

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

Meeting Summary | October 17, 2023

**Published Agenda**

10:00 -10:30 AM	Welcome
10:30 - 10:45 AM	Review Norms
10:45 - 12:00 PM	Discussion & Activity
12:00 - 1:00 PM	Lunch & Small Group Activity
1:00 - 1:30 PM	Align on Our Legislative Charge
1:00 - 1:30 PM	Review Roadmap
2:00 - 2:15 PM	Break
2:15 - 3:45 PM	CDE Accountability Follow-Up Presentation
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
<b>Dr. Wendy Birhanzel (chair)</b>	<i>Superintendent</i>	In-person
<b>Rebecca McClellan (vice chair)</b>	<i>State Board of Education</i>	In-person
<b>Tomi Amos</b>	<i>Charter Network Leader</i>	Virtual
<b>Dr. Rob Anderson</b>	<i>Superintendent (Urban)</i>	In-person
<b>Amie Baca-Oehlert</b>	<i>Statewide Teachers Organization</i>	Absent
<b>Pam Bisceglia</b>	<i>Statewide Organization Specializing in Equity and Inclusion</i>	In-Person
<b>Dr. Brenda Dickhoner</b>	<i>Charter School Institute (Governing Board Member)</i>	In-Person
<b>Kathleen Duran</b>	<i>Expert in English Language Acquisition and Bilingual Ed</i>	In-Person
<b>Lindsey Gish</b>	<i>Teacher (Middle School)</i>	In-Person

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

**Facilitators:** Dr. Wendy Birhanzel and Ms. Rebecca McClellan

**Welcome**

The Task Force chair and vice chair welcomed participants. They thanked members for feedback offered during previous meetings and noted their continued feedback would be used to inform meeting agendas and discussions moving forward.

The chair and vice chair invited members to ask any clarifying questions from the last meeting. Some Task Force members asked for more information about the new measures and cut scores for the 2024 state accountability frameworks, as recommended by CDE’s Technical Advisory Panel and on the docket for State Board of Education action at its November meeting. Concerns were expressed about the impact of making this decision on the Task Force’s deliberations and ultimate recommendations. Some Task Force members voiced interest in drafting a statement for the State Board of Education’s consideration that would request a delay in acting on any new measures until the Task Force has accomplished its objectives and work.

Next, the chair and vice chair reviewed the meeting objectives. In this meeting, Task Force members will:

- Review group norms to guide the Task Force’s deliberations moving forward
- Build connections among each other in relation to the Task Force’s work
- Realign on the legislative charge of the Task Force

- Review and discuss a draft roadmap of upcoming meeting topics aligned to the legislative charge that includes the completion of the interim and final reports
- Discuss the Task Force's follow up questions to CDE on the current accountability system

### **Review & Re-adopt Group Norms**

The chair and vice chair reviewed Task Force norms:

- 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.

Members did not have any edits or additions to the list of norms.

### **Building Connections and Understanding the Expertise of Task Force Members**

To help the group better understand the expertise and perspective of fellow Task Force members, participants were asked to share their answers to the following questions with the full group:

- Why were you identified for this Task Force?
- What is your connection to the accountability system?
- What do we, as a Task Force, need to make the decisions for our state and our students?

Attendees were encouraged to write down at least one question or comment for each fellow Task Force member based on the prompts above.

### **Lunch & Small Group Activity**

Following the full group conversation, Task Force members engaged in small groups to gain an even better understanding of fellow members' expertise and perspectives on the accountability and accreditation system.

### **Legislative Charge**

The chair and vice chair re-reviewed with the Task Force the four "shall's" stated in H.B. 1241 that the Task Force must, at a minimum, consider. The four considerations include:

- Academic opportunities or inequities that may impact achievement gaps;
- Improvements to the accountability and accreditation system to expand and incentivize academic opportunities and address inequities;
- Promising practices in school and districts; and
- Recommendations for legislation and/or rules as necessary.

The statute also stipulates the Task Force shall consult with parent organizations, student organizations, and additional stakeholders as needed to address questions necessary to finalize its findings and recommendations.

The chair and vice chair emphasized the importance of including these “shalls” in the final report produced by the Task Force. They also clarified to the Task Force the final report may recommend legislation, rule changes or both.

The chair and vice chair identified tools available to the Task Force to fulfill its legislative charge. The Task Force may review:

- Results of the statewide education accountability systems audit;
- Local accountability systems;
- Results of the local accountability system grant program;
- Annual report and evaluation from the high school innovative learning pilot program;
- Results of the school transformation grant program;
- Interim and final reports from the secondary, postsecondary, and work-based learning integration Task Force;
- Promising practices from other states as identified by task force members; and
- Leading indicators or instructional practices that could be added to the accountability measures.

The chair and vice chair reminded the group of the legislation’s March 1, 2024, due date for the interim report and the November 15, 2024, due date for the final report. The chair and vice chair then led the Task Force in a discussion of possible high-level components of each report and invited group discussion. They also noted recommendations in the final report do not have to mirror the preliminary recommendations in the interim report.

The interim report, scheduled for delivery to the legislature in March during the legislative session, will not permit the implementation of preliminary recommendations. Therefore, according to the chair and vice chair, the November report presents a strategic opportunity for offering final recommendations. The chair and vice chair proposed using the same report format as the [Secondary, Postsecondary and Work-Based Learning Integration Task Force](#) (created by H.B. 22-1215), which is completing its work this fall, as a template for the H.B. 1241 Task Force’s report.

### **Roadmap for Task Force Research and Deliberations**

The chair and vice chair introduced a roadmap of activities to accomplish the Task Force’s charge.

#### *Roadmap Phase I*

From November to January, Phase I will assist the Task Force in shaping the interim report and prioritizing key objectives. At meetings during Phase I, the focus will be these three charges from the authorizing legislation: Identifying academic opportunities and addressing disparities affecting academic achievement gaps; Enhancing the accountability and accreditation system to promote academic opportunities and address disparities; and

highlighting promising practices within Colorado and other states. External stakeholders may also be invited to offer additional perspectives.

### *Roadmap Phase II*

Starting in February 2024, Phase II will focus on the development of the Task Force's final recommendations. The chair and vice chair explained meetings in Phase II will center on "how" the taskforce can improve on the "what's" identified as priorities in Phase I; "how" the taskforce will accomplish the "what's" identified as priorities in Phase I; "how" promising practices will be incorporated in final recommendations; and "how" rules or legislation need to change to accomplish the Task Force's goals. As in Phase I, external stakeholders may be invited to provide additional perspectives.

The chair and vice chair invited any immediate feedback from members on the proposed roadmap, and then they invited Task Force members to offer additional feedback on the roadmap in a post-meeting survey. The final roadmap will be refined and adapted during the Task Force's next meeting on November 3. The chair and vice chair noted meeting agendas aligned with the roadmap will be developed on a rolling basis using Task Force feedback from surveys administered between meetings.

### **CDE Accountability Follow up Presentation**

Lisa Medler and Marie Huchton presentation – tour guides for walking through the accountability system

Small group discussions about the [Question and Answer from Accountability Presentation on September 26, 2023](#). The task force was divided into five small groups and did a jigsaw activity on the Q&A. Small Groups summarized their learnings:

- Small N Size - Group
  - Study from CU-Boulder investigating n-size issues is referenced. It documents there is more variability for smaller systems. A small number of students can impact swings in ratings at either end.
  - State has addressed small n-counts by using 3-year frameworks and adding Insufficient State Data ratings.
  - More ISD assignments in 2022 and 2023 due to data limitations from the pandemic - big impact on smaller systems. Expecting further reduction in 2024 with three years of data.
  - Remaining questions: Are these policies enough? Or is there more that can be done to address variability in small systems? What are diff N size requirements for Framework components? What if there is not enough data to report growth? Can disaggregated groups be combined?
- Federal Requirements - Group
  - State and federal identification processes are different with some overlap. The supports system (e.g., grants, improvement planning), however, are available to all identified sites so that they can access what they need no matter how they were identified.

- The federal identification system does have some key differences from the state system. In particular, there is the Targeted Support which identifies schools based upon outcomes for different groups of students, like students with disabilities, high poverty, and multilingual learners.
- A detailed table describing the minimum federal accountability requirements and a description of CO's state plan is included.
- Accountability Clock - Group
  - CDE provided some new analysis to address questions on the amount of "bounce" for sites and then on the correlation of sites on the accountability clock with student demographics.
  - Most schools (70.8%) have never been on the clock. The data request provides more breakdown on sites that were on clock for a minute, bounced on and off, and/or remained on the clock. It may be worth digging more into the outliers or have beat the odds.
  - The scatterplots on the relationship between the clock and student demographics have some good takeaways.
    - Multilingual Learners: No discernable relationship. Schools with MLs are spread across all plan types.
    - Poverty: Weak to moderate correlation. Higher poverty does not mean the school will be on the clock. Relationship to further on the clock, though.
    - Minority: Weak correlation
    - IEP: No discernable relationship. Questions on ability to disaggregate IEP by disability types. Concern about small n-counts.
- Data - Group
  - This discussion covered growth gaps, On-Track Growth, impact of student mobility and K-2 data.
  - A history of inclusion of growth gaps in the frameworks and ultimately for its discontinuation is described (e.g., not enough meaningful differentiation). Disaggregated data was moved to other existing performance indicators.
  - A brief description of the proposed new On Track Growth performance indicator is included. CDE provided a more in depth walkthrough of the measure in the presentation. The state board is voting at their November meeting on whether to include it in the 2024 frameworks (along with the new higher bar measures). Some task force members expressed interest in delaying inclusion given the task force's charge. Some members shared that they needed more information first.
  - Students must be continuously enrolled between October count and the state assessment window to be included in the frameworks. There does appear to be a relationship between highly mobile populations and lower accountability ratings.
  - CDE does not administer or oversee K-2 assessments, including for the READ Act. TAP has discussed the potential for using K-2 literacy data in state accountability, but there are concerns about using these data for accountability v. for formative reasons.

- School Awards - Group
  - There are a number of existing awards. There appears to be a good distribution of awards that rely on achievement and that use growth. Questions on how to use the awards and then put into practice or to learn from. Concerns that there may be n-count issues that prevent some schools from being recognized. There may be other entities that awards could incentivize promising practices (e.g., districts, local school boards)
  - All awards, eligibility criteria and recipients are available on the CDE website.
  - There are a list of links that provide case studies and promising practices.

CDE provided a deeper dive presentation into the growth model and on the proposed new approach to On-Track Growth. Big concepts included the purpose of growth, academic growth, 50th percentile, calculating Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) and Median Growth Percentiles (MGPs) for schools and districts. A big takeaway was that growth data needs to be considered along side achievement data. On-Track Growth will help us understand if students that are not meeting state expectations are at least on track to meet expectations - or continue to meet expectations if they are already in the “meets” category. During the presentation, meeting attendees were broken into small groups to discuss with each other the process and basics of the growth model to check their understanding. They were also asked to write down any remaining questions on a sticky note. The CDE will aim to answer these questions in future meetings.

The CDE also asked meeting attendees to provide input on what additional deep dives or analyses would be helpful to provide to the Task Force in future meetings, in order to support its work moving forward.

### **Closing Remarks and Next Steps**

The chair and vice chair thanked members for their participation, and they thanked the CDE staff for their work to answer the Task Force’s questions about Colorado’s accountability system.

#### *Summary of next steps*

- By October 24: Task Force members should complete the post-meeting survey—a tool for capturing members’ feedback for Meeting #3 and a means for offering suggestions for future meetings
- New Education First facilitators will schedule one-on-one meetings with all Task Force members
- Task Force members will complete a meeting poll to establish meeting cadences through Summer 2024 4

**The next meeting will take place on November 3, 2023.**

**The meeting was adjourned.**

\*\*\*\*\*

***Meeting summary prepared by CDE and Education First***