

YOU ARE REVIEWING A WORKING DOCUMENT THAT WILL NOT BE FINALIZED UNTIL LATER THIS YEAR. THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS DOCUMENT HAVE NOT YET BEEN AGREED UPON. THE FINAL VERSION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DUE BY NOVEMBER 15, 2024, AND WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A FULL REPORT.. TASK FORCE MEMBERS DEVELOPED THESE DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS IN SMALL GROUPS OVER MULTIPLE MONTHS OF DATA REVIEW, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT, AND STATEWIDE PUBLIC COMMENT. THE TASK FORCE IS SEEING THIS SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIRST TIME ON JULY 29. [CLICK HERE IF YOU WANT TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE TASK FORCE.](#)

Tip: Click on the Recommendation #s to go directly to the full recommendation in the main document.

#	1241 Task Force Draft Recommendations (on July 29, 2024, there were 68 recommendations)
<u>Impact of N-Size on Performance Frameworks</u>	
<u>1</u>	Create a "super subgroup" by grouping together smaller subgroups of students to ensure they meet the n-size threshold for reporting academic growth and achievement.
<u>2</u>	Explore how the state could equalize the weight of each individual student such that the accountability system reduces the oversized impact individual students have on small systems.
<u>3</u>	Explore how the state could compare schools with similar characteristics and calculate a median growth percentile, similar to how individual student comparisons are made.
<u>4</u>	Leverage the request for reconsideration process for accountability ratings proactively, allowing small schools and districts to address potential issues before preliminary scores are finalized.
<u>5</u>	Explore combining data from two or more small schools that have an ISD rating.
<u>6</u>	CDE should study the possibility of an entirely alternative accountability process specifically tailored for small and rural districts that accounts for local factors and trend data, ensuring ratings are assigned with context while minimizing the burden on rural areas.
<u>Recognition of Trends Between Similar Groups of Students</u>	
<u>1</u>	The accountability system should adopt a combined subgroup approach for achievement and growth scores when determining school and district ratings.
<u>2</u>	Designation of a student with a disability under the performance frameworks should include the combined count of students identified under IDEA and students having an academic impairment under Section 504.
<u>3</u>	The Colorado Department of Education should implement business rules following framework scoring to ensure a district is only awarded the designation of distinction if they meet the below criteria.
<u>Assessments</u>	
<u>1</u>	Continue to use a standards based state assessment.
<u>2</u>	Maintain a singular state accountability system.
<u>3</u>	Make the CMAS assessment adaptive as permissible under the current ESSA requirements (for example, cover only content assessed in the students current grade-level) to decrease testing time similar to the current PSAT/SAT assessment.

YOU ARE REVIEWING A WORKING DOCUMENT THAT WILL NOT BE FINALIZED UNTIL LATER THIS YEAR. THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS DOCUMENT HAVE NOT YET BEEN AGREED UPON. THE FINAL VERSION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DUE BY NOVEMBER 15, 2024, AND WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A FULL REPORT..

TASK FORCE MEMBERS DEVELOPED THESE DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS IN SMALL GROUPS OVER MULTIPLE MONTHS OF DATA REVIEW, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT, AND STATEWIDE PUBLIC COMMENT. THE TASK FORCE IS SEEING THIS SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIRST TIME ON JULY 29.

CLICK [HERE](#) IF YOU WANT TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE TASK FORCE.

4	Eliminate the paper-based testing option for the CMAS assessment (like the current PSAT/SAT assessment) to facilitate the use of computer-adaptive testing, reduce the number of misadministration, and decrease the time required to produce assessment results.
5	Consider a comparable translation of math, science, and social studies assessments into additional languages besides English.
6	Expand the Colorado Spanish Language Arts (CSLA) assessment beyond grades 3 and 4.
7	Continue to review and design culturally and linguistically responsive assessment content and questions to reduce potential bias.
8	Consider more time flexibility on assessments so that all students receive the time they need to demonstrate their learning.
9	Continue to reflect on and adapt the state assessment to newer technologies. Specifically, consider how technology, such as artificial intelligence, may/should impact state assessments (including scoring constructed responses).
10	Expand the opportunities for schools and districts to promote the benefits of participation on the state assessment with students, families, staff, and communities.
11	Reward schools and districts that have total participation rates above 95 percent on the state assessments.
12	Continue to provide administrative considerations and accessibility feature accommodations that are allowable to all learners.
13	Consider dividing the assessments into sections to more specifically evaluate the desired skills.
14	Only include state assessment data in the academic achievement and academic growth indicator on the framework.
15	Consider modifications to the state’s approach to non-federally required assessments.

Measures for High School

1	Remove SAT Reading/Writing and Math from the PWR Indicator.
2	Maintain graduation rate in the PWR indicator, but increase transparency on what the graduation guidelines are for districts and schools.
3	Add “College Before Graduation” as a PWR sub-indicator in the accountability frameworks.
4	Keep “dropout rate” as a PWR sub-indicator, but reduce the number of points allocated for a low “dropout rate,” further incentivizing and giving credit for “graduation rate” within the PWR indicator.
5	To better reflect the suite of postsecondary options available to students beyond high school, rename “matriculation rate” to “pathways progression” and keep it as a PWR sub-indicator.

YOU ARE REVIEWING A WORKING DOCUMENT THAT WILL NOT BE FINALIZED UNTIL LATER THIS YEAR. THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS DOCUMENT HAVE NOT YET BEEN AGREED UPON. THE FINAL VERSION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DUE BY NOVEMBER 15, 2024, AND WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A FULL REPORT..
TASK FORCE MEMBERS DEVELOPED THESE DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS IN SMALL GROUPS OVER MULTIPLE MONTHS OF DATA REVIEW, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT, AND STATEWIDE PUBLIC COMMENT. THE TASK FORCE IS SEEING THIS SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIRST TIME ON JULY 29.
CLICK [HERE](#) IF YOU WANT TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE TASK FORCE.

6	The legislature should consider amending statute to allow for the addition of a district PWR option.
7	Continue to support and develop career-exploration and entrepreneurship learning opportunities for students at both the elementary and middle school levels through ongoing resource development with the collaboration of CDE and potential future financial contributions from the state.
8	The Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Governance Board, housed in the Office of Information Technology, should support the development and implementation of a SLDS in Colorado and ensure it highlights outcomes of current PWR programs being used in Colorado.

Measures for Early Grades

1	Given the challenges discussed above with adding additional measures focused on K-2 to Colorado’s accountability system, the task force does not recommend additional state measures for the early grades as a solution to the current inequities and opportunities for students.
2	The task force recommends using local K-2 measures as an addendum to state measures or through a dashboard of student information.

Public Reporting and Engagement

1	Focus on one statewide dashboard.
2	Determine what the statewide vision is for student success and display prominently the key indicators that map to that vision on the dashboard.
3	Run a public information campaign to launch the new dashboard.
4	Include summative ratings on the dashboard.
5	Revise summative rating labels to improve understandability.
6	The statewide dashboard should include school and district-level information and be easily searchable.
7	To the extent possible, improve the timeliness of state summative data so that the data are actionable by school leaders, educators, and parents.
8	In the statewide dashboard, considering including local indicators reported out by school districts.
9	Beyond the dashboard, enable the development of reports that are customized to a stakeholder group/type.
10	Encourage sharing of best practices from schools and districts that are having success with parent engagement around data.

Improvement Planning

1	CDE should continue to engage in a regular cycle of stakeholder input and revisions to the improvement
-------------------	--

YOU ARE REVIEWING A WORKING DOCUMENT THAT WILL NOT BE FINALIZED UNTIL LATER THIS YEAR. THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS DOCUMENT HAVE NOT YET BEEN AGREED UPON. THE FINAL VERSION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DUE BY NOVEMBER 15, 2024, AND WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A FULL REPORT..

TASK FORCE MEMBERS DEVELOPED THESE DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS IN SMALL GROUPS OVER MULTIPLE MONTHS OF DATA REVIEW, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT, AND STATEWIDE PUBLIC COMMENT. THE TASK FORCE IS SEEING THIS SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIRST TIME ON JULY 29.

CLICK [HERE](#) IF YOU WANT TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE TASK FORCE.

	planning template.
2	CDE should provide guidance to local boards on when and how to review and monitor the improvement planning process.
3	CDE should further streamline the improvement planning process to direct more resources and attention toward schools at risk of going on the accountability clock, while continuing to make the process simple and straightforward for schools and districts not on the clock.
<u>Supports and Interventions</u>	
1	State support and interventions must occur earlier in the process (Year 0 and 1).
2	State support and interventions must be bold and urgent earlier in the process (Beginning in Year 1).
3	Increase opportunities for schools and districts to learn from each other.
4	Increase state funding for bold turnaround school and district solutions.
5	State Board of Education (“SBE”) directive actions must change and expand beyond current options.
<u>Awards</u>	
1	Utilize awards to focus on what’s working in schools and districts opposed to what’s not.
2	Increase the amount of resources available to CDE or others to meaningfully research, document and disseminate the best practices that are occurring in award-winning schools and districts.
3	Streamline the number of existing awards to ensure maximum impact and focus on state priorities and values.
4	Consider expanding the criteria for what schools can be awarded for so that it is clear success is not solely synonymous with academic achievement.
5	Implement business rules for awards eligibility that mirror those recommended earlier in this report that address when a district should be eligible to receive a distinguished designation.
6	Offer additional benefits for districts and schools that do receive awards to make awards more attractive and compelling.
<u>Accreditation</u>	
1	Develop an accreditation process separate from or not exclusively determined by Performance Frameworks.
2	If accreditation remains dependent on Performance Framework plan types, implement changes to the Performance Frameworks identified as challenges in this report.
3	If accreditation remains dependent on Performance Framework plan types, rename the plan types for better

YOU ARE REVIEWING A WORKING DOCUMENT THAT WILL NOT BE FINALIZED UNTIL LATER THIS YEAR. THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS DOCUMENT HAVE NOT YET BEEN AGREED UPON. THE FINAL VERSION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DUE BY NOVEMBER 15, 2024, AND WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A FULL REPORT.. TASK FORCE MEMBERS DEVELOPED THESE DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS IN SMALL GROUPS OVER MULTIPLE MONTHS OF DATA REVIEW, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT, AND STATEWIDE PUBLIC COMMENT. THE TASK FORCE IS SEEING THIS SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIRST TIME ON JULY 29. CLICK [HERE](#) IF YOU WANT TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE TASK FORCE.

	stakeholder understanding.
4	Consider replacing the Request to Reconsider process with a more traditional accreditation process.
5	Expand Accreditation assurances and factor these into the Performance Framework Rating.
6	Eliminate the condition of an Alternative Education Campus (AEC) school rating being removed from district performance.
Participation and Opt Out	
1	Schools with less than 85 percent of the students participating in assessments should not be eligible for awards
2	Revise the prohibition on encouraging and discouraging opt- outs.
3	Review and update process for determining which students count for participation rates and how to better report/share information related to who is and isn't participating
4	Refer to recommendations from assessment section of this report that will help increase buy-in to and value of assessments by students, families, teachers, etc.

DRAFT