



COLORADO

Department of Education

Vision

All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in society, the workforce, and life.

Goals

Every student, every step of the way



Meeting Logistics & Desired Outcomes

Meeting:	Graduation Guidelines Assessment Work Group				
Date:	January 22, 2015	Time:	1:00-4:00 PM	Location:	Board Room, CDE
Meeting Lead:	Elliott Asp				
Meeting Participants: <i>(Who most needs to attend?)</i>	Members of the Graduation Guidelines Assessment Work Group				
Meeting Objectives: <i>(Is a meeting necessary to accomplish the objectives?)</i>	To complete the career and college demonstrations chart outlining the competencies a student must meet or exceed before graduating from high school.				

Agenda Items and Next Steps

Time	Agenda Item	Notes & Next Steps <i>(be sure to include communication to those not at the meeting who need to know the results)</i>
1:00 PM	Overview of the Day – Elliott	
	Discussion of the statutory requirements for graduation guidelines – Misti	
	Review of feedback on the draft - Elliott	
	Discussion of reviews – All	
	Next Steps – Rebecca and Elliott	

Graduation Guidelines Statutory References

The following statutory changes occurred as a result of the graduation guidelines HB 07-1118 and SB08-256. Below are the policies created by this bill and recommendation for district implementation.

22-2-106(a.5) To adopt, on or before May 15, 2013, a comprehensive set of guidelines for the establishment of high school graduation requirements to be used by each school district board of education in developing local high school graduation requirements. Each school district board of education shall retain the authority to develop its own unique high school graduation requirements, so long as those local high school graduation requirements meet or exceed any minimum standards or basic core competencies or skills identified in the comprehensive set of guidelines for high school graduation developed by the state board pursuant to this paragraph (a.5). In developing the guidelines for high school graduation, the state board shall utilize the recommendations of the state graduation guidelines development council established in section 22-7-414, as it existed prior to July 1, 2008, and shall:

- (I) Take into account recommendations from the 2006 report of the Colorado education alignment council appointed by the governor pursuant to executive order B 009 05;
- (II) Ensure that the state graduation guidelines are aligned with the description of postsecondary and workforce readiness, including but not limited to the minimum required English language competencies, adopted by the state board and the Colorado commission on higher education pursuant to section 22-7-1008 and with the preschool through elementary and secondary education standards adopted by the state board pursuant to section 22-7-1005;
- (III) Work with the Colorado commission on higher education to ensure that the state board's guidelines for high school graduation adopted pursuant to this paragraph (a.5) and the postsecondary academic admission standards established pursuant to section 23-1-113, C.R.S., are aligned for students entering a four-year public postsecondary education institution on or after August 1, 2013;
- (IV) Recognize and address the multiple and diverse pathways to diplomas offered by school districts in the state. The guidelines for high school graduation shall accommodate the differing and broad categories of student interests and economic needs, including but not limited to agriculture, architecture, arts, communications, business and management, construction technology, education, finance, government, health sciences, tourism, human services, information technology, law and public safety, manufacturing, marketing and sales, physical education, science and technology, and transportation. The guidelines for high school graduation adopted by the state board pursuant to this paragraph (a.5) shall ensure, at a minimum, that, while not identical, each pathway is equally rigorous.
- (V) Utilize standards-based education, as described in section 22-7-402, and as revised pursuant to part 10 of article 7 of this title, as the framework for the development of the guidelines for high school graduation and consider how high school graduation requirements can be articulated in a standards-based education system. In the process of developing the guidelines for high school graduation, the state board shall ensure that the state model content standards, adopted pursuant to section 22-7-406, are sufficiently rigorous, particularly in the core academic subject areas of mathematics, science, reading, and writing so that students are exposed to subject matter that research indicates will adequately prepare them for entrance into the workforce or the postsecondary education system. On or before August 1, 2007, the state board shall begin to receive public comment on the adequacy of the existing state model content standards. As part of receiving public comment, the state board is encouraged to form a stakeholder group of parents, teachers, administrators, and others to develop recommendations related to modernizing the state model content standards in mathematics, science, reading, and writing. On or before February 1, 2008, the state board shall report to the education committees of the house of

representatives and the senate, or any successor committees, on the adequacy of the existing state model content standards in these subject matters.

22-7-402 (11) "Standards-based education" means a system of instruction focused on student learning of content standards. This system aligns programs of instruction and assessments with the content standards. The implementation of "standards-based education" shall not require districts to abandon the use of Carnegie units, to abandon a letter grade system, to adopt outcome-based methods of teaching, or to use student portfolios in place of assessments. In addition, implementation of "standards-based education" shall not require changes in current class schedules and does not encourage block scheduling or other experimental methods of class scheduling.

(VI) Recognize and acknowledge the importance of obtaining the core competency skills and standards to succeed in the twenty-first century, including but not limited to proficiency in math, science, and written and verbal communication skills;

(VI.5) Recognize and acknowledge the importance of education in performing arts, as defined in section 22-1-104.5 (1) (b), and visual arts, as defined in section 22-1-104.5 (1) (c), in strengthening student learning in other subjects and in supporting students' ability to succeed in the twenty-first century; and

(VII) Take into account the importance of pre-high school and postsecondary career planning that provides middle school and junior high school students and parents with awareness of the school district's high school graduation requirements, the multiple pathways a student can follow, and other pertinent information that will help prepare a student for a successful high school experience.

22-32-109

(kk) (I) To undertake a community-based process to develop a blueprint for the education system in the community and to determine the skills students will need to be successful after graduation. Each board of education shall seek input from the community at large, which may include, but need not be limited to, students, parents, business persons, neighboring school districts, and regional boards of cooperative services. Each board of education shall use this blueprint, together with the guidelines for high school graduation requirements developed by the state board pursuant to section 22-2-106 (1) (a.5), to establish local high school graduation requirements applicable to students enrolling in ninth grade beginning in the 2014-15 school year. To assist the state board of education in fulfilling its duties under part 10 of article 7 of this title, each board of education shall provide to the state board of education information concerning the blueprint and the input received in developing the blueprint. A board of education that has undertaken a comprehensive community-based process and has revised its high school graduation requirements within the previous two years shall not be required to develop a new blueprint for the education system in its community or make any revisions to its high school graduation requirements.

(II) Each board of education shall report its blueprint for the education system in the community and its new or revised high school graduation requirements to the public through the accreditation process, as determined by the state board. In its report, the board of education shall demonstrate how its high school graduation requirements meet or exceed any minimum standards or core competencies or skills identified in the guidelines for high school graduation requirements developed by the state board pursuant to section 22-2-106 (1) (a.5).

Related Statutory References:

22-1-104(3) (a) Satisfactory completion of a course on the civil government of the United States and the state of Colorado, which includes the subjects described in subsection (2) of this section, shall be a condition of high school graduation in the public schools of this state.

COLORADO REVISED STATUTES

C.R.S. 23-1-113 Colorado Commission on Higher Education.

(1.5) (a) (I) The commission shall establish and the governing boards shall implement a policy pursuant to section 23-1-113.3 to identify matriculated students who need basic skills courses in English and mathematics and standards and procedures whereby state institutions of higher education may offer basic skills courses as provided in section 23-1-113.3.

(4) The commission shall work with the state board of education to align the academic admission standards established pursuant to this section with the guidelines for high school graduation requirements developed pursuant to section 22-2-106 (1) (a.5), C.R.S. Any revised academic admission standards shall be implemented no later than the selection of the freshman class of fall 2012.

(8) (a) On or before December 15, 2013, based on adoption of the description of postsecondary and workforce readiness, the commission shall, if necessary, revise the minimum academic admission standards for first-time freshmen at all state-supported baccalaureate and graduate institutions of higher education in the state to ensure that the minimum academic admission standards are aligned with the description of postsecondary and workforce readiness adopted by the commission and the state board of education.

(d) In revising the minimum academic admission standards, the policy established pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection (1.5) of this section, and the basic skills placement or assessment tests pursuant to this subsection.

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Description

Adopted June 30, 2009

By the State Board of Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education

Description of PWR

“Postsecondary and workforce readiness” describes the knowledge, skills, and behaviors essential for high school graduates to be prepared to enter college and the workforce and to compete in the global economy.

To be designated as postsecondary and workforce ready, secondary students shall demonstrate that the following content knowledge and learning and behavior skills have been achieved without the need for remedial instruction or training. This demonstration includes the completion of increasingly challenging, engaging, and coherent academic work and experiences, and the achievement of proficiency shown by a body of evidence including postsecondary and workforce readiness assessments and other relevant materials that document a student’s postsecondary and workforce readiness.

I. Content Knowledge

Literacy

- Read fiction and non-fiction, understanding conclusions reached and points of view expressed
- Write clearly and coherently for a variety of purposes and audiences
- Use logic and rhetoric to analyze and critique ideas
- Access and use primary and secondary sources to explain questions being researched
- Employ standard English language properly and fluently in reading, writing, listening, and speaking

Mathematical Sciences

- Think critically, analyze evidence, read graphs, understand logical arguments, detect logical fallacies, test conjectures, evaluate risks, and appreciate the role mathematics plays in the modern world, i.e., be quantitatively literate
- Understand and apply algebraic and geometric concepts and techniques
- Use concepts and techniques of probability and statistics
- Apply knowledge of mathematics to problem solve, analyze issues, and make critical decisions that arise in everyday life

Science

- Think scientifically and apply the scientific method to complex systems and phenomena
- Use theoretical principles within a scientific field and relevant empirical evidence to make and draw conclusions
- Recognize that scientific conclusions are subject to interpretation and can be challenged
- Understand the core scientific concepts, principles, laws, and vocabulary, and how scientific knowledge is extended, refined, and revised over time

Social Studies and Social Sciences

- Identify and describe historical, social, cultural, political, geographical, and economic concepts
- Interpret sources, and evaluate evidence and competing ideas
- Build conceptual frameworks based on an understanding of themes and the overall flow of events
- Understand how government works in the United States and in other countries, the varying roles individuals may play in society, and the nature of civic responsibility
- Interpret information from a global and multicultural perspective

The Arts and Humanities

- Understand and appreciate how the arts and humanities (expressions of culture and identity through language, movement, sound, and visual representation) contribute to and shape culture and our understanding of culture
- Understand how the arts and literature are used as instruments of social and political thought
- Identify leading innovators in the arts and humanities and the contributions they have made to their respective art forms

II. Learning and Behavior Skills

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving

- Apply logical reasoning and analytical skills
- Conduct research using acceptable research methods
- Understand different research approaches
- Collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data and research
- Evaluate the credibility and relevance of information, ideas, and arguments
- Discern bias, pose questions, marshal evidence, and present solutions

Find and Use Information/Information Technology

- Select, integrate, and apply appropriate technology to access and evaluate new information
- Understand the ethical uses of information
- Provide citations for resources

Creativity and Innovation

- Demonstrate intellectual curiosity
- Generate, evaluate, and implement new ideas and novel approaches
- Develop new connections where none previously existed

Global and Cultural Awareness

- Appreciate the arts, culture, and humanities
- Interact effectively with and respect the diversity of different individuals, groups, and cultures
- Recognize the interdependent nature of our world
- Understand how communicating in another language can improve learning in other disciplines and expand professional, personal, and social opportunities

Civic Responsibility

- Recognize the value of civic engagement and its role in a healthy democracy and civil society
- Be involved in the community and participate in its political life
- Balance personal freedom with the interests of a community

Work Ethic

- Plan and prioritize goals
- Manage time effectively
- Take initiative, and follow through
- Learn from instruction and criticism
- Take responsibility for completion of work
- Act with maturity, civility, and politeness
- Demonstrate flexibility and adaptability

Personal Responsibility

- Balance self-advocacy with the consideration of others
- Possess financial literacy and awareness of consumer economics
- Behave honestly and ethically
- Take responsibility for actions
- Understand the relevance of learning to postsecondary and workforce readiness
- Demonstrate awareness of and evaluate career options
- Attend to personal health and wellness

Communication

- Read, write, listen and speak effectively
- Construct clear, coherent, and persuasive arguments
- Communicate and interact effectively with people who have different primary languages

Collaboration

- Work effectively with others
- Acknowledge authority and take direction
- Cooperate for a common purpose
- Use teamwork and leadership skills effectively

Ian's note: This is current CCHE Policy I, E: STATEWIDE REMEDIAL EDUCATION POLICY

Entire document available at:

<http://highered.colorado.gov/stats/track.asp?mtr=/Publications/Policies/Current/i-parte.pdf>

This table will be evaluated by the Commission every three years against Colorado specific data. The Commission may adjust the cut scores based on empirical data of student performance in college English and college mathematics courses.

Table 1 – College-Ready Assessment Cut Scores

Assessment Test	English Subscore	Math Subscore
ACT	18	19
SAT	430	460
ACT Writing Subscore* / **	TBD	---
Accuplacer*	TBD	TBD
Compass	79	63
PARCC***	TBD	TBD
SBAC***	TBD	TBD

* *These subscores are being researched by the Department and will be added.*

** *Not required, not a primary assessment, but can be used as a secondary evaluation.*

*** *Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and Smarter Balanced (SBAC) instruments are currently being deployed and field-tested nationally and by the Colorado Department of Education in an effort to implement and assess statewide college and career readiness standards for students. The research and validation studies will be available by 2016-17, at which point Colorado institutions of higher education will begin to utilize the approved college-readiness scores.*

Ian's note: The table below contains current, CCHE approved cut scores in red, underlined text as well as suggested cut scores that will be considered for the next revision of this CCHE policy.

Compiled Results of Suggested College-Ready Assessment Cut Scores
Version: January 21, 2015

Underlined, red text signifies current, CCHE approved cut score.

Assessment	English Subscore	Mathematics Subscore	Math for the Liberal Arts Subscore	Intro to Statistics Subscore	College Algebra & Pre-Calc Subscore	Other?
ACT	<u>18</u>	<u>19</u>	ASU 15 CMU 19-21 CSU-P 19 FLC 19 Metro 19 UCD 19 UNC 19 Aims 19	CSU-P 22 FLC 19 Metro 19 UCD 19 UNC 19 Aims 21	ASU 21 CMU 19-23 CSU-P 22 FLC 22 Metro 27 UCD 25 UNC 19 Aims 23	ASU Finite Math 19 CMU Pre-Calc, Bus Calc & Trig 24-26 CMU Calc I 27 Metro Finite Math & Math for El Ed-variable by course and institution UCD Calc I 27 <u>Aims</u> Trig 24 Survey Calc 25 Calc I 28 Intg Math I/II 19
SAT	<u>430 (Critical Reading)</u>	<u>460 (Mathematics)</u>	CMU 460-559 CSU-P 460 Metro 460 Aims 460	CSU-P 520 Metro 460 Aims 460	CMU 460-589 CSU-P 520 Metro 590 UCD 560 Aims 460	CMU Pre-Calc, Bus Calc & Trig 590-664 CMU Calc I 665 Metro Finite Math & Math for El Ed-variable by course and institution UCD 620 <u>Aims</u> Trig 690 Survey Calc 690 Calc I 740 Intg Math I/II 460
Accuplacer	80 (Reading Comprehension)	85 (Elementary Algebra)	CMU 85+ (El Alg) or 42-60 (College Level) CSU-P 85 (El Alg)	CSU-P 63 (College Level Math) Metro 72 (El Alg)	CMU 85+ (El Alg) or 42-60 (College Level) CSU-P 63 (College Level)	CMU Pre-Calc, Bus Calc & Trig 61-80 (College Level) CMU Calc I 81-120 (College Level)
	95 (Sentence Skills)					

			Metro 72 (El Alg) Aims EA 85+	Aims EA 85+	Level Math) Metro 45 (College Level Math) UCD 85 (El Alg) Aims EA 85+	Metro Finite Math & Math for El Ed-variable by course and institution UCD Calc I 80 (College Level Math) <u>Aims</u> Trig CLM 55 Survey Calc CLM 55 Calc I CLM 80 Intg Math I/II EA 85+
Compass	<u>79</u>	<u>63</u>	CSU-P 63	CSU-P 63	CSU-P 63	
ALEKS			UCB \leq 34% Quantitative Reasoning and Mathematical Skills		UCB 60-74% APPM 1340: Calc I w/Algebra GEEN 1235: Precalc for Engineers MATH 1081: Calc for Social Sciences & Business MATH 1150: Precalc Mathematics	UCB 35-59% MATH 1011: Fundamentals and Techniques of College Algebra MATH 1021: Numerical/Analytical College Trigonometry MATH 1071: Finite Math for Social Science & Business UCB \geq 75% APPM 1350: Calc I for Engineers ECON 1088: Math Tools for Economists MATH 1300: Analytic Geom/Calc I MATH 1310: Calc, Stochastics & Modeling
GED	170 (scaled score for each of the content areas)					
PARCC	4	4				
SBAC	3	3				

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Minimum Postsecondary and Workforce Ready (PWR) Indicators

December 2014

Introduction

This proposal reflects the suggestions for revising the current menu generated by the Assessment Work Group (AWG) based on questions and input from the AWG and organizations and individuals state-wide. This draft is intended as a starting point for discussion and will be revised based on feedback from the members of the AWG.

Over the past 6 months the workgroup has identified several overarching questions regarding the current menu. These include:

1. Is the level of competency students must demonstrate PWR readiness or success?
2. Should the guidelines be phased-in? That is, should the menu be scaled back for the class of 2021 and expanded for subsequent graduating classes?
3. Do students need to be PWR in all 4 core content areas?
4. Should the “cut-points” for existing indicators be adjusted for internal consistency and to reflect the appropriate level of rigor?
5. What additional indicators should be added to the menu?
6. Should local assessments be added to the menu? If so, under what parameters/conditions? How could CDE assure that local assessments are valid indicators of PWR and are legitimate gatekeepers for graduation and that the level of rigor is comparable across districts (at least at a minimal level)?

The revised menu that follows is based on these responses to the questions articulated by the AWG.

1. The level of competency that students must demonstrate is readiness to enter postsecondary education and/or the workforce. That is, the student can demonstrate she has the requisite knowledge and skills to be successful in postsecondary education and/or an entry level position of a career.
2. These guidelines would not be phased-in. The work group saw no advantage to that approach. The proposed menu would apply to the graduating class of 2021.
3. It is the state’s role to establish guidelines for demonstrating PWR that all students would need to meet. Demonstrated competency in English/Language Arts and Math as established in this menu would enable students to take credit-bearing courses in higher education and/or obtain an entry level position in a career track. Districts could choose to require students to demonstrate competency in other subject areas as determined by the local school board and the community.
4. The “cut-points” for the existing indicators were adjusted to reflect PWR “readiness.” The cut-points for new indicators also reflect that level of rigor.

ORIGINAL DEVELOPED BY ELLIOTT ASP

5. Accuplacer, ACT Compass, ACT Work Keys, GED and PARCC were added to the menu in this draft proposal.
6. Collaboratively developed assessments have been added to the menu. Collaboratively developed assessments are performance tasks that measure PWR that have been created by a group of educators according to a process determined by CDE. CDE in collaboration with district personnel and national experts would identify a process for developing a pool of PWR assessments that could be used by districts as part of their graduation requirements. CDE's role would be to convene and facilitate assessment development and establish a procedure for vetting those assessments. Assessment development could be done centrally or on a regional basis across the state and would involve a variety of stakeholders including content area teachers, career and technical educators, higher education faculty and business/industry leaders. CDE would certify that these assessments measure what they are designed to measure (i.e., PWR) and that the results from these assessments can be used as a requirement for graduation. Districts could chose to use assessments from the approved pool provided they followed the administration and scoring procedures identified by the department.

ORIGINAL DEVELOPED BY ELLIOTT ASP

Competency Demonstration	English/Language Arts	Math
Accuplacer	Reading-62 Sentence Skills-70	Early Algebra-61
ACT	Reading-17 or English-18	Math 19
ACT Compass	Reading-77 Writing Skills-74	Algebra-36
ACT Work Keys - National Career Readiness Certificate	Silver or higher ¹	Silver or higher
Advanced Placement	2 or higher	2 or higher
ASVAB	50	50
Concurrent Enrollment College Course ²	Passing grade	Passing grade
District Capstone ³		
GED	Reasoning through Language Arts Test - 160	Mathematical Reasoning - 160
Industry Certificate		
International Baccalaureate	Successful completion of 11 th grade IB curriculum	Successful completion of 11 th grade IB curriculum
Local Assessments ⁴		
PARCC	3 or higher	3 or higher on Algebra II or Integrated II
SAT	430	460

¹ 4 on each Work Keys core area assessment

² Passing grade is determined by district policy for concurrent enrollment.

An eligible concurrent enrollment course is the pre-requisite directly prior to a credit-bearing course or a credit-bearing course

³ See criteria developed by the Capstone Work Group

⁴ See criteria for utilizing local assessment



Holyoke School District Re-1J

Office of the Superintendent

Memorandum

To: Dr. Elliot Asp
CC: Margo Allen
From: Bret Miles, Superintendent
Date: January 6, 2015
RE: Graduation Requirements Feedback

Elliot,

Thank you for taking feedback on the ongoing work around Graduation Requirements. Even though I am not able to attend the meetings, our District is very concerned about these upcoming rules. My principal and high school guidance counselor have been attending and forwarded me this latest information.

I would like to start with the same, tired argument about the whole darn thing. If you will humor me, I will state my thoughts briefly and then get to the specific feedback you have asked for. I object to CDE's interpretation of the statute that the graduation requirements need to be "competency-based." The law did not require the department to go in this direction and it is unclear to me how CDE can justify making one part of the K-12 experience a competency based system and not everything. It simply does not make sense to have pupil counts under the Carnegie system, audits looking at seat time, the majority of the assessment system tied to grade levels, and then set arbitrary cut points on unrelated tests for exit criteria. It just doesn't make sense to operate one part of a system differently from the rest of the system. What would have prevented this advisory group to create two sets of graduation guidelines: one tied to the courses we take that are created based on State Standards, and one that is a "competency-based" system tied to random test scores? Then they would have truly been guidelines.

Still looking at the big picture, I am still unclear how the State Department of Education can promote the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) as the basis for instruction in the state and then choose to use assessments to measure student success that are not derived from the CAS. We have gone to great lengths to find ways to be fair for teacher evaluation, that the scores used to measure teacher effectiveness must be tied to the standards the teachers used to write lessons. Why is it acceptable to have a system that is unfair to students?

Sorry for those couple minutes of your life that you will never get back listening to the same old argument from me. While I could go on and on, I don't want to lose your attention completely as a raving lunatic would. Therefore I will jump to specific thoughts and concerns about the document you have put out to us.

1) Inequitable System – especially for rural school districts.

My first concern is that students all across the state have different options. These options are restricted if you are in a school that has fewer resources or a school that is located in a rural setting. The number of AP, IB, Concurrent Enrollment, and Industry Certificate classes varies greatly across the state. A student

in Holyoke has fewer options than a student in a large school near a Community College or University. If a student has fewer chances to meet a cut point in a category, they have less of a chance of graduating and that needs to be reviewed again.

- 2) I applaud the efforts for including Collaboratively-developed assessments. My concern would be that CDE does not have the amount of personnel to work with districts that wish to demonstrate student achievement in this way. I would argue that schools closer to Denver have a great opportunity to develop these assessments if it must be done with CDE personnel. This is another potential equity issue. However, my top concern here is that it will be a capacity issue that could limit the potential of this option.

Would you consider opening up the collaboratively-developed assessment concept to existing assessment vendors? Could CDE do the same correlation study of scores between NWEA MAPS and the GDE, ASVAB, or AccuPlacer scores? Is there a process of looking at the correlation of scores and using that data to set cut points for any other assessment given? You might think this is inconsistent with the argument of using tests for exit criteria not aligned with the standards, and that is true. However, if we can be assured the same percentage of students make the same cut points, I am willing to make a tradeoff of some of the alignment between the test and standards (MAPS and CAS) when I am getting much better feedback on progress and better tools that can impact instruction.

I hope the collaboratively-developed assessment concept could be expanded and that accessibility for this service to small rural districts could be considered.

- 3) I do have concerns about including GED in the mix. I suppose that is because for years and years we have been told that completers are not graduates. Without the benefit of the discussion in the room I struggle with this concept and would expect that others will need additional clarification if these recommendations move forward.
- 4) I feel that acceptance into the College-level course shows readiness for post-secondary work. Completing a post-secondary class shows you are meeting the expectation of that level. Why would we hold a high school student to college level work to show they are finished with high school? Doesn't seem to fit for me.
- 5) Finally, I take exception with where some cut scores are set. How can a minimum ACT score be set somewhere near the current State average? It screams of a hidden agenda identifying public schools as failures and CDE should be first on line defending schools for the great work done. This seems to endorse the popular criticism that half of schools are failing. Also, how can we set PARCC scores before we ever give the test?

Thank you for taking my comments. I realize it may never happen, but I keep waiting for the State Board or these work groups to go back to the word "guidelines" and implement something that matches a guideline rather than a meet or exceed requirement. I also think there is room for a competency based set of requirements and a course set of requirements, and while it will still be state-mandated minimum requirements, there could be two routes to take based on the district.

I appreciate your work, your patience, and your willingness to engage with us who are opposed to the work. Best of luck and I look forward to following up with you throughout the process.

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Minimum Postsecondary and Workforce Ready (PWR) Indicators

December 2014

Introduction

This proposal reflects the suggestions for revising the current menu generated by the Assessment Work Group (AWG) based on questions and input from the AWG and organizations and individuals state-wide. This draft is intended as a starting point for discussion and will be revised based on feedback from the members of the AWG.

Over the past 6 months the workgroup has identified several overarching questions regarding the current menu. These include:

1. Is the level of competency students must demonstrate PWR readiness or success?
2. Should the guidelines be phased-in? That is, should the menu be scaled back for the class of 2021 and expanded for subsequent graduating classes?
3. Do students need to be PWR in all 4 core content areas?
4. Should the “cut-points” for existing indicators be adjusted for internal consistency and to reflect the appropriate level of rigor?
5. What additional indicators should be added to the menu?
6. Should local assessments be added to the menu? If so, under what parameters/conditions? How could CDE assure that local assessments are valid indicators of PWR and are legitimate gatekeepers for graduation and that the level of rigor is comparable across districts (at least at a minimal level)?

The revised menu that follows is based on these responses to the questions articulated by the AWG.

1. The level of competency that students must demonstrate is readiness to enter postsecondary education and/or the workforce. That is, the student can demonstrate that she has the requisite knowledge and skills to be successful in postsecondary education and/or an entry level position of a career.
2. These guidelines would not be phased-in. The work group saw no advantage to that approach. The proposed menu would apply to the graduating class of 2021.
3. It is the state’s role to establish guidelines for demonstrating PWR that all students would need to meet. Demonstrated competency in English/Language Arts and Math as defined in this menu would enable students to take credit-bearing courses in higher education and/or obtain an entry level position in a career track. For that reason, the menu does not include science or social studies. However, districts could chose to require students to demonstrate competency

in other subject areas as determined by the local school board and the community. **Comment:** The Graduation Guidelines passed by the State Board in May, says on page 7 that ... "At a minimum, the determinations should articulate the academic competency levels for high school graduates in English language arts (reading, writing, and communicating), mathematics, social studies, and science. Please see my revised menu below for my solution to this dilemma.

4. The "cut-points" for the existing indicators were adjusted to reflect PWR "readiness." The cut-points for new indicators also reflect that level of rigor^[c2]. **Comment:** The State BOE Guidelines imply readiness cut points in AP classes as a "3" or higher (page 7).
5. Accuplacer, ACT Compass, ACT Work Keys, GED and PARCC were added to the menu in this draft proposal.

Collaboratively-developed assessments have been added to the menu. Collaboratively- developed assessments are performance tasks that measure PWR that have been created by combined groups of educators and other stakeholders according to a process determined by the department. CDE in collaboration with district personnel and national experts would identify a process for assembling a pool of PWR assessments that could be used by districts as part of their competency-based graduation requirements. CDE's role would be to convene assessment development groups, facilitate and support their work and establish a procedure for vetting those collaboratively-developed assessments. Assessment development could be done centrally or on a regional basis across the state and would involve a variety of stakeholders including content area teachers, career and technical educators, higher education faculty and business/industry leaders. CDE, using a broad-based review process, would certify that these collaboratively-developed assessments measure what they are designed to measure (i.e., PWR) and that the results from these assessments are appropriate to be used as a requirement for high school graduation. Districts that choose to use assessments from the state approved pool would receive training in the administration and scoring procedures constructed by the developers and certified by the department. Individual districts and groups of districts (e.g., BOCES) could submit locally developed assessments to the department review panel as candidates for inclusion in the state pool^[c3]. CDE will maintain a list of approved assessment measures that districts may select from in lieu of creating their own. **Comment:** This underlined process seems far more expeditious and cost effective than the process described above it. See the revised chart for my idea of "State reviewed and approved locally developed assessment measures.

Menu of Postsecondary and Work Force Indicators

	Competency Demonstration	English/Language Arts	Math	Social Studies	Science
High School Measures	<u>PARCC/ CMAS</u>	<u>3 or higher on 11th grade ELA assessment</u>	<u>3 or higher on Algebra II or Integrated II</u>		
	<u>Locally created, standards based, state approved end-of-course assessments/performances</u>	<u>State reviewed and approved scoring criteria</u> (May meet any or all content area criterion)			
	<u>Advanced Placement</u>	<u>3 or higher</u>	<u>3 or higher</u>	<u>3 or higher</u>	<u>3 or higher</u>
	<u>International Baccalaureate Diploma</u>	<u>Earned IB diploma (Meets all 4 content area criterion)</u>			
	<u>District Capstone¹</u>	<u>Criteria under development Locally created, portfolio-based demonstration subject to state review/approval⁴ (May meet any or all Content Area Criterion)</u>			
Post-secondary measures	<u>Accuplacer</u>	<u>Reading-62 Sentence Skills-70</u>	<u>Early Algebra-61 84</u>		
	<u>ACT Accuplacer</u>	<u>Reading-17 or English-18 Reading-62 Sentence Skills-70</u>	<u>Math 19 Early Algebra-61</u>		
	<u>ACT Compass ACT</u>	<u>Reading-77 Writing Skills-74 Reading-17 or English-18</u>	<u>Algebra-36 Math 19</u>		
	<u>ACT Work Keys - National Career Readiness Certificate ACT Compass</u>	<u>Silver or higher² (May meet any or all content area criterion)</u> <u>Reading-77 Writing Skills-74</u> <u>Algebra-36</u>			
	<u>ASVAB Advanced Placement</u>	<u>50 (meets all 4 Content Area Criteria)</u> <u>502 or higher</u>	<u>2 or higher</u>		
	ASVAB	50 or higher (Meets all 4 content area criterion)			
	<u>Concurrent Enrollment College Course³ [C4] ASVAB</u>	<u>Passing grade (May meet any or all content area criterion)</u> 50 50			

¹ See criteria developed by the Capstone Work Group

² 4 on each Work Keys core area assessment

³ Passing grade is determined by district policy for concurrent enrollment. An eligible concurrent enrollment course is the pre-requisite directly prior to a credit-bearing course

⁴ See Washington State Graduation Requirements for an example

	<u>GED District Capstone</u> ⁴	<u>Reasoning through Language Arts Test - 160</u> Criteria under development	<u>Mathematical Reasoning - 160</u> Criteria under development		
	<u>Industry Certificate</u> <u>GED</u>	Criteria under development (May meet any or all <u>content area criterion</u>) <u>Reasoning through Language Arts Test - 160</u> <u>Mathematical Reasoning - 160</u>			
	<u>Collaboratively-developed performance assessments</u> ⁵ <u>International Baccalaureate</u>	<u>State-wide scoring criteria</u> <u>Successful completion of 11th grade IB curriculum</u>	<u>State-wide scoring criteria</u> <u>Successful completion of 11th grade IB curriculum</u>		
	<u>PARCC Collaboratively-developed performance assessments</u> ⁶	<u>3 or higher on 11th grade ELA assessment</u> <u>State-wide scoring criteria</u>	<u>3 or higher on Algebra II or Integrated II</u> <u>State-wide scoring criteria</u>		
	<u>PARCC</u>	<u>3 or higher on 11th grade ELA assessment</u>	<u>3 or higher on Algebra II or Integrated II</u>		

⁴ See criteria developed by the Capstone Work Group See State of Washington Graduation Requirements for example

⁵ See #6 above

⁶ See #6 above

Elliott,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft proposal. Overall, the proposal represents a substantive improvement over the starting point for graduation guidelines assessment work group, and is generally reflective of ideas discussed by the group. The emphasis on readiness is particularly important, and limiting the scope to mathematics and literacy flows logically from it. Here are several suggestions for improvement, based on review by district leadership. I look forward to our next conversation, and welcome any questions you may have.

- (1) State that, when students demonstrate competency according to state established standards any time in high school, it should satisfy the requirement for graduation (grades 9 - 12). This is implied by including scores on tests that can be taken at any time in high school, but should be stated directly.
- (2) To afford AP the same standing as IB in the table, "successful completion of an Advanced Placement course" should be indicated as a criterion that could be added on the same line as reaching an AP score of 2. AP can be taken at any grade in high school and some are year long courses and some are semester, so this might lead to a need for additional clarification.
- (3) Clarify International Baccalaureate- is this year one to the diploma program? IB does not have grade 11 curriculum per se. An IB score of 3 is no longer noted as a criterion, and there is some similarity of an IB score of 3 with an AP score of 2, which is still included in the table.
- (4) Clarify that "Concurrent Enrollment College Course" in the table includes College Succeed courses. Or, add a line for successful completion of College Succeed courses. With CU Succeeds, the courses are considered concurrent enrollment if a student doesn't enroll and pay tuition.
- (5) Provide additional information where you have indicated "criteria under development". For Industry Certificate, if students complete coursework that is part of a CTE articulation agreement and the student successfully completes the course/earns college credit, then this course completion should satisfy the appropriate graduation requirement(s). Under Capstone, we recommend school districts be allowed to use approved capstone experience to demonstrate that a student meets any/all of the state requirements. BVSD wants to be involved in the development of the capstone experience criteria, which need to incorporate alternative data sets and measures, not just external academic measures.
- (6) Clarify whether Integrated II is intended under PARCC mathematics. If so, Algebra II is not the most comparable option in a traditional sequence, or necessarily the traditional sequence course-based PARCC test that should count for mathematics.
- (7) We recommend a provision that a school district can apply/petition to use district graduation standards instead of state standards. When districts demonstrate graduates consistently succeed in post-secondary education/career the district would be allowed to substitute

Jonathan

Jonathan Dings
Executive Director of Student Assessment and Program Evaluation
Boulder Valley School District
720-561-5822 (phone)
720-561-5538 (fax)

Menu of Postsecondary and Work Force Indicators

All indicators should be accessible to students when the underlying competencies have been achieved not based on seat time or year in high school.

	Competency Demonstration	English Language Arts	Math
High School Measures	PARCC	4 or higher on 11th grade ELA assessment	3 or higher on Geometry or Integrated II
	Advanced Placement	3 or higher <i>(define courses that qualify)</i>	3 or higher <i>(define courses that qualify)</i>
	International Baccalaureate Diploma	CCCS currently requires a score of 4 on the IB English test to give credit for ENG 121: Composition I	CCCS currently requires a score of 4 on the IB math tests to give credit for Math for the Liberal Arts and College Algebra
	Locally created, standards based, state approved end-of-course assessments/performances	State reviewed and approved scoring criteria	State reviewed and approved scoring criteria
	District Capstone	Locally created, portfolio-based demonstration subject to state review/approval	Locally created, portfolio-based demonstration subject to state review/approval
Post-secondary Measures	Accuplacer	Reading Comprehension-80 Sentence Skills-95	Elementary Algebra-85
	ACT	English 18	Math 19
	ACT Compass	Writing Skills 79	Mathematics 63
	ACT Work Keys - National Career Readiness Certificate	Silver or higher <i>(these designations have changed-update)</i>	Silver or higher <i>(these designations have changed-update)</i>
	Concurrent Enrollment College Course	College-level course: C- Remedial course: "successful completion"	College-level course: C- Remedial course: "successful completion"
Work Force Measures	ASVAB	50 or higher	50 or higher
	GED	170 (scaled score for each of the content areas)	170 (scaled score for each of the content areas)
	Industry Certificate	Criteria under development	Criteria under development

From Adams 50 (Jeni Gotto)

UIDELINES DRAFT

Suggestions

I am attaching my suggested revisions. I found one slight typo on the top of page 2 ("choose" rather than "chosed") and I recommend changing the minimum Math Accuplacer score to 85. At FRCC, the minimum Accuplacer score on the EA math test to enroll in college level mathematics (college algebra or math for liberal arts) is 85. If a student scores between 60 and 84 on this test, they place into the developmental

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Minimum Postsecondary and Workforce Ready (PWR) Indicators

December 2014

Introduction

This proposal reflects the suggestions for revising the current menu generated by the Assessment Work Group (AWG) based on questions and input from the AWG and organizations and individuals state-wide. This draft is intended as a starting point for discussion and will be revised based on feedback from the members of the AWG.

Over the past 6 months the workgroup has identified several overarching questions regarding the current menu. These include:

1. Is the level of competency students must demonstrate PWR readiness or success? **The level of competency should demonstrate PWR readiness.**
2. Should the guidelines be phased-in? That is, should the menu be scaled back for the class of 2021 and expanded for subsequent graduating classes? **Scaling back the menu would be counterproductive. The menu should be implemented in whole if this is the path chosen.**
3. Do students need to be PWR in all 4 core content areas? **Including science and social studies does uphold the validity of both subjects and ensure a well-rounded citizen. However, the uncertain future of the social studies test in particular creates a case of suggesting students show competency in English, Math, and possibly Science.**
4. Should the “cut-points” for existing indicators be adjusted for internal consistency and to reflect the appropriate level of rigor? **AP cut-points should reflect a consistency with IB requiring an AP score of 2 as indicated in the revised menu.**
5. What additional indicators should be added to the menu?
6. Should local assessments be added to the menu? If so, under what parameters/conditions? How could CDE assure that local assessments are valid indicators of PWR and are legitimate gatekeepers for graduation and that the level of rigor is comparable across districts (at least at a minimal level)? **Adding local assessments to the menu does provide smaller districts, which are unable to offer a wide variety of options to provide multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate competencies, options to help students meet expectations.**

The revised menu that follows is based on these responses to the questions articulated by the AWG.

1. The level of competency that students must demonstrate is readiness to enter postsecondary education and/or the workforce. That is, the student can demonstrate that she has the

requisite knowledge and skills to be successful in postsecondary education and/or an entry level position of a career.

2. These guidelines would not be phased-in. The work group saw no advantage to that approach. The proposed menu would apply to the graduating class of 2021.
3. It is the state's role to establish guidelines for demonstrating PWR that all students would need to meet. Demonstrated competency in English/Language Arts and Math as defined in this menu would enable students to take credit-bearing courses in higher education and/or obtain an entry level position in a career track. For that reason, the menu does not include science or social studies. However, districts could choose to require students to demonstrate competency in other subject areas as determined by the local school board and the community.
4. The "cut-points" for the existing indicators were adjusted to reflect PWR "readiness." The cut-points for new indicators also reflect that level of rigor.
5. Accuplacer, ACT Compass, ACT Work Keys, GED and PARCC were added to the menu in this draft proposal.
6. Collaboratively-developed assessments have been added to the menu. Collaboratively-developed assessments are performance tasks that measure PWR that have been created by combined groups of educators and other stakeholders according to a process determined by the department. CDE in collaboration with district personnel and national experts would identify a process for assembling a pool of PWR assessments that could be used by districts as part of their competency-based graduation requirements. CDE's role would be to convene assessment development groups, facilitate and support their work and establish a procedure for vetting those collaboratively-developed assessments. Assessment development could be done centrally or on a regional basis across the state and would involve a variety of stakeholders including content area teachers, career and technical educators, higher education faculty and business/industry leaders. CDE, using a broad-based review process, would certify that these collaboratively-developed assessments measure what they are designed to measure (i.e., PWR) and that the results from these assessments are appropriate to be used as a requirement for high school graduation. Districts that choose to use assessments from the state approved pool would receive training in the administration and scoring procedures constructed by the developers and certified by the department. Individual districts and groups of districts (e.g., BOCES) could submit locally developed assessments to the department review panel as candidates for inclusion in the state pool.

Menu of Postsecondary and Work Force Indicators

Competency Demonstration	English/Language Arts	Math
Accuplacer	Reading-62 Sentence Skills-70	Early Algebra-61
ACT	Reading-17 or English-18	Math 19
ACT Compass	Reading-77 Writing Skills-74	Algebra-36
ACT Work Keys - National Career Readiness Certificate	Silver or higher ¹	Silver or higher
Advanced Placement	2 or higher	2 or higher
ASVAB	50	50
Concurrent Enrollment College Course ²	Passing grade	Passing grade
District Capstone ³	Criteria under development	Criteria under development
GED	Reasoning through Language Arts Test - 160	Mathematical Reasoning - 160
Industry Certificate	Criteria under development	Criteria under development
International Baccalaureate	Successful completion of 11 th grade IB curriculum	Successful completion of 11 th grade IB curriculum
Collaboratively-developed performance assessments ⁴	State-wide scoring criteria	State-wide scoring criteria
PARCC	3 or higher on 11 th grade ELA assessment	3 or higher on Algebra II or Integrated II

¹ 4 on each Work Keys core area assessment

² Passing grade is determined by district policy for concurrent enrollment. An eligible concurrent enrollment course is the pre-requisite directly prior to a credit-bearing course

³ See criteria developed by the Capstone Work Group

⁴ See #6 above

Margo,

Here is my (and my colleagues') feedback:

1. If IB course work and concurrent enrollment courses are in the menu, AP Courses should be considered as well.
2. We are not sure what the IB "complete 11th grade curriculum" really means.
3. I'm not very familiar with GED, but I saw that GED score range of 150-169 is considered a passing score. So why are we using 160 and not 150 in our cut scores? Maybe this was discussed in the last meeting which I missed, so please enlighten me.
4. I'm a bit concerned about the collaboratively-developed assessment, whether the development of the criteria is going to align with the rolling out of the menu in terms of timeframe. Hate to not have the criteria ready when we roll out the menu, and to find that this menu item isn't practical after all and have to remove it from a published menu is probably not a good move. If we are confident that the criteria can be developed in time for the menu roll out (again, this may have been discussed in the last meeting which I missed), then I'm all for it.

Thanks!

Yu-Lu Hsiung, Ph.D.

Data Analysis and Reporting Manager | Denver Public Schools | 720.423.3310

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Minimum Postsecondary and Workforce Ready (PWR) Indicators

December 2014

Introduction

This proposal reflects the suggestions for revising the current menu generated by the Assessment Work Group (AWG) based on questions and input from the AWG and organizations and individuals state-wide. This draft is intended as a starting point for discussion and will be revised based on feedback from the members of the AWG.

Over the past 6 months the workgroup has identified several overarching questions regarding the current menu. These include:

1. Is the level of competency students must demonstrate PWR readiness or success?
2. Should the guidelines be phased-in? That is, should the menu be scaled back for the class of 2021 and expanded for subsequent graduating classes?
3. Do students need to be PWR in all 4 core content areas?
4. Should the “cut-points” for existing indicators be adjusted for internal consistency and to reflect the appropriate level of rigor?
5. What additional indicators should be added to the menu?
6. Should local assessments be added to the menu? If so, under what parameters/conditions? How could CDE assure that local assessments are valid indicators of PWR and are legitimate gatekeepers for graduation and that the level of rigor is comparable across districts (at least at a minimal level)?

The revised menu that follows is based on these responses to the questions articulated by the AWG.

1. The level of competency that students must demonstrate is readiness to enter postsecondary education and/or the workforce. That is, the student can demonstrate that she has the requisite knowledge and skills to be successful in postsecondary education and/or an entry level position of a career.
2. These guidelines would not be phased-in. The work group saw no advantage to that approach. The proposed menu would apply to the graduating class of 2021.
3. It is the state’s role to establish guidelines for demonstrating PWR that all students would need to meet. Demonstrated competency in English/Language Arts and Math as defined in this menu would enable students to take credit-bearing courses in higher education and/or obtain an entry level position in a career track. For that reason, the menu does not include science or social

studies. However, districts could choose to require students to demonstrate competency in other subject areas as determined by the local school board and the community.

4. The “cut-points” for the existing indicators were adjusted to reflect PWR “readiness.” The cut-points for new indicators also reflect that level of rigor.
5. Accuplacer, ACT Compass, ACT Work Keys, GED and PARCC were added to the menu in this draft proposal.
6. Collaboratively-developed assessments have been added to the menu. Collaboratively-developed assessments are performance tasks that measure PWR that have been created by combined groups of educators and other stakeholders according to a process determined by the department. CDE in collaboration with district personnel and national experts would identify a process for assembling a pool of PWR assessments that could be used by districts as part of their competency-based graduation requirements. CDE’s role would be to convene assessment development groups, facilitate and support their work and establish a procedure for vetting those collaboratively-developed assessments. Assessment development could be done centrally or on a regional basis across the state and would involve a variety of stakeholders including content area teachers, career and technical educators, higher education faculty and business/industry leaders. CDE, using a broad-based review process, would certify that these collaboratively-developed assessments measure what they are designed to measure (i.e., PWR) and that the results from these assessments are appropriate to be used as a requirement for high school graduation. Districts that choose to use assessments from the state approved pool would receive training in the administration and scoring procedures constructed by the developers and certified by the department. Individual districts and groups of districts (e.g., BOCES) could submit locally developed assessments to the department review panel as candidates for inclusion in the state pool.

Menu of Postsecondary and Work Force Indicators

Competency Demonstration	English/Language Arts	Math
Accuplacer	Reading-62 Sentence Skills-70	Early Algebra-85
ACT	Reading-17 or English-18	Math 19
ACT Compass	Reading-77 Writing Skills-74	Algebra-36
ACT Work Keys - National Career Readiness Certificate	Silver or higher ¹	Silver or higher
Advanced Placement	2 or higher	2 or higher
ASVAB	50	50
Concurrent Enrollment College Course ²	Passing grade	Passing grade
District Capstone ³	Criteria under development	Criteria under development
GED	Reasoning through Language Arts Test - 160	Mathematical Reasoning - 160
Industry Certificate	Criteria under development	Criteria under development
International Baccalaureate	Successful completion of 11 th grade IB curriculum	Successful completion of 11 th grade IB curriculum
Collaboratively-developed performance assessments ⁴	State-wide scoring criteria	State-wide scoring criteria
PARCC	3 or higher on 11 th grade ELA assessment	3 or higher on Algebra II or Integrated II

¹ 4 on each Work Keys core area assessment

² Passing grade is determined by district policy for concurrent enrollment. An eligible concurrent enrollment course is the pre-requisite directly prior to a credit-bearing course

³ See criteria developed by the Capstone Work Group

⁴ See #6 above

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Minimum Postsecondary and Workforce Ready (PWR) Indicators

December 2014

Introduction

This proposal reflects the suggestions for revising the current menu generated by the Assessment Work Group (AWG) based on questions and input from the AWG and organizations and individuals state-wide. This draft is intended as a starting point for discussion and will be revised based on feedback from the members of the AWG.

Over the past 6 months the workgroup has identified several overarching questions regarding the current menu. These include:

1. Is the level of competency students must demonstrate PWR readiness (proficiency) or success?
2. Should the guidelines be phased-in? That is, should the menu be scaled back for the class of 2021 and expanded for subsequent graduating classes?
3. Do students need to be PWR in all 4 core content areas?
4. Should the “cut-points” for existing indicators be adjusted for internal consistency and to reflect the appropriate level of rigor?
5. What additional indicators should be added to the menu?
6. Should local assessments be added to the menu? If so, under what parameters/conditions? How could CDE assure that local assessments are valid indicators of PWR and are legitimate gatekeepers for graduation and that the level of rigor is comparable across districts (at least at a minimal level)?

The revised menu that follows is based on these responses to the questions articulated by the AWG.

1. The level of competency that students must demonstrate is readiness to enter postsecondary education and/or the workforce. That is, the student can demonstrate that she has the requisite knowledge and skills to be successful in postsecondary education and/or an entry level position of a career.
2. These guidelines would not be phased-in. The work group saw no advantage to that approach. The proposed menu would apply to the graduating class of 2021.
3. It is the state’s role to establish guidelines for demonstrating PWR that all students would need to meet. Demonstrated competency in English/Language Arts and Math as defined in this menu would enable students to take credit-bearing courses in higher education and/or obtain an entry level position in a career track. For that reason, the menu does not include science or social

studies. However, districts could choose to require students to demonstrate competency in other subject areas as determined by the local school board and the community.

4. The “cut-points” for the existing indicators were adjusted to reflect PWR “readiness.” The cut-points for new indicators also reflect that level of rigor.
5. Accuplacer, ACT Compass, ACT Work Keys, GED and PARCC were added to the menu in this draft proposal.
6. Collaboratively-developed assessments have been added to the menu. Collaboratively-developed assessments are performance tasks that measure PWR that have been created by combined groups of educators and other stakeholders according to a process determined by the department. CDE in collaboration with district personnel and national experts would identify a process for assembling a pool of PWR assessments that could be used by districts as part of their competency-based graduation requirements. CDE’s role would be to convene assessment development groups, facilitate and support their work and establish a procedure for vetting those collaboratively-developed assessments. Assessment development could be done centrally or on a regional basis across the state and would involve a variety of stakeholders including content area teachers, career and technical educators, higher education faculty and business/industry leaders. CDE, using a broad-based review process, would certify that these collaboratively-developed assessments measure what they are designed to measure (i.e., PWR) and that the results from these assessments are appropriate to be used as a requirement for high school graduation. Districts that choose to use assessments from the state approved pool would receive training in the administration and scoring procedures constructed by the developers and certified by the department. Individual districts and groups of districts (e.g., BOCES) could submit locally developed assessments to the department review panel as candidates for inclusion in the state pool.

Menu of Postsecondary and Work Force Indicators

Competency Demonstration	English/Language Arts	Math
Accuplacer	Reading-62 Sentence Skills-70	Early Algebra-61
ACT	Reading-17 or English-18	Math 19
ACT Compass	Reading-77 Writing Skills-74	Algebra-36
ACT Work Keys - National Career Readiness Certificate	Silver or higher ¹	Silver or higher
Advanced Placement	2 or higher ^[Author1]	2 or higher
ASVAB	50	50
Concurrent Enrollment College Course ²	Passing grade ^[Author2]	Passing grade
District Capstone ³	Criteria under development	Criteria under development
GED	Reasoning through Language Arts Test - 160	Mathematical Reasoning - 160
Industry Certificate	Criteria under development	Criteria under development
International Baccalaureate	Successful completion of 11 th grade IB curriculum ^[Author3]	Successful completion of 11 th grade IB curriculum
Collaboratively-developed performance assessments ⁴	State-wide scoring criteria	State-wide scoring criteria
PARCC	3 or higher on 11 th grade ELA assessment	3 or higher on Algebra II or Integrated II

Additional comments that our AP program director wanted to share and has heard from the field:

I have recently fielded a number of emails from concerned partners in secondary schools who believe that the unintended consequences of the Colorado Graduation Guidelines' College and Career Ready Determinations (CCRD) will have an extremely negative impact at their campuses. In the words of a school leader from Delta High School:

"These cut points will destroy the AP program we have worked so hard to develop with equity. Telling a struggling junior that he needs a 3 on an AP Calculus exam or a C- in CE College Algebra to graduate gives him no real choice." – Shawna Magtutu

These sentiments have been echoed from a wide variety of schools, and I believe I understand their concerns. The CCRD definitely deserve CDE's careful consideration and revision to ensure that all metrics accurately gauge *minimum student competency that is equivalent to college-readiness*. However, as currently written, Concurrent Enrollment's readiness determiner is a course grade, not a display of proficiency. By replacing an independent measure of competency with a course grade, the grad guidelines remove any opportunity for normed, relative equivalence amongst the metrics and Colorado students concerned with high school graduation will lose the freedom to challenge themselves in more

¹ 4 on each Work Keys core area assessment

² Passing grade is determined by district policy for concurrent enrollment. An eligible concurrent enrollment course is the pre-requisite directly prior to a credit-bearing course

³ See criteria developed by the Capstone Work Group

⁴ See #6 above

rigorous courses. As Mrs. Magtutu states, struggling students will be far less likely to engage in the rigors of AP or IB than a course that has no standardized performance requirement.

As I have understood from our partners in the field, the belief is that Colorado needs graduation guidelines with the same requirements for all courses: either all competency-based metrics or all course completion. [Author4]