

October 18 Tracker

Gold Level Recommendation Issues

Issue	Resolution—turn green when consensus, turn yellow if on hold or if someone will be writing suggestions. Write assignments, dot points, and resolution in the cell.
Performance Frameworks #3 10 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pam and Rhonda write a few dot points flagging the implications of this recommendation, i.e. there will be two different ways of reporting out on students with disabilities outcomes ● Also note comment from Wendy: “If we flag implications - we need to also include that we currently do this for CLDE students - that equity piece is important hat different subgroups are treated differently” (this is currently in findings, not recommendations section) <p><i>Dot points to add to report:</i></p> <p>Counting SWDs for Two Years Post Exiting IEP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) includes statutory language that allows counting Multilingual Learners in the ML group for two years after gaining language proficiency (exited FEP). The task force is concerned that the The statute does not afford the same flexibility to students with disabilities who have exited as it does for Multilingual Learners. Students with disabilities who have exited an IEP must be removed from the students with disabilities group for ESSA identification purposes and reporting to the U.S. Department of Education and the public. However, the Task Force values and finds it important to count students with disabilities up to two years after exiting an IEP, as this is in alignment to the way ML students are counted and reported. ● Unfortunately, the current Colorado ESSA State Plan, approved by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), does not count exited students with disabilities. If we were to propose that change, the ED would not approve it. ● If we do not The state must implement our ESSA State Plan as approved, for example if we were to count students who have exited their IEPs for ESSA identification purposes, it would jeopardize the State’s ESSA funding (~\$240 million per year). Nevertheless there is nothing that prevents the state from providing numbers that satisfy the US Department of Education, but also provides a count of students with disabilities up to two years of exiting an IEP. Such reporting should not compromise ESSA funding. ●

<p>Performance Frameworks #8 20 min</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Eliminate this as a recommendation ● Create a new dot point on Pam’s issue and place in “further study”: we will focus on including students with disabilities (Pam’s idea) ● Focus on not including “shoulds” or other value statements ● Ed First to provide outline for Pam to fill out with content/examples <p>Area for Further Study: <i>Potential outline:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue – Students with disabilities working toward extended evidence outcomes and receiving a certificate of completion as graduates - Stakeholder perspectives – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research and data tells us many special education students take more than 4 years to graduate; however, our current system expects them to graduate in 4 years. This is a mixed message for this population. - We want to ensure that these students’ success is still monitored but also align with what research tells us - Questions to consider – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will students with disabilities working towards extended evidence outcomes and receiving a certificate of completion be included in the graduation count - How should special education students that take more than 4 years count into graduation? - How should special education students that are deemed completers be counted for graduation rates?
<p>Assessments #12 20 min</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We will use option 2 listed in report document: “clarify what schools can and cannot do regarding encouraging and discouraging participation in the state assessment.” ● Will add clarification language that schools can incentivize and celebrate ● Keep language around following up with schools disincentivizing.
<p>Assessments #13 10 min</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Change language to “clarify” which students count for participation; amend language to focus on transparency about who counts for participation ● Remove from assessment recs and move to public reporting
<p>Continuous Improvement #22 20 min</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Separate into 2 recommendations: (1) what must be brought to the board and (2) corrective action to bring to CDE ● Approval on Year 4 and 5 ● Wendy: write dot points: Include additional language explaining ISD: Low Participation (this is where there is not consensus) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are you doing to education and encourage test participation. And explaining the implications ○ What are you doing to ensure staff are not discouraging participation ○ How are you working with organized external opt out campaigns.

Accreditation #30 10 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete the delaying of frameworks.
Accreditation #31 10 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haven't had time to recommend new names — but designations are confusing; it's important to emphasize Rebecca, Tammi, and Nicholas' point: "the current labels are not intuitive or helpful for parents to advocate for their students" – and move to public reporting? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From Brenda: "Revise summative rating labels to improve differentiation and understandability. Colorados ratings are not intuitively understandable and could be updated to help leaders, educators, parents and other stakeholders comprehend the overall data. " • Especially since the audit called out the lack of transparency for parents. (Mark) • Interest in greater differentiation between levels – 70% of schools are performance (Ryan) <p>BUILD FROM HERE: Revise summative rating labels to improve differentiation and understandability. Colorados ratings are not intuitively understandable nor do they provide sufficient levels of differentiation, especially at the upper end of the performance spectrum. They and she should be updated to help leaders, educators, parents and other stakeholders comprehend the overall data.</p> <p>Change to a recommendation and put it in frameworks or public reporting. Make it direct, with a caution to include experts and stakeholders to determine the ratings.</p>

Intent of Recommendation Issues

Issue	Resolution—turn green when consensus, turn yellow if on hold or if someone will be writing suggestions. Write assignments, dot points, and resolution in the cell.
Rec #6 Create "Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness before Graduation" sub-indicator to PWR 15 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a few people craft dot points around who needs to offer approval for what a quality program is and criteria for approval • 1215 language: Include in a subindicator learner attainment outcomes that are connected to a defined PWR pathway: • Earn a quality, in-demand industry credential or postsecondary certificate (as defined by the Quality and In-demand Non-degree Credentials Framework), • Accumulate college credit that is attached to a defined PWR pathway, and • Gain relevant work-based learning

		<p>and/or on-the-job experience (as described in the “Learning Through Work” and “Learning At Work” sections of the Colorado Work-based Learning Continuum):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Brenda – made suggestions in the document. Sorry. Removed them from the doc and put here: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concurrent enrollment and CTE courses aligned with GT pathways ○ Advanced Placement (AP) ○ International Baccalaureate (IB) ○ State-approved work-based learning experiences ○ Industry-recognized credentials and postsecondary certificates (as defined by the Quality and In-demand Non-degree Credentials Framework) ○ Early college programs resulting in college credential or degree ○ Earning the Seal of Biliteracy ● Brenda, Tammi, Lisa, Ryan, and Kathy should get together on the language for elevating quality options, including but not limited to xyz; providing guidance to TAP on what they’re looking for on one vs. multiple opportunities students are counted for; modify some of the intent to shift more to blurred lines approach re: credit earned before high school and matriculation ● Include bullet at end of SECOND bulleted list (p26): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ State should consider how to incorporate existing diploma endorsements (PWR, Seal of Biliteracy, STEM) and establish processes for regular updates to the endorsements. ● In making that change, also strike “earning seal of biliteracy” from the FIRST bulleted list
<p>Rec #7 Rename the PWR matriculation rate indicator and thus expand it to be more inclusive of high-quality postsecondary options 15 min</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Include a bullet in the reporting/dashboard section that articulates that we will disaggregate matriculation data by school and/or district.
<p>Rec #2 Combine student groups for ratings while disaggregating student groups for state reporting. 10 min</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strike references to combined subgroup for PWR
<p>Rec #9 Re-evaluate weighting of frameworks to see if there should be an even greater emphasis on</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Group is good with adopting the language for the recommendation on slide 52, but taking out the information on the correlations (this is included already on p. 18-19 of the report)

growth 15 min		
Rec #1 Lower student count thresholds for accountability calculations and reporting 5 min		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential solution from Ryan: While individual schools and districts can see their student performance data and may have different criteria for determining if and when changes should be made to improve student outcomes, this study should also explore how the lowered thresholds might impact interpreting the data and the school and district continuous improvement efforts.
Assessment Recommendations for Further Study: Consider eliminating the elementary and middle school social studies assessment 10 min.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will eliminate dot point on removing social studies assessment
Recommendation #15: Improve the timeliness of assessment results 5 min		<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Rec #21 final dot point clarifying language around this creative funding options idea. 5 min		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the dot point; keep it in the preamble information
Rec #25 change 3-6 months 10 min		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewrite to include requirements and refer convening with peers around turnaround to learn and share best practices