

**COLORADO ACCOUNTABILITY, ACCREDITATION, STUDENT PERFORMANCE
AND RESOURCE INEQUITY TASK FORCE**
(created by H.B. 23-1241)

Meeting Summary | August 15, 2024

Published Agenda

10:00-10:05 AM	Welcome and Overview
10:05-10:20 AM	Whole Group Pulse Check on Full Draft
10:20-12:05 PM	Whole Group Feedback on Draft Recommendations
12:05-12:20 PM	Transition to Working Lunch
12:20-2:10 PM	Small Group Work Time on Framework Recommendations
2:10-3:25 PM	Small Group Work Time on Other Recommendations
3:25-3:55 PM	Whole Group Synthesis
3:55-4:00 PM	Closing

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.

In Attendance

Task Force Members:

NAME	REPRESENTING	VENUE
Dr. Wendy Birhanzel (chair)	<i>Superintendent</i>	In-Person
Hon. Rebecca McClellan (vice chair)	<i>State Board of Education</i>	In-Person
Tomi Amos	<i>Charter Network Leader</i>	Absent
Dr. Rob Anderson	<i>Superintendent (Urban)</i>	In-Person
Amie Baca-Oehlert	<i>Statewide Teachers Organization</i>	In-Person
Pamela Bisceglia	<i>Statewide Organization Specializing in Equity and Inclusion</i>	In-Person
Dr. Brenda Dickhoner	<i>Charter School Institute (Governing Board Member)</i>	In-Person
Kathleen Durán	<i>Expert in English Language Acquisition and Bilingual Ed</i>	In-Person
Lindsey Gish	<i>Teacher (Middle School)</i>	In-Person
Alison Griffin	<i>Workforce Development and Education Organization</i>	Absent
Don Haddad, Ed.D.	<i>Superintendent</i>	In-Person

Dr. Rhonda Haniford	<i>Colorado Department of Education</i>	In-Person
Tammi Hiler	<i>Governor’s Office Representative</i>	In-Person
Ted Johnson	<i>District Administrator (Rural Accountability)</i>	In-Person
Erin Kane	<i>Superintendent</i>	In-Person
Dr. Anne Keke	<i>Local School Board Member</i>	Virtual
Ryan Marks	<i>District Administrator (Accountability)</i>	In-Person
Nicholas Martinez	<i>Statewide Parents/Families Organization</i>	In-Person
Tony May	<i>Local School Board Member (Rural)</i>	In-Person
Dr. Robert Mitchell	<i>Teacher (Rural)</i>	Absent
James Parr	<i>District Administrator (Rural Accountability)</i>	Virtual
Catie Santos de la Rosa	<i>Teacher (Elementary)</i>	In-Person
Mark Sass	<i>Statewide Teachers Organization</i>	In-Person
Dan Schaller	<i>Charter School Organization</i>	Absent
Jen Walmer	<i>Statewide Education Policy Organization</i>	In-Person
Lisa Yates	<i>Superintendent (Rural Participant in Local Accountability System Grant)</i>	In-Person

CDE Staff: Lisa Medler, April Thompson, and Lisa Steffen

Facilitators: Sheila Briggs, Adam Brumer, and Kelly Jasiura

Summary

Welcome and Overview

The chair and vice chair welcomed the task force and gave a high-level preview of the meeting. The chairs shared that most of the day would be focused on sharing and incorporating task force feedback on the recommendations to reach full consensus on them. The chairs emphasized that everyone must share their feedback on the recommendations during this meeting for the task force to stay on track to meet the final report deadline of November 15. They also noted that after today’s meeting, the task force and facilitators would continue to refine the report for clarity and cohesion.

The chairs then reviewed the objectives for the meeting, which included:

- Share all feedback on the full draft report
- Begin to revise the draft report and identify additional work needed between now and September
- Understand the timeline and each person’s role for creating the next draft

The chairs then briefly went over the agenda and reviewed the Task Force’s norms, charge, and participation etiquette. They also reminded the Task Force to submit their stakeholder consultation notes to the facilitators so these stakeholder engagement efforts can be referenced in the final report.

Whole Group Pulse Check on Full Draft

Before diving into the day's work, the Task Force was invited to briefly share their major takeaways on the report after reviewing the full draft. Using the online tool Mentimeter, Task Force members were asked to share three words to describe the report. Words like "thoughtful," "comprehensive," and "long" were most frequently shared, but Task Force members also added words such as "complicated," "transparent," and "unfinished."

Members were then asked to respond to a multiple-choice question that asked them to complete the following prompt: "Having read the report in its entirety, I'm feeling like..." The choices included:

- Choice 1: I can live with everything in here; let's move forward with editing for clarity and voice
- Choice 2: I can live with all the recommendations, but there is some substantive language I feel strongly about modifying
- Choice 3: There are recommendations in the report I cannot live with if they are not changed

Half the group selected choice 3, with the other half selecting choice 1 or 2. Some members noted, though, that while they selected choice 3, there are only a few recommendations they "cannot live with."

Whole Group Feedback on Draft Recommendations

Next, the Task Force engaged in an activity to get more specific feedback on individual recommendations to better prioritize the work still to be done. On the walls of the meeting room, the facilitators hung pieces of chart paper that each included one of the 68 recommendations currently in the draft report. Task Force members were asked, for each recommendation, to add either a green, yellow, or red sticker to each recommendation to visually represent their level of agreement with the recommendation. A green sticker means the Task Force member supports the recommendation; a yellow sticker means the member can live with the recommendation, but they request important revisions; and a red sticker means there is something in the recommendation the task force member cannot live with. Members were also asked to add what information they would like considered or what they cannot live with if they left a yellow or red sticker. They were also invited, but not required, to add comments if they left a green sticker. Task Force members attending virtually participated in an online version of this activity.

This exercise provided a visual summary of the Task Force's consensus building to help members understand what to prioritize to strengthen this report's recommendations and work toward consensus. The facilitators noted that the feedback left in the comments of the [draft report](#) do not indicate how strongly members feel about that feedback. The facilitators added that this activity would provide study groups with greater insight into what they needed to change in their recommendations to gain full task force consensus. They also noted that study groups should take care of how to incorporate feedback from those who added a red sticker so as not to change the vote of those who added a green or yellow sticker. To effectively incorporate feedback from those who added red stickers without changing the agreement of those who left green or yellow stickers, as a full group, the Task Force reviewed all the feedback on the red stickers, polling whose agreements would change if that feedback was incorporated.

Lastly, the facilitators also noted that this exercise was not meant to be a voting activity, and that Task Force members would continue to be able to refine their recommendations ahead of the September meeting. For those Task Force members unable to join the day's meeting, their feedback was collected through the comments shared in the draft report.

Small Group Work Time on Framework Recommendations

Over a working lunch, task force members met in their framework study groups to incorporate task force feedback on their recommendations. As a reminder, the five study groups focused on the accountability system's frameworks are:

- Impact of n-size and participation rates on SPF ratings
- Recognition of trends between groups of students
- Assessments used for accountability ratings
- Measures sufficient for high school
- Measures sufficient for early grades

Task Force members were first instructed to remove from the wall any recommendations that had only green stickers, and thus approval, from the full task force. Facilitators noted that the study groups should spend most of their time resolving yellow or red stickers while avoiding making changes to their recommendations that would change members' green stickers. Task Force members were encouraged to invite colleagues over to their study groups to better understand their concerns and needs, and to bring together members with opposing comments to discuss possible compromises.

When this process was completed, the facilitators asked task force members to record in the [recommendations overview document](#) any changes made to their recommendations or note any additional recommendations that were proposed.

Once they finished incorporating feedback, the facilitators instructed task force members to use a peer review tool to improve the writing of their section.

Small Group Work Time on Other Recommendations

The task force completed the same process described above in their second round of study groups. The other elements under consideration by the task force include:

- Improvement planning
- Supports and interventions
- Awards
- Public reporting and engagement
- Accreditation
- Participation/Opt Out

The facilitators decided to hold off on discussing the accreditation recommendations with the full Task Force until the September meeting because these recommendations are dependent on others made throughout the report.

Whole Group Synthesis

After the study group work, the full task force came back together to discuss the major changes that were made across the recommendations during the day's meeting. The facilitators also used this time to gather any final proposed recommendations from task force members that will need to be discussed in future meetings. Task force members indicated they want to discuss the following topics to generate potential recommendations at the next meeting:

- Weighting of growth and achievement in performance frameworks
- How districts are held accountable for AEC students
- Allowing a GED to be counted toward graduation if certain criteria are in place
- How to include federal accountability in a dashboard model

The facilitators then asked task force members to finalize their updated recommendations by August 25 so the facilitators could create an updated draft of the report for the task force to review ahead of the September 16 meeting. The task force agreed that they are comfortable with the facilitators not only integrating new recommendations and comments in the second draft, but also refining the report for wording and clarity and combining sections where there is significant overlap between study group recommendations.

Closing

The chairs closed out the meeting and thanked the Task Force for their hard work and the CDE and the Aurora PLCC staff for their technical and logistical support. The facilitators then reviewed the next steps.

Summary of next steps

- **August 25:** Task Force members finalize updates to recommendations
- **September 6:** Facilitators develop second draft of final report with a focus on incorporating edits and comments and revising report content for cohesion and clarity
- **September 7-15:** Task Force reviews second draft of final report ahead of September 16 meeting
- Task Force members complete the post-meeting survey
- Task Force members engage in study group meetings, in accordance with open records and meetings laws, as needed
- Task Force members continue to conduct stakeholder consultations, as needed

The next meeting will take place on September 16 at the Aurora PLCC.

The meeting was adjourned.

Meeting summary prepared by Education First