

My affiliation with the 1241 Task Force is.	Based on your experience in the Task Force thus far, please share any additional suggestions your facilitators can apply to better support your and fellow task force members' work to achieve the Task Force's objectives. (e.g. keep doing, start doing, stop doing). Know that the facilitators have read suggestions previously submitted.	CDE Presentation: Data Review	Revisiting Resource Inequities	Review Colorado's Accountability and Accreditation System	Panel Discussion: 1215 Task Force's Findings and Recommendations	The CO Accountability system—What is working and what could be improved? (Parts I and II)	Please let us know if there is anything else you wish to share that is not yet captured in your above responses.
I am an appointed Task Force member	Today virtual meeting was really well done. Think we should consider alternating again in the future. In some ways it was easier to interact and move between small groups more easily on line.	This is always such an important part of the meeting - would like to expand slightly to ensure we have real time to talk through.		Loved the quiz - think we should expand and do it again. Was telling to see that there are still some who don't remember some of the key components.	Very good panel		
I am an appointed Task Force member	You all are doing a great job facilitating each session!	Very helpful data!	I'm struggling with drawing a throughline to the inequities and what to do with them within the frameworks. But we will have more conversations next week.	Thank you!	Appreciated the specific recommendations shared.	There are many suggestions ...	
I am an appointed Task Force member	Nothing at this time!	Always helpful - so thorough, thank you!			Would have loved more time with the task force - I think the connection between their recommendations and our recommendations around PWR are critical and I would have appreciated more time to hear from our fellow TF members about this particular part of the accountability framework.	On the second part - my group was assigned Public Engagement and we didn't really tackle that issue. I am not sure that there was clear understanding of what role Public Engagement really plays in the accountability system - and therefore it was hard to make recommendations or suggestions for improvement.	
I am an appointed Task Force member	none	A lot of info but helpful	wondering how this will come together	great game to review	helpful info	great conversation	
I am an appointed Task Force member	Keep doing the perfect balance of using the workbook, having in person conversations, whole group vs. breakout discussions. This was an incredibly effective way to encourage participation from all members of the task force. I also think we should be scheduling and bringing in more outside groups to share best practices. It's been fantastic to hear from CDE and for them to provide so much data for us, but I think we are really getting pretty insular and we have a lot to learn from others (or we could go down data holes forever).	Extremely helpful. Looking forward to digging through the scatterplots a bit further.		I really loved and appreciated this! I learned a lot and was glad to challenge my own knowledge in the "quiz format". Thank you for bringing such innovative learning models to the table.	Very grateful to have the opportunity to hear from the 1215 task force and to have time for the committee to ask questions and determine how to best integrate these changes into our own recommendations.	I feel like this is becoming a really helpful resource for the interim report. I appreciate you giving us a chance to work in the full document and then to laser focus in on a specific topic.	
I am an appointed Task Force member	Keep doing: Icebreakers getting to know you Small group discussions Presentations and panel discussions (content and process from the 1215 group was very helpful to hear/ think about)	Would love to have this information ahead of time for review		Engaging way to review information in a short time span	Excellent for bot the content covered and considering the process the task force utilized.	Great discussion in our groups	
I am an appointed Task Force member	Review of exactly where to find information entered by groups is helpful.	Excellent. Thank you for extending the convo to cover questions.	Excellent	Good	Great presentation	Great conversations	
I am an appointed Task Force member	Until 2:00, I felt the experience, expertise and collective knowledge of the task force members has been secondary to other experts. I appreciate that there needs to be common ground to get to group recommendations. For the last 60 minutes of the session, I finally felt that members could begin to identify specific challenges and process solutions. We really need to use the expertise on this task force in future work.		Still wonder how these will be utilized and seems just a task because of legislation more than leading to solid recommendations. Task force members are patiently helping in working through this dilemma for me. If we are considering these resource inequities being part of state accountability, it shapes how we interact in the processing groups.		1215 did thoughtful work. This task force needs to be as thoughtful in considering unintended consequences of recommendations. Many of the recommendations could lead to MORE resource inequities. Fundamentally, are we incentivizing a certain set of practices established by a group that many not fit every local context? Parking lot holds some important questions.	Can we synthesize thinking into principles that need to be addressed in state accountability. We have many working documents, with many ideas. It is still very difficult to understand where there is common ground in the room because our efforts continue to be on collecting ideas/challenges rather than vetting/debating ideas/challenges. It feels we are on a path to justify or tweak the current system with little substantive change. I know this is a long process and I will trust it, but still believe there are task force members carrying experience and study that is untapped at a deeper level. I feel an urgency to be able to communicate the direction or even ideas the task force is contemplating, and do not feel confident to do that. That is not to say we have not gathered information. I will be patient that we will synthesize all this, but it does feel very slow.	The facilitators are doing an excellent job of synthesizing thoughts and being responsive. The time is facilitated professionally. I appreciate the thoughtfulness. Thank you.
I am an appointed Task Force member	Sent this in the chat, but wanted to name it here: having a short time to read a slide or poll item vs it being read to us would help me tremendously. After a brief preview (can be very short) then facilitators could go into the summary or their discussion points. If this is just an issue for me, I can certainly work with what is best for the group! Thank you!	It has been helpful to circle back multiple times, while adding to this bank of information. It is very, very appreciated. Lisa and her team are phenomenal at guiding, clarifying.	That was a good activity today. I appreciate the small group setting so much and find it really helpful to make sure everyone can contribute. It went fast and hopefully we made headway.		Thank you for the ability to ask questions to the panel. I am still wondering about the Global Seal/ State Seal of Biliteracy becoming a prominent part of the conversation in PSW and/or accountability as part of an asset based 21st century skill (having proficiency in a language other than English). Businesses see value, yet the connection to untapped jobs - yet being behind the curve on the ability to view view multilingualism as an asset and barriers to the Seal for some multilingual learners is impacting Colorado's ability to prepare students for careers now and in the future. I am open to further sharing or discussion, or I can explore and connect on my own if there are recommendations on where a good place to continue this conversation might be at the state level. Thanks for your thoughts.	Again, appreciated the small group. I felt I was able to both learn and contribute deeply.	Thank you for another great session. Virtual is hard to pull off with the constraints of the TF and you all did a great job.
I am an appointed Task Force member	Facilitators did a very good job in keeping the task force engaged in a virtual setting!	very informative	I believe it was good to revisit that and discuss it again	keep bringing it back	gave me a good insight on where our work	that was very engaging and I believe a lot of good ideas came from that that we could explore for recommendations	na

	Based on your experience in the Task Force thus far, please share any additional suggestions your facilitators can apply to better support your and fellow task force members' work to achieve the Task Force's objectives. (e.g., keep doing, start doing, stop doing). Know that the facilitators have read suggestions previously submitted.	CDE Presentation: Data Review	Revisiting Resource Inequities	Review Colorado's Accountability and Accreditation System	Panel Discussion: 1215 Task Force's Findings and Recommendations	The CO Accountability system—What is working and what could be improved? (Parts I and II)	Please let us know if there is anything else you wish to share that is not yet captured in your above responses.
My affiliation with the 1241 Task Force is...	<p>It appears that the task force has spent a considerable amount of time on just background information. It would be helpful to have some specialized groups (like ACEE) present to the task force their specific concerns and suggestions for improvement. Based on my observations, it does appear that there are still some significant misconceptions amongst some of the task force members regarding the measures used in the SPF as well as how they are calculated. Having a group of district accountability and assessment folks present their technical concerns and suggestions to the task force might help to shine a light on some of these misconceptions and accelerate the work.</p> <p>How might the facilitators get the task force members to dig into the work even more quickly?</p> <p>Would it be possible for the meeting to include a public comment section where members of the public could interact with the task force members? This too might help to provide more context and/or help accelerate the work. Perhaps this could just 15 min of public comment (similar to school or state board meetings).</p>	<p>There was some very helpful information in this section. It would have been interesting to give some members of the task force more time to dig in and synthesize this information for their peers. For instance, it was evident from the task force member comments that they were very interested in looking at scatter plots of things like %PWL vs. %of points earned on the SPF. The tools provided (data view) enable them to see the scatter plots but it doesn't provide the correlation coefficients that would help them interpret the scatter plot in the same way the data was synthesized in the resource guide. The resource guide does a great job of explaining high vs. low correlations and references these throughout. If the taskforce members are going to independently investigate some of these correlations then they need to be able to see the same R values as were provided in the resource guide.</p> <p>It is evident that there is a very high correlation between poverty and achievement. This high correlation would seem to suggest the need to reduce the weight of achievement in the Frameworks if the goal is to create a more equitable system.</p> <p>The task force might consider overtly discuss the values behind these correlations. Do we want a system that is highly correlated with poverty or other factors outside the classroom? Why or why not?</p>	<p>I'm not sure how valuable this topic is unless the taskforce is going to overtly discuss how to protect the accountability system against specific resource inequities. There was discussion about how access to "high quality" teachers and curriculum absolutely creates inequities. It should be pointed out, though, that we don't have any reliable / universal measures to determine who is a high quality teacher or what is a high quality curriculum outside of test scores (which is problematic). I heard discussion about having districts submit information about the curriculum and resources that they are using to create a database that could then be capitalized on. Unfortunately, I think this might be much more work than it is worth right now until we have established measures that can be used to evaluate not just the quality of the resource but also the implementation. There really isn't enough resolution in the educator effectiveness system to make meaningful distinctions between teachers in order to label them as "Master" teachers or "High Quality" teachers.</p> <p>I hope that the purpose of this discussion would be to highlight how the inequitable access to resources, from students across the state, affects the measures used to compile the SPF.</p> <p>What might it look like to actually measure or report out the degree to which the community is represented in the SPF has easy access to resources? The matriculation data might land completely differently when it's shared out that the community doesn't have any access to local institutes of higher ed or educators that are capable of teaching concurrent enrollment. It may also lend weight to the rating if someone notices a low PWR rating in contrast to a high rating for access to PWR resources. This might add context to the report and bring it to life. It might also feel more equitable to the communities as it could highlight their lack of access to resources that have a positive benefit on the outcomes for their students.</p>	<p>I wonder if any new knowledge or understanding was generated during this session. It appeared to be fairly confirmatory in the sense that everyone answered the survey questions quickly and accurately. I would have like to see the TF spend more time digging into each others misconceptions around the accountability system.</p> <p>For instance: it appears that committee is confused about the states ability to create a "super group" of subgroups to eliminate the problem of double, triple, or quadruple counting a student due to the fact that the show up in multiple subgroups. The fact of the matter is that we can absolutely do this for STATE accountability but not for FED accountability. This is a non-issue as we already have 2 different systems in place right now. Currently the FED system does not allow parent opt out system in the state. We have one system for the state (the SPFs that we all use) and another system for the feds that only districts that "opt" really pay attention to. I'm not sure that the TF understands these nuances and therefore is not prepared to push the envelope in this regard.</p>	<p>This was welcome discussion and creates one of my biggest concerns. While their recommendation to move SAT out of PWR and back into achievement makes complete sense, the recommendation to increase the matriculation weight is very problematic.</p> <p>The matriculation data is the least reliable data in the entire SPF. The matriculation data relies on the national student clearinghouse which was not designed to measure post-secondary enrollment of high school students, but rather as a clearinghouse for banks to check up on their borrowers with student loans. Participation by colleges in this system is entirely voluntary. Independent and peer reviewed studies have dug into the methodology used by the clearinghouse to "match" students and has found many holes in this system. They estimate that, on average, the clearinghouse is missing about 11% of valid enrollments and that this number increases dramatically for schools in impoverished or rural areas.</p> <p>The committee should really consider having CDE specifically discuss the degree to which they have independently validated and audited the matriculation data. It is my understanding that this has never been done due to the difficulty of coordinating between multiple agencies, charges by NSC for access to the data, lack of access to higher education data outside of Colorado, and the age of the data.</p> <p>"Using National Student Clearinghouse Data for Measuring Public Postsecondary Outcomes. Washington Case Study"  <a href="https://erdc.wa.gov/node/815">https://erdc.wa.gov/node/815</a>  <a href="https://erdc.wa.gov/file/411/download?token=dPXPTn6s">https://erdc.wa.gov/file/411/download?token=dPXPTn6s</a></p> <p>What I like about this study, is that it provides a methodology for investigating the accuracy of the NSC results at a state level. How might we partner / collaborate as a community to perform or support our own Colorado study, especially if the data is used for high stakes accountability?</p> <p>There are a couple of issues that this paper points out that the task force might want to dig into.</p> <p>The study reported that the NSC results only yielded an 89% accuracy at the state level, with much lower levels of accuracy among various sub groups. In contrast we can assume that CMAS / SAT data is 100% accurate. How does the accountability system deal with the fact that there may be an excess of 10% of inaccuracy in the system at a state wide level? How has this known inaccuracy been accounted for in the cut points? How might this error get magnified for districts with different populations? Imagine that you have a district with 100 graduates. 80% of them matriculate to an actual college. Due to the inaccuracy of the NSC system only 89% of those 80% were actually accounted for. That means only 71 students were actually reported as matriculating by the NSC. Had the results been accurate, the district would have received a rating of "Exceeds" as 80 is above the 75.8% cut point. But due to the inaccuracy of the measurement tool (NSC), the district would only receive a rating of "Meets". If the district had 76 students matriculate then they would receive a rating of meets, but due to the inaccuracy of the system the district would receive a rating of approaching. It should be noted that this inaccuracy will always be an under count rather than an over count, meaning that we can't expect the error to even itself out. We know that it will always undercount the results.</p> <p>Ultimately, the final statement in the conclusion of the paper should be concerning for us regarding the valid use of this metric in an accountability system.</p> <p>Overall, the differences we found are of enough magnitude to raise concerns about biases in the NSC match results, especially when breaking out postsecondary outcomes by race and ethnicity or by geographic areas such as school districts. Researchers should be aware of the potential biases and note it in their findings."</p> <p>The study showed that the accuracy of the results can vary widely when accounting for race, ethnicity, or geographic background. This means that smaller school districts or districts that qualify for title 1 funding will most likely have less accurate results than other districts. I believe that this raises a very strong equity concern if we know that the measure is already biased against specific populations.</p> <p>My contention, and that of my colleagues, would be that we can't use metrics based on the potential for the data to be valid, rather we should only use metrics that we KNOW are valid. We have auditing mechanisms (for all metrics other than this one) wherein we can confirm that CDE records match our records. The assessment audit is so tight that we have to actually account for every student in the state and confirm that they have, in fact, been measured. I would highly encourage CDE to consider eliminating this metric from the SPF until districts have the ability to audit the student level results in the same way as they are able to with all other metrics or until a better metric is found / invented. The reasoning behind using this metric appears to contradict the strong value of transparency used in ALL of the other metrics on the SPF. Another solution would be to allow districts to self-report this data based on their own local records regarding students intent / acceptance into college, though this assumes that all districts have a mechanism for collecting and verifying this data.</p> <p>It appears, on the surface, that this metric was selected out of expedience rather than quality. Though legislation mandates that a matriculation metric be included in the SPF, CDE has always had the authority to delay the inclusion of a metric if it is inappropriate, suffers from validity issues, or has yet to be developed. This has happened a number of times throughout the years (including the recent vote by the board to delay the use of the growth to standard metrics). How appropriate is it for us to use the metric when neither CDE nor the individual districts have the ability to confirm that the results are accurate? How might we collaborate and build a better metric in the meantime?</p>		
I am a member of the public	<p>Keep doing shared learning (presentations, etc.), start finding ways for us to agree on things so that it feels like we are making progress toward something and not just doing tasks and activities</p>	<p>It feels like we need time to react to the data, ask questions in the moment and get answers in the moment (I know that is not always feasible), because it feels like the data is presented in a certain way and if there are questions, there is valled defensiveness or not even enough time given to address and have a real in depth discussion</p>			<p>Informative and helpful</p>	<p>I wonder if we will have a way to reach agreement on what the task force as a whole believes is working and what could be improved? Is that a next step?</p>	