COLORADO ACCOUNTABILITY, ACCREDITATION, STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCE INEQUITY TASK FORCE

(created by H.B. 23-1241)

Meeting Summary | November 3, 2023

Published Agenda

10:00 - 10:15 AM	Welcome
10:15 - 10:30 AM	Review Norms and Objectives
10:30 - 11:00 AM	Review Progress to Date and Open Questions
11:00 - 11:30 AM	Review a Decision Making Process for Today's Work
11:30 AM - 12:00 PM	Refine and Adopt a Roadmap for Upcoming Topics
12:00 - 12:30 PM	Lunch
12:30 - 2:30 PM	Discussion: What are the academic opportunities or inequities that may impact academic achievement gaps?
2:30 - 2:45 PM	Break
2:45 - 3:45 PM	Develop Parameters for a Stakeholder Consultation Process
3:45 - 4:00 PM	Wrap Up & Next Steps

Note: Throughout the meeting, the chair and vice chair made real-time adjustments in conversation and facilitation, resulting in variations from the original agenda for some topics and time ranges.

Task Force Members in Attendance

NAME	REPRESENTING	VENUE
Dr. Wendy Birhanzel (chair)	_Superintendent_	In-person
Rebecca McClellan (vice chair)	_State Board of Education_	In-person
Tomi Amos	_Charter Network Leader_	Virtual
Dr. Rob Anderson	_Superintendent (Urban)_	Absent
Amie Baca-Oehlert	_Statewide Teachers Organization_	In-person
Pam Bisceglia	_Statewide Organization Specializing in Equity and Inclusion_	In-person

Dr. Brenda Dickhoner	*Charter School Institute (Governing Board Member)*	In-person
Kathleen Duran	*Expert in English Language Acquisition and Bilingual Ed*	In-person
Lindsey Gish	*Teacher (Middle School)*	Absent
Alison Griffin	*Workforce Development and Education Organization*	In-person
Dr. Don Haddad	*Superintendent*	Virtual
Dr. Rhonda Haniford	*Colorado Department of Education*	In-person
Tamara Hiler	*Governor's Office Representative*	In-person
Ted Johnson	*District Administrator (Rural Accountability)*	In-person
Erin Kane	*Superintendent*	Absent
Dr. Anne Keke	*Local School Board Member*	In-person
Ryan Marks	*District Administrator (Accountability)*	In-person
Nicholas Martinez	*Statewide Parents/Families Organization*	In-person
Tony May	*Local School Board Member (Rural)*	Absent
Dr. Robert Mitchell	*Teacher (Rural)*	In-person
James Parr	*District Administrator (Rural Accountability)*	Virtual
Catie Santos de la Rosa	*Teacher (Elementary)*	In-person
Mark Sass	*Statewide Teachers Organization*	In-person
Dan Schaller	*Charter School Organization*	In-person
Jen Walmer	*Statewide Education Policy Organization*	In-person
Lisa Yates	*Superintendent (Rural Participant in Local Accountability System Grant)*	In-person

Facilitators: Dr. Wendy Birhanzel and Ms. Rebecca McClellan

Guests: Sheila Briggs, Adam Brumer, Kelly Jasiura

<u>Welcome</u>

The Task Force chair and vice chair welcomed participants. They thanked members for completing the feedback survey following meeting #4 and shared that Task Force member feedback was used to inform the agenda and activities for today's meeting. They also noted that if members did not have a chance to complete the survey, they will still be able to offer input throughout the course of the day's meeting.

The chair and vice chair then introduced the new facilitators from Education First, Sheila Briggs and Adam Brumer. They noted that the facilitators would just be observing and listening during this meeting before taking on the full facilitation role in December. The new facilitators will also be reaching out to Task Force members to schedule 1:1 conversations to help them learn about the perspectives

represented on the Task Force and understand how the group can continue to build engaging conversations together.

Review Norms and Objectives

The chair and vice chair reviewed the meeting norms with the group. They are the same as previous meetings and include:

- Assume positive intent from others' thoughts and input;
- Agree to disagree;
- Maintain flexibility and allow for opinions to change;
- Share the speaking and listening space with fellow members in an equitable and respectful manner;
- Respect the candidness of others as a gift; and
- Expect non-closure.

Later in the meeting, the group chose by consensus vote to adopt a new norm that when a Task Force member is reporting out from a small group, other Task Force members should not debate their statements. These conversations can follow after all groups have had an opportunity to share out.

The chair and vice chair also shared with the group a new flip chart "parking lot" where Task Force members can capture thoughts that might not directly align with the conversation at hand. This would allow the group to revisit these topics, as appropriate, in the future.

The chair and vice chair then presented the meeting objectives, which were informed by the feedback survey that about half of the Task Force members completed:

- Review group norms and objectives to guide the Task Force's deliberations for the day
- Review progress to date and open questions
- Discuss and adopt a decision making process
- Refine and adopt the roadmap of upcoming meetings topics aligned to the legislative charge that includes the completion of the interim and final reports
- Discuss and identify the academic opportunities or inequities that may impact academic achievement gaps
- Develop parameters for a stakeholder consultation process

The chair and vice chair also noted that, in accordance with the feedback received in the survey, the meeting activities would incorporate more breakout groups and additional reflection time.

Review Progress to Date and Open Questions

Next, the chair and vice chair shared the survey feedback they received on how to improve future meetings. The feedback on the last meeting was largely positive, and Task Force members noted they appreciated (1) the clarity the roadmap brought to the Task Force's work, (2) that there was a greater

opportunity to hear more voices, and (3) CDE's work to answer members' questions on the accountability system.

Some recommendations to improve future meetings included:

- Instituting a protocol that will allow the group to check statements or claims that are questionable
- Begin by addressing issues the group can build consensus on, as a way to build trust among the group
- Identifying specific areas for adjustments and revisions to accountability system
- Ensuring facilitators read diverse experiences represented in Task Force and use road map to drive meeting facilitation
- Improving experience of online participants

The chair and vice chair also shared with the group feedback on how to make future meetings more engaging, which included:

- More opportunities to learn new information and perspectives
- Framing meetings around roadmap and focusing on Task Force end goals
- Breaking into small work teams, for example to start identifying what needs changing in accountability system
- Balancing time spent on presentations, questions, and small/full group work during meetings
- Adding more bio breaks
- Incorporating pauses for reflection
- Focusing only on 1-2 topics per meeting

They noted they are working to incorporate these suggestions into future meetings.

The chair and vice chair then introduced Lisa Medler and Marie Huchton from CDE and explained that the Review Progress to Date and Open Questions agenda item will be a standing item on meeting agendas to answer FAQs from Task Force members. Lisa and Marie added that they will collect questions from the Task Force at each meeting and provide answers in a written Q&A document. They will also present a deeper dive on certain questions at future meetings, in coordination with upcoming agenda items. Future deep dive topics will focus on promising practices, including case studies and other states' approaches to accountability and growth models, and the interaction of student demographics and their influence on accountability frameworks.

This meeting's topic focused on helping Task Force members interpret scatter plots, specifically how the accountability framework assignments are correlated with the percent of multilingual learners, poverty, students of color, and students with IEPs in a school, respectively.

CDE then asked the group to write down what additional deep dives and analyses they would like to see at future Task Force meetings. CDE representatives shared that they would prioritize requests based on the needs and direction of the Task Force.

Review a Decision Making Process for Today's Work

The chair and vice chair explained the decision making process the Task Force would engage in for today's meeting. The group will first strive for consensus (level 1), which will be used to make informal decisions or simple formal decisions through verbal agreement or thumbs up, thumbs sideways, or thumbs down vote from the Task Force. Majority vote (level 2) will be used to make formal decisions when consensus is not reached, and it will include an option for dissenting opinions.

The chair and vice chair noted that these are just the decision making processes for this meeting, and the Ed First facilitators would present other options for decision making at future meetings. They also agreed that if a Task Force member is not present at a meeting, they must accept the votes made by their colleagues, unless there is a decision made earlier to receive a vote from every task force member, regardless of their attendance. Any Task Force member can ask to raise a vote from a "level 1" consensus to a "level 2" majority vote. Moving forward, the Task Force will document what decision making processes were used during meetings and how folks voted on each item, for the public record.

Refine and Adopt a Roadmap for Upcoming Topics

The chair and vice chair then reviewed the roadmap presented at the last meeting, and proposed changes to the roadmap based on feedback received in the survey. These changes include:

- Adding "shall" statements to both roadmap phases, related to the production of the interim and final reports
- Flipping the December and January meeting topics, so that the group discusses promising practices during the December meeting

There was consensus among the group to adopt these changes to the roadmap.

Discussion: What are the academic opportunities or inequities that may impact academic achievement gaps?

Next, the Task Force engaged in a series of small and full group conversations to discuss the academic opportunities or inequities that may impact academic achievement gaps, as aligned with the "shall" considerations of the Task Force's charge.

First, the group reviewed the categories of academic opportunities and inequities proposed by the Task Force in the survey, which included:

Academic Opportunities:
- Instruction/curriculum
- Assessments
- Staffing

Inequities:
- Staffing
- School resources/funding
- Regional differences

- Access to advanced/postsecondary options
- Intervention
- School funding
- School makeup/demographics
- Tutoring/additional learning time

- Poverty
- Access to high quality instruction/curriculum
- School performance frameworks
- School size
- Staffing

The Task Force then divided into smaller groups to discuss the categories using the following questions as a guide:

- Are there any categories that are missing?
- Are there any categories that should be changed/expanded? If so, how?
- Are there any categories that are duplicative or could be collapsed? If so, how?

The Task Force then reconvened and shared out answers from their small group discussions. Many members noted that often the presence of something results in an "academic opportunity" and the absence of that same thing resulted in an "inequity." The Task Force ultimately decided that they would address this as one list—addressing both opportunities and inequities at the same time.

Each individual group shared out their consensus statements for academic opportunities and inequities. These included:

Group 1:
- District/school priorities AND provisions of resources.
- Adequate resources.
- Trained, qualified teacher and staff.
- Wraparound resources and community support and assets.
- Access to high quality, rigorous Grade Level materials.
- Leadership and Governance.
- Strong school culture & behavioral practices.
- Empowering and creating opportunities for passionate learning.

Group 2:
- Educators
  - Minimum staffing
  - Instructional practices
  - Teacher quality
  - Planning time
  - Professional development
  - Diverse workforce
  - School and district leadership
    - School board

- Instruction
  - All children can learn/high level expectations
  - Student identity as an asset
  - Adherence to state standards
  - High quality curriculum
  - Culturally relevant
  - Differentiated
  - Data driven
  - Equal access to varied learning opportunities
- Tiered Supports
  - Differentied
  - Intervention
  - Tutoring
  - Extended Learning opportunities
- Community Supports
  - MTSS
  - Wraparound services/community schools
  - Parent/family engagement
- Resources
  - Money, time, people, prioritization and flexible

Group 3:

1. Set of curriculum that may overcome inequities
2. Staffing (#, quality, experience, diversity, use)
   a. Flex to share staff
   b. Innovation
   c. Leverage support from postsecondary/business
3. Resources (Funding, staff, partnerships, high quality materials, context matters, curriculum/assessment)
   a. Academic
   b. Financial (site report as a part of framework)
   c. State policy (tuition forgiveness, housing, incentives etc)

CDE compiled these responses into one document. **As a next step,** Task Force members were asked to provide feedback on the consensus statements, particularly looking for areas of duplication and where categories could be collapsed. The chair and vice chair will then refine the list and bring it back for a group vote during the December meeting.

Develop Parameters for a Stakeholder Consultation Process

Next, the Task Force engaged in a series of discussions to determine the process and parameters for engaging external stakeholders through the Task Force's work. The legislation states that the Task Force has the opportunity to seek feedback from "parent organizations, student organizations, and additional stakeholders as needed to address questions necessary to finalize its findings and recommendations."

The following questions were presented to the Task Force for consideration:

- Parameters
    - What do we want feedback on?
    - What do we want it to accomplish?
    - How do we want to get this feedback?
- What information do you want to ask for from…?
    - Parent organizations
    - Student organizations
    - Additional organizations
    - Demographics/experiences/specific groups

The Task Force answered these questions through individual reflection, small group discussions, and ultimately a whole group share out.

As a next step, the chair and vice chair said they would use the reflections from the Task Force members to create a proposed process for engaging external stakeholders. They will bring it back to the full group for approval in December.

Wrap Up & Next Steps

Lastly, the chair and vice chair reviewed the feedback from the survey on what tools the Task Force wants to use in their deliberations. The top three tools identified by Task Force members include (1) promising practices from other states as identified by Task Force members, (2) results of statewide education accountability systems audit report, and (3) local accountability systems.

The chair and vice chair then reviewed the upcoming meetings dates and reminded the Task Force to complete the feedback survey. They also noted that Sheila and Adam from Ed First would resume facilitation of the meetings beginning in December.

Summary of next steps

- **By November 10:** Task Force members complete adding their comments to the academic opportunities and inequities statements document
- **By November 17:** Task Force members should complete the post-meeting survey
- Task Force leadership will refine the list of academic opportunities and inequities, as well as the proposed ideas to engage external stakeholders, and present to the Task Force members at the next meeting

- New Education First facilitators will schedule one-on-one meetings with interested Task Force members

The next meeting will take place on December 1, 2023.

The meeting was adjourned.

*****

Meeting summary prepared by Education First