think it's for
18 information which is valuable, and understanding
19 the elements that are going into providing this
20 score for teachers, the pieces that are going
21 into the formula are changing.  We need
22 information, information -- not comfort,
23 information; teachers are going to need
24 information, communities are going to need
25 information to have faith in what that score is.

199 1 honors science and they're taking for high
2 school credit.  So even though they're in the
3 8th grade they're taking high school, so the
4 class size changed.  Does that have an impact at
5 all?
6 MS. ACOSTA:  We still use the 8th grade
7 class cap in my school.
8 MS. GINN:  What now?
9 MS. ACOSTA:  For my school, for the 8th
10 grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use
11 the 8th grade class cap size.
12 MS. GINN:  I thought it was in the pipeline
13 for --
14 MS. ACOSTA:  The new law says --
15 MS. GINN:  -- the new law so it does count,
16 yes.  That's why I asked.  The new law says if
17 you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th
18 grade, you base it upon the high school.
19 MR. TOMEI:  Question.  Jon, everything
20 we've discussed and everything we've looked at
21 is that.  Were there any noticeable differences
22 in the data we're talking about for regional --
23 DR. COHEN:  You see the same kind of -- we
24 can pop it open for reading.
25 MR. TOMEI:  As long as we know that the
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200 1 MR. TOMEI:  I tend to agree with you.  If
2 we agree that we can't parse it out, that we
3 either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to
4 me even though we know that only portions are
5 significant and the effect size is likely
6 extremely small; it's not going to have a marked
7 effect on the statistics we're generating or
8 teacher accountability, but it seems to me
9 easier to explain from a policy standpoint that
10 we kept it in the model because we know this is
11 -- particularly class size is a sensitive issue
12 and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a
13 few years before we then make a case of where
14 we're at the point where we really don't want it
15 in the model because of parsimony
16 considerations.  But to do that now, I think it
17 would be harder to explain that from a policy
18 perspective to explain why we kept in something
19 even though it has a very effect size.  So I'm
20 with Linda on this; I'm more comfortable leaving
21 it in.
22 MS. GINN:  Me, too, because that's the
23 reason I said things are changing.  So I'd
24 rather have it in and err on the safe side.
25 MR. LeTELLIER:  I'd rather be able to point
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to data that says it doesn't matter than not have it in the model and try to convince teachers it's not there because it doesn't matter.

I make a motion that --

MS. BROWN: There's a motion on the floor.

MR. FOERSTER: It was ambiguous which is why we stopped, but we have gotten technical guidance.

Linda, your motion was that we accept or keep in the model all of the class size and homogeneity covariates as they're listed for both math and reading.

Is that the motion that you seconded?

MR. MOREHOUSE: Yes.

MR. FOERSTER: Then it's moved and seconded. All those in favor of including all of the class size and homogeneity covariates in the model for math and reading, please indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you.

I'm not sure how we're doing on scheduling and breaks. Do you want to take a break? Are you all ready for a break? Do you want --

MS. KEARSCHNER: We only have a few more to American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

DR. DORAN: Let me explain these others so you can consider them at your convenience.

Missing mobility, we don't know about the transitions. Attendance is a continuous variable of the number of days present in the school. Gifted is a dichotomous variable coded as zero or one, one meaning they are gifted, zero meaning they are not; and ELL/LY was also a dichotomous -- that was a dichotomous variable that was well coded as ELL/LY 1, zero otherwise.

You can consider these.

MS. FEILD: The ELL was I believe the flag was set if they were less than two years in the program, correct?

DR. DORAN: Yes.

MS. FEILD: And the gifted is based on the primary exceptionality whether or not the child is enrolled in a gifted course?

DR. DORAN: Yeah, the code is L and the exception model --

MS. FEILD: So that means a kid could be gifted, but he hasn't been enrolled in a gifted course in five years.

And for the modal age, the adjustment is per one --
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MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about mobility.

DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam?

MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this.

DR. DORAN: -- within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age.

Jon, how is mobility coded?

DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of transitions, a transition being you leave a school and enter another school is a transition, or you leave the school and re-enter that school more than 21 days later. We just count the number of times that a student makes the transition.
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1 differently in the early grades than the later
grades because my recollection was a
conversation about kindergarten or first grade
students and some local action research that was
done that showed significant differences between
students who were born in January and February
versus those who were --

MS. FEILD: Yes, that was Miami-Dade. That
was placement into gifted, placement into gifted
in higher level was for kids that were -- that
turned older in the grade level. Those kids
were higher in terms of being placed into gifted
than those that were younger.

MR. TOMEI: Okay. That talks to the
question that I want to ask that should that I
want to ask, that should that particular
variable be looked at in high resolution than
just increments of a year?

DR. COHEN: I don't think increments of a
year; I think a unit is a year, but it would be
like 1.1 year and 1.2 years, but let me point
out that what this is saying is basically the
kid's been retained so they're a year older than
everybody else. You're expecting the teacher to
produce 13 points less growth, which if you want
American Court Reporting
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1 to think about the potential unintended
consequences, it could be that a teacher would
tend to write off those kids. It could be that
a teacher would tend to write off those kids.
The kids who were already struggling, they had
been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a

MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would
be that that kid could be extra credit, right,
because the standard has been lowered for that
child. If I demonstrate just even an average
amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get
extra credit if you will for them. I think it
could be a positive incentive, also.

DR. LetTELLIER: That's a good point.
MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take
these individually or as a group?
MR. TOMEI: Group.
MR. FOERSTER: I'm getting a wince from the
sidelines.
DR. HOVANETZ: It's not a wince, but
thinking about what we just said here is we want
to expect less from students that we know are
definitely struggling and most need our help.
American Court Reporting
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MS. BROWN: It depends if the student was retained --
DR. DORAN: That's right, they would reach
if they overcame --
MS. BROWN: They had been retained in the
prior grade, so they could be a year older and
have been retained five years ago.
MS. FEILD: The fifth graders there
probably weren't retained in 4th grade; they
were probably retained in 3rd and they're
already one year behind, and they're going to
carry that throughout 10th grade.
DR. DORAN: Just a thought for your
consideration, based on what you just said, it
was observed under this system. So if you
continue then you're continuing with the
expectation that those students would be allowed
to under-perform or have a lower expected growth
than other students. In other words, it's
another way of saying you're not going to change
what was necessarily change what was observed in
the past. It reminds of that saying, if you do
what you've always done, you'll get what you've
always got. So this is an opportunity where you
could say that was observed but I'm unhappy with
American Court Reporting
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it. So that's a thought that you can consider
when you make a change in this particular part
of the policy.
MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the
teachers that we have in Florida are concerned
for the students who sit in their classroom, and
I do not think that teachers are going into the
classroom saying that baby is two years older
than his age, so you know what? I'm going to
sit him in the corner because he can score 40
points lower and it's not going to make a
difference. Teachers teach because they love
kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes,
they are. I just watched on the news last night
about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean,
there are exceptions to the rules no matter
where you go, and in education, also; but the
majority of the teachers that I have worked with
in Florida that I've been on committees with go
into that classroom and say this child has been
retained twice, and I'm going to do everything
in my power when this child leaves my classroom
that they are going to be caught up or as close
to caught up as they can be.
Given that constraint, given all the other
American Court Reporting
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factors that have brought that child here
retained once or twice, what is something to
level when the teacher falls short of bringing
that child right to grade level? What levels
that out? What says that we know you taught
your heart out and did everything you could and
he's still a little bit behind, but we're a
little bit closer. And I think trend data is
going to show what teachers are doing.
All teachers, yes, but I don't think that
data shows teachers that are saying, Johnny, go
sit in the corner, you're worth 40 points, you
don't have to score as high as everybody else.
I mean, are there teachers like that? Yes,
there are, but there's other data that's going
to start weeding those teachers out and it's not
going to be your retained students.
MS. BROWN: I think it's important, too,
because it's true that there's an opportunity to
say we're going to make change and this, that,
and the other; but we're also supposed to be
charged with making sure that we are looking out
for maintaining equity for teachers in
evaluation. And when we also look at the
instances, I mean, another thing we've looked at
American Court Reporting
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here is what is the end that teachers are
dealing with? So how many teachers have an
entire class of retained kids? Now it's
possible, there are a few because some schools
can make that decision but not all schools do.
Speaking with teachers that are dealing
with struggling students that are working hard
like Stacy's talking about, they want to know
that their effort will be rewarded, which in
this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but
they also want to know that if their effort
doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid
magically back to the norm in one year that they
have the student that they're not going to be
penalized for that.
MR. FOERSTER: Jon?
DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside --
maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the
numbers do imply that the kid who's been
retained can continue -- can always have
teachers who are identified as at least being
the standard and continue to fall farther and
farther behind the peers. That's what it does
to that expectation, and so in urban districts
where you have high retention rates, you are de
American Court Reporting
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1 facto setting lower expectations for groups of
2 students in that area. If you guys know you're
3 doing that and you're comfortable with doing
4 that, that's your choice. You should recognize
5 that as something that leaving this in the model
6 does, in the same way that it increases the
7 expectation for ELL students.

MS. FEILD: See, that's the problem. Maybe
9 mentally it doesn't sound right, but if we're
10 using data to drive our decision, we can't go
11 hand -- we can't go picking and say we're going
12 to keep this because politically this will look
13 well but we're going to take this one out
14 because it appears that we're having to reduce
15 the expectations. I mean, the data is showing
16 this and this is going to be what a teacher is
17 going to be evaluated on. So it's hard for me
18 to say, you know, we didn't want to set the
19 wrong message out there and say we expect kids
20 that are retained to score less, but by the way,
21 you're an autistic teacher and because your
22 autism in the data shows you need to make 20
23 more points and we're going to put that in your
24 model.

DR. DORAN: Let me just say one thing real
25 American Court Reporting
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25 quickly so you see what he's saying. In this
2 particular model, if the student were -- the
3 difference would be 14 points. Then the next
4 year they met their prediction, but the next
5 year they could still be 10 points and be behind
6 but that's compounded, so now a student can be
7 24 points behind their per years. Then the next
8 year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes
9 compounded each year and those students are
10 still meeting their expectations, but the gap
11 between those students and their non-retained
12 peers becomes larger and larger over time and
13 those students would still be meeting their
14 expectations despite that gap becoming larger.

MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also
16 I think interweaving is an assumption that by
17 allowing that continue we no longer have high
18 expectations for students. This is only one
19 piece of the pie and it's only one way that
20 we're calculating the teacher effect. That's
21 what this is all about. We still have policies
22 and procedures and things in place to make sure
23 that students are making gain on a different
24 scale by which we will measure a student's
25 growth. We have policies and procedures for --
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1 are they meeting their benchmarks, are they
2 moving forward, are they on track to graduate?
3 Will they graduate? Those pieces.
4 So we have parallel systems running and our
5 educational system is designed and each of our
6 districts is working to insure that our lowest
7 performing students are exceeding their
8 expectations. So I think to only look at it
9 here implies that we're not doing anything
10 anywhere else.

MR. TOMEI: The data are what the data are,
12 okay? It captures a phenomenon that's actually
13 taking place. We can keep it in the model which
14 is how you fairly treat the teachers that are
15 teaching those students. We can take it out of
16 the model; that doesn't change the phenomenon.
17 It doesn't change our expectations. In my way
18 of thinking, I disagree with Jon because I don't
19 think that changes our expectations for those
20 students. We still want to set the bar high,
21 but if we take it out of the model we're
22 ignoring something that we know has an impact on
23 the teacher. So it's a no-brainer to me. We're
24 not changing the phenomenon with our decision.
25 The data are what the data are. We're just
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1 deciding are we going to keep it in the model
2 and react to it in terms of teacher
3 accountability or not? And I don't think this
4 has anything to do with expectations for
5 students.

MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just
7 said was going through my head, too. We're not
8 saying now we're giving a pass for students to
9 not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's
10 using the data to realistically say what a
11 teacher is accountable for at a certain level,
12 and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the
13 other pieces of the puzzle to account for
14 student growth.

MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the
16 model gives that teacher an opportunity to
17 benefit from over-achieving with that student
18 and setting the mark higher. So if there is
19 some policy consequence on expectations, I think
20 leaving it in the model has a positive effect on
21 expectations, not a negative.

MS. BROWN: And I just thought of something
23 that maybe could be potentially true just in
24 this data set. If the grade 5 teacher
25 incredibly exceeds the expectation then that
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1 student's next year's expectation is naturally
elevated by the model because we're using prior
performance to help drive that expectation. So
even though that student is still in that
category of difference from modal age, they are
moving as teachers make that increased
performance. So there is still an incredible
incentive to move students along.

But this allows us, as you said, it's an
anomaly that occurs. These are not always
retained children, either. There are many
children that come to us from out of country
over-aged and as they matriculate through they
continue to be over-aged. So we may still be
getting that same gain.

MS. FEILD: I think the thing is on these
student variables there's almost two categories.
There's one category that once the child meets
it, it stays with him forever. Over-aged once
he retains that once he carries that, right?
Gifted is the same way. If the child is staffed
into gifted in first grade, never even attended
a gifted class, he's going to carry a higher
expectation throughout his entire career, same
thing with ESE, but there are a few others like
American Court Reporting
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2 mobility and attendance that are going to alter
every single year based on that. So it's hard
because, you know, you may have a child that was
staffed at gifted because he had a great
pre-school and they staffed him in first school
but turned out to be average, but he's going to
be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of
the time, throughout his entire educational
career unless we go in and take off the gifted
flag.

MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time.

MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up
one step further. It is completely understood
you guys get the data, you understand the
implications of something very bold, and yes
this is about determining how to set up a
teacher evaluation system, but the reason the
teacher evaluation system was changed was to
improve student achievement, so we just don't
want to lose sight of the fact that the ultimate
goal here isn't just an effective teacher
evaluation system, it's revising the teacher
evaluation system with the end goals of
improving student achievement.

So just keeping that in mind, I know we
American Court Reporting
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1 have other accountability systems where we can
perpetually meet the standards but not actually
improve the student's status, and just from the
pure policy side of that, the implications to
understand that the over-arching goal is to
improve student achievement, and one of the
catalysts the legislature thinks that you can do
that is to change the metric by which we
evaluate teachers. So just keeping that in
mind, yes, we're trying to put together the best
teacher evaluation system we can.

MR. LeTELLIER: Christy, I have a question
about that because that's very important
obviously; but is there really any incentive for
a teacher not to want to succeed with that
student, to not work hard with them? In other
words, if we leave that in the model I don't see
any incentive for the teacher to put the kid in
the corner like somebody was saying and not work
harder. I think if anything maybe we would be
changing to the positive knowing that, hey, you
know, you can actually work hard with the
student and there is a good incentive.

I'm asking you, am I looking at that wrong.

DR. HOVANETZ: I agree, John, but I think
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1 but it's the expectation that the state is
setting. By saying we don't expect this student
as much as another student because they have
over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is
going to do that but it's worsening our
expectation for that particular student is lower
because they're older and that compounds year
after year.

MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation
is not lower. The data that you provided shows
that it is lower. So all that we're saying is
if we take that into account, will we actually
move that data year after year after that
teacher is working hard so that that number
actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could
that have a positive impact versus is there any
negatives to leaving it in?

MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score
point? I mean, we're talking 13 -- and.

PANEL MEMBERS: Yes.

MS. FRAKES: And that's very -- I mean,
we're talking 13 points. I don't think that's
huge. I don't think it's going to make me say
I'm not going to work with you as much over 13
points. Now if it said, I don't know, 500
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possibly, but we're talking 13 points maybe in
5th grade, 26 at the most. I mean, that's not
going to make me do any less of my job because
if I do I'm a fool. I mean, that's not a huge
amount of number for me to say my expectations
are lower for you, and that's why I wanted to
ask that question.

MS. BROWN: I just want to not be
completely argumentative, just a little bit, but
I think there's two ways to look at the same
coin. It has two sides. I don't -- I firmly do
not believe that -- and statisticians will not
agree with me -- that policy-wise we are saying,
the State is saying, we expect less. What I
believe we could be saying policy-wise is the
State recognizes the difficult job of the
teacher in the classroom, therefore we have a
variable included for the time when you do have
to deal with this situation; we're helping you,
we know you're going to keep moving forward.
How about for once the State say I'm behind
you as a teacher? That could possibly be the
policy statement we're making. It doesn't have
to be that those are the words because not one
person in this room used those words.
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MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and
something else I think we all need to consider,
we're looking at these numbers only how teachers
are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid
that comes in my room and say let me see how
many points I can get from him; I look at every
kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a
student that I'm going to teach. All of the
other stuff is just stuff. I am first and
foremost a teacher, and when they come in my
room I don't care if you've got a score here or
here, it is my job to teach him. What the State
has with their policy -- thank you for that
little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that
much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do
and that is to teach.
MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to
put a bow on this one. It really seems like a
philosophical decision here again. It's
perspective and what you believe you're
conveying by accommodating this in the model.
There's one argument to be made that by
incorporating this difference for modal age,
you're conveying a lower expectation for
students and that could have an adverse effect
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Ther's a counter-argument that by
including this difference for modal age what
you're actually doing is honoring the job of the
teacher and saying our experience tells us that
this is the real world, this is what happens;
and we're going to acknowledge that and hope
that you actually take this as an incentive or
an opportunity, let's say, to be rewarded for
the extraordinarily hard work that would be
required to reach a normal growth or what would
be a standard growth for a child with this
attribute. That seems to be what it is about,
which way you think this would go and what you
feel more comfortable advocating for when we
walk out of here.
So the matter is do we include difference
for modal age in the model? And I will take a
motion to that effect and we can put it to a
vote.
MR. LeTELLIER: I move that we include it
in the model.
MS. GINN: Second.
MR. FOERSTER: All those in favor of
including difference for modal age in the model,
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indicate by raising your right hand. Okay.
Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this
point or do we want to keep going?
MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we
retain all remaining variables in the model and
see if it gets seconded.
MS. GINN: Second.
MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any
discussion on including the balance of these
variables in the model? Ready for a question.
All those in favor of including the balance of
these covariates in the model, indicate by
raising your --
MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait,
wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag.
Somebody tells me what that means, please.

DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we
observe the number of times they move between
schools and the criteria was less than 21 days,
Christy; it that right? If they re-enter school
less than 21 days, it's not considered mobile.
If it's more than 21 days, they are mobile; is
that right? All right.
In other cases, we don't have that
information about a particular kid; we just
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Looking at one data point for per semester.
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1 need two things. We need the teacher effect and its standard error. In order to get its standard error, you have to have at least three kids in the class. Now if you wanted to come up with some number that says you have to have at least 10 kids or 11 kids, there would be no empirical criteria which we could come up with that number, so it would just be a number that we would choose out of thin air, okay? We could have that conversation.

But one of the things that would happen is if you have teachers included in the model that have only a very small number of kids, say four or say nine, the standard error of that teacher effect will be really, really big. What that means is, is it will be hard for any teacher that has a very, very small number of kids to have a reliable teacher effect so that they would be either identified as high value-added or very, very low value-added. They would have to do something exceptional with those students to be identified as such. So there's something of a safeguard in place by use of the standard error in making the determination of where a teacher effect is, whether they're high or low.

Now with that said, if you wanted to have a conversation about what is the minimum number of students a teacher would need to have in class before you produce or use a teacher effect estimate? You could have that conversation, but there's no statistical guidance that we could offer. It would be just an opinionated conversation that you could have, a well-considered opinion; you could come up with something that's very thoughtful. We would just have to not be able to advise you on what that number would be other than it has to be bigger than three.

So what you're saying is that teachers that have less than 10 statistically are going to fall in that range of we're not real sure if they're high; we're not real sure if they're low.

DR. DORAN: Most likely they would and it would be true because the standard error of their teacher effect would be very vague, which means they're not measured very reliably because there's not a lot of information, information in the sense you have a lot of kids, that would help us make a good estimate of their teacher
effect. So most likely they would be in that range. --

MS. WESTPHAL: So when we get that kind of rating, that's when we would say, okay, these evaluation peaks are going to pick up the business rule, like, okay now you're down to 40 or 60 or something?

DR. DORAN: Kathy?

MS. HEBDA: The 40 or 50% applies in the law to the number of years in teacher data that you have, not to the number of students that you have. The student conversation seems to be something you have on the local level because only the district is going to know ultimately how many students were assigned to that teacher.

We'll know in the database to a certain point, but until we get the student teacher data link in place, it's going to be the survey periods. So there are going to be some things in the evaluation system that they're going to have to have local decisions on when there are things about data that are only known locally and not known at the state level.

MS. KEARSCHNER: That kind of goes to my question here, an example that we need for the American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

business rule, that in this case you have a big standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body -- we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on?

MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way.

MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something in the future --

MS. HEBDA: Yes.

MS. EDGECOMB: As we move forward, I think we're going to have piggyback or preparation for materials. This is going to the commissioner by June 1st.
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What happens if for some reason there's any aspect of this that he does not accept? What happens then to our responsibility to respond to any area that is unacceptable?

MS. HEBDA: Your responsibility as a committee is to make a recommendation to the commissioner, and the information that Mary Ann will put together and that we'll put together working for you will also have to ultimately reflect what the commissioner says. But there's a video from this meeting, there will be notes from this meeting, there will be other things that capture what you all did to come to your recommendation and so that if the final decision by the commissioner on June 1st is different from yours then there will be documentation of that.

MS. EDGECOMB: Okay. What happens to the body of all this work? I mean, if he says no -- is it all no, partially no, some no?

MS. HEBDA: What the commissioner has to do is recommend a model or select a model. Now he can select the model that you recommend or he can select a different model. He doesn't really have a choice right now to not select a model.

Mr. FOERSTER: Any other questions? Okay.

We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect to the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means.

MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it was a little frustrating at some times. With everybody talking at the same time, there's no way to indicate -- you know, Stacey wants to talk, she's next; John's next, and then Ronda.

I tried to click that just because I thought, well, I can't speak, I'll just try American Court Reporting 850.421.0058.
really quick, you know, and it doesn't work. So I didn't know if that was a possibility. It might help moderate things.

MS. HEBDA: We'll do our best.

MR. MOREHOUSE: What time is it, the webinar?

MS. HEBDA: I think it's 4:30.

MR. MOREHOUSE: If you can't participate, can we get access to a video?

MS. HEBDA: Yeah, we'll record everything. We record all of it and as soon as possible the materials will be sent to you soon.

MR. FOERSTER: Okay, last order of business for me at least. I'm hoping you guys can provide some feedback as to whether or not you're satisfied with how business is transacted to this point, and if there are any constructive criticisms that you might have or suggestions you'd like to make, I would welcome them.

Yes, sir?

MR. LeTELLIER: I wouldn't mind when we're meeting to have a glossary of sorts to work from, sort of a card that we can look at and refer to that may have pertinent data as we're discussing this. This way it might be easier for us to grasp some of these concepts quicker.

MR. FOERSTER: Would it be helpful to have that even before the meeting so that it could be studied before we meet?

MR. LeTELLIER: I would like that.

MR. FOERSTER: Okay. Thank you. Any other suggestions? Okay. Then I'm going to say again thank you. We are on behalf of the commissioner, chancellor, State Board of Education, DOE, everybody, the entire state of Florida, literally the entire state of Florida, thank you. You do amazing work, you're a remarkable group of people, and what you're doing for our state, for our kids, for education system, and for our teachers, everybody in the system, it's historic. It just is. Not to sound too hokey or anything, but I really believe that and I hope you all understand just how important it really is and just how grateful we are that each of you is here and dedicating this time to it.

I also want to thank everybody who watched today on the web and was present in the room. I know not everybody can make the commitment that you're making to the time, but it's very, very important that everybody see just how deliberative and thoughtful and careful and outspoken in everything that you are. I wish there was a great way to capture that whole 3 minute segment that we could mail to everybody and they could see it because you deserve a lot of credit for that, and that is an incredibly important part of this whole process that we're going through as a state that everybody see just what this process is like. So I commend you from the bottom of my heart and from my brain, both parts of me really appreciate what you've done. Other than saying that it's actually Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home.

MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms.

* * * * *

(Whereupon, this concludes the meeting.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>197.9, 197.11, 198.5, 204.10, 242.12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>206.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>206.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>205.6, 215.5, 232.6, 233.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>210.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>203.13, 232.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>205.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>206.25, 221.19, 221.22, 221.24, 222.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>242.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>215.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>228.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>235.25, 236.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>197.9, 197.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2013</td>
<td>242.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>189.12, 214.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>199.11, 222.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>203.23, 225.19, 225.21, 225.22, 226.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>215.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>242.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>237.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>205.8, 222.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>205.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>197.9, 197.11, 240.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>215.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>196.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>210.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>197.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>211.10, 212.12, 234.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>198.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43:30</td>
<td>238.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>210.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>197.11, 217.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>234.9, 237.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>221.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>196.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>222.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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