



Record of Meeting Minutes

Date and Time of Meeting:	January 22, 2015– 1:00-4:00 PM
Reporting:	Margo Allen
Subject of Meeting:	Graduation Guidelines Assessment Work Group
Facilitator:	Elliott Asp

In Attendance: Elliott Asp, Mike Bowers, Floyd Cobb, Jonathan Dings, Mary Kay Dore, Jeni Gotto, Yu-Lu Hsiung, Michelle Johnstone, Amy LoBue, Ian Macgillivray, Patti Milner, Gerry Olvey, Susan Ortner, Pamela Osborne, Matt Pickering, David Platt, Robin Russel, Misti Ruthven, Holly Sample, Chris Selle, Patti Turner, Johan van Nieuwenhuizen, Robert Williams.

1. Meeting Minutes:

No.	Discussion	Initiator
1	Overview of the day and agenda	Elliott
2	Robin: Several of the other graduation guidelines work groups are finished and have produced a report of recommendations. After reviewing the draft reports, I'll bring appropriate input back to this group.	Robin
3	<p>GG Statutory References C.R.S. 22-2-106 (a.5).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is in law? See handout (attached). Observe “verbs” carefully. “Ensure,” “Recognize” and “Address.” Make rigorous. <p>22-2-106(a.5): “Adopt” guidelines to be used by school district board of educations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I: “Take into account” 2006 report of alignment council. II: “Ensure” alignment with description of post secondary workplace readiness... Our guidelines need to be aligned with English Language competencies and elementary and secondary education standards. III: “Work” with Higher Education to “ensure” alignment with postsecondary academic admission standards... IV: “Recognize and address: multiple pathways. Guidelines should “accommodate” differing needs... V: “Utilize” standards based education as the framework. Standards should be rigorous. VI: “Recognize and acknowledge” important of core competency skills in math, science and communication and standards...also performing arts.... VII: “Take into account” important of postsecondary career planning...” <p>22-31-109: “Undertake” community-based process to develop blueprint...to establish local high school graduation requirements...</p> <p>C.R.S. 23-1-113 Colorado Commission on Higher Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Article 23 provides for the expectation of alignment with higher education and graduation guidelines with the minimum academic admission standards. <p>Group Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State Board adopted the Graduation Guideline rules (13 page document)–did not approved the menu portion. Look back at law to update the menu. Our task: To make recommendations to the department to use to make 	Misti/Elliott

	<p>recommendations to the State Board of Education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No later than June 2015. • What does “align” mean – not “adopt and make equal to.” <p>Legal Opinion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AG said: In #II - verb “ensure” is the strongest. It includes, but not limited to, English language competencies. • AG: In #III Ensure GG is aligned with higher education (See Statute 23). • AG: GG must ensure that we have minimum English Language competencies, aligned with higher education (include math as well as English). • Elliott: We don’t have to align to Social Studies and Science. Only need to consider ELA and Math. <p>Special Education Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Education? Lots of discussion about special education students and what GG means to them. Rigorous transition plan has been discussed as well as post-secondary plans. The challenge is to figure out what to tell the State Board. Define “exception”? • Feedback Vote: Move ahead with ELA and math – thumbs up. • Patti: Does ELA mean English language acquisition? • #VI – Mentions science. It’s the verb – “recognize and acknowledge.” • #V -- The Colorado Academic Standards will play a role in education not just the GG requirements. • If you have minimum guidelines, will you get a situation where a 10th grader has met all of the “minimum” standards and therefore can graduate? There is a difference getting credits versus demonstrating competencies. • Seems reasonable to ensure communication skills to postsecondary or training programs. 	
4	<p>Review of Colorado Commission on Higher Education Policy (handout attached)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College readiness means not the need for remediation instruction. • Current CCHC cut scores have been expanded. More rows and columns have been added. • Three gateway course: (1) liberal arts degree, (2) Intro to statistics, (psychology/anthropology majors), (3) STEM careers – need calculus. • Accuplacer will feed into the CCHC policy. • Determine remediation dependent on the pathway. • Difference between admission and college readiness. • The Higher Ed Commission is working to align the academic admission standards. • Misti: Align with readiness not credits. One of the core values in the group is readiness for the next step. 	Ian Macgillivray
5	<p>Review Ian’s discussion and handout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about social studies? • If you are teaching K12 Colorado Academic Standards, do you meet Higher Education standards? Misti: In #II that is a value for CDE to work with Higher Education to ensure alignment of PWR to academic standards. State Board is directed to update PWR every six years. This year is Year 6. Patti: reference need for no remediation? Will review this summer for better alignment. • “Align” - how rigorous is that concept? Does it mean “equal or exceed,” or “conceptually close”? Misti: Does not mean the “same.” It is more “consistent with” or “not contradictory to.” • Jonathan: There seems to be a disconnect between admission requirements and 	All

	<p>“readiness.” There seems to be two ways to be ready; i.e., accepted for admission to an institute of higher learning, (meet the postsecondary readiness standards or just take my money). How to make sense of this disconnect? How to get a meaningful product from this group?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floyd: There are two groups: (1) A group that doesn’t have to remediate and (2) a group that does. How do you handle the second group? Ian: Remedial policy – Give a second assessment. Let you try the class with supplementary instruction. Not a hard line. • Elliott: Other pathways? Look at the middle of the cut-scores. • Ian: PWR description says “without the need for remedial instruction” – interpretation by campus to campus. • Chris Selle: Remember those students who may not be college bound. I would not like to see our final product only consider college requirements. • Ian: Since we can’t decide the definition of remediation, it is important to be flexible. 	
6	Break out in four smaller groups to review the group’s emailed suggestions (see handouts of emails).	Elliott
7	<p>What are some themes or suggestions that need further discussion regarding the Draft Minimum Postsecondary and Workforce Ready (PWR) Indicators?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enlarge the timeframes to meet the requirements (not limited to junior and senior year, and not implementing immediately). • Concerns about implementation – it will take time slow. On track. • Use the ACT score to be ready. • Communicating with local school boards requires time. • Promote flexibility in demonstrating postsecondary or workforce readiness, including course based. • Theme: Flexibility and equity in meeting requirements. We define diploma when our kids have been successful at next level. • Not limit PWR to students who are going to attend a 4-year institution. • Finding and defining lower bounds/lower limits to PWR, more like what we see in practice, which isn’t a hard line. • Define the lower limits. • Need realistic options for small school districts. • Considerable concern about capacity to make changes. • Scores (grades) versus course completion. • GED does fit but is not part of the current menu. • Don’t see CAS measures in this. • Struggle with the bar – is it too high or so low to be meaningless? • Phasing in capacity for competency-based. Colorado is not proficient in the competency-based methodology yet. Need flexibility in timeline. • Add Competency in AP, IB, CE with successful completion. There might be an equity issue here for district that do not have access to AP, IB, etc. • Add NWEA (MAP) on local assessment list? • Where is the remediation line drawn in DHE’s world? • Aren’t we preparing high school graduation versus what High Ed is doing? • Readiness – what does this mean? Admission vs. placement • What is a “guideline” – meet or exceeds • Define what diploma means. • Alternative flexibility – what about local control? Adding local assessments – is this realistic? 	All

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still some concern about mathematics cut scores. • Pool of assessments would be helpful. Approve the pool. • Education Effectiveness in some districts might be considered. How to work all these together is a concern. 	
8	<p>Next steps:</p> <p>Rebecca: When come to the SBE? There will be an information agenda item for the February State Board Meeting to give an update on our progress. Although there is no final decisions yet, we would like to hear from the Board and possibly get public comments. The April Board meeting will present final recommendations.</p>	Rebecca

Meeting ended at 3:45 p.m.