

## **DAC Meeting Minutes**

PSD Boardroom

Wednesday, January 14, 2026

6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

### **Present**

Meghan Archuleta   Erin Austin   Clare Barquero   Ashley Barrett  
Stephanie Cotton-Maceta   Erica Daniell   Jamie Forde   Jess Ellis Hagman   Tena Green  
Jodi Quass   Courtney Rickard   Marybeth Rigali-Oiler   Ian Rutherford  
Michael Werner   Joe Zappa

### **Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting opened with DAC acknowledgement of a leadership transition and a request to support new members (Erin Austin and Courtney Rickard) by conducting brief introductions. Members shared their names and DAC representation roles, including parents (early childhood, elementary, secondary), community members, charter school representation, district staff, administrators, and Cabinet liaisons.

Following introductions, DAC leadership emphasized that the DAC is a member-driven body, distinct from Cabinet or district administration meetings. Members were reminded that the group uses a “meeting design” rather than a traditional agenda to reinforce shared ownership of the meeting and allow flexibility based on committee needs.

Clarification was provided regarding DAC role designations, noting that representation categories are defined and required by Colorado state law governing district accountability committees. Members were encouraged to view these labels as structural requirements rather than limitations.

DAC leadership reaffirmed long-standing committee norms that members are encouraged to “bring their whole selves” to discussions. While members hold designated roles, all participants are welcome to contribute perspectives based on their lived experiences, professional backgrounds, and multiple identities in support of students, families, staff, and the broader community.

It was noted that strengthening family, school, and community partnerships has been a recurring priority for the DAC and remains an important focus area. Given the significance of this topic, the committee agreed to allow flexibility with the meeting timeline to ensure adequate discussion.

## **Preview Meeting Design– Ashley Barrett**

Ashley read through the meeting design.

## **Approval of Minutes**

The committee approved and seconded the November 19, 2025 meeting minutes.

---

## **Agenda Item: Family, School, and Community Partnerships (FSCP) Framework and Discussion**

DAC members received a presentation outlining the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) Family, School, and Community Partnerships (FSCP) framework and its alignment with PSD practices. The framework is guided by CDE and supported through monthly statewide “Coffee Chat” meetings for district leaders in similar roles. FSCP was emphasized as an essential, ongoing strategy—not a one-time goal—and a critical component of improving student outcomes, including attendance, sense of belonging, smoother transitions, and academic performance.

The committee reviewed how FSCP is embedded within the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), including its explicit inclusion within MTSS fidelity tools used by schools. A CDE-provided “trail map” was described, outlining four steps: forming teams, following the framework, writing a plan, and evaluating outcomes. PSD’s approach includes site-based FSCP teams, typically involving family liaisons, administrators, counselors, teachers, McKinney-Vento representatives, and occasionally parents. Team structures and meeting frequency vary by school based on need.

The CDE FSCP framework centers on four essential elements:

1. Creating an inclusive culture
2. Building trusting relationships
3. Designing capacity-building opportunities
4. Dedicating necessary resources

These elements are drawn from national standards and supported by detailed rubrics schools may use for self-assessment and continuous improvement. DAC members were informed that PSD is comparatively well resourced in this area, with 29 family liaisons districtwide, ensuring every school has access to a liaison (some serving multiple sites based on enrollment and need).

## **Family Liaison Role and Access**

Discussion clarified that the role of family liaisons has evolved beyond interpretation services to encompass broad family-school-community engagement. Liaisons support families with communication, conflict resolution, navigation of school systems, access to resources (e.g., food, transportation, housing support), and connection to academic and community services. Their work primarily supports multilingual learners and students experiencing housing instability (McKinney-Vento), though services are available through self-referral, staff referral, and data-informed outreach.

Clarification was provided on McKinney-Vento definitions, emphasizing that “unhoused” includes doubled-up living situations and inadequate housing conditions. Caseloads vary by site, with an ideal range of approximately 75–80 families per liaison, though some secondary schools experience significantly higher needs.

DAC members asked questions regarding how families identify and contact their assigned liaison. It was shared that PSD maintains a public-facing webpage listing family liaisons by school, including photos and multilingual introductions. Whether liaisons appear on individual school staff lists is determined at the school level.

## **Implementation, Strategies, and Evaluation**

The committee reviewed examples of high-impact FSCP strategies, noting that while foundational activities (e.g., events, fundraisers, social gatherings) are valuable for relationship-building, strategies most closely tied to academic outcomes involve direct capacity-building and instructional connections. Evaluation methods include surveys, feedback from families, attendance data, and ongoing team reflection.

Examples of promising practices were shared, including culturally responsive family events, workshops tied to academic needs, partnerships with community organizations, and leveraging public resources (e.g., libraries). CDE’s statewide “Promising Practices” repository was highlighted as a resource for schools.

## **DAC Discussion: Universal vs. Targeted Family Engagement**

A robust discussion followed regarding the distinction between targeted FSCP efforts (often associated with family liaisons) and broader, universal family engagement for all PSD families. Members expressed concern that family engagement efforts can unintentionally feel siloed or limited to specific populations, and that Tier 1 (universal) family engagement strategies may be underdeveloped.

Key questions raised included:

- How consistently FSCP principles are embedded in school improvement planning and School Accountability Committee (SAC) work.
- Whether schools meaningfully engage families who are less likely to participate in surveys or traditional engagement opportunities.
- How PSD can better communicate clear, accessible pathways for all families to engage (e.g., SAC, PTA, volunteering, feedback channels).
- Whether districtwide guidance or a family engagement policy could promote consistency and equity across schools.

Members discussed concerns about overburdening family liaisons and emphasized the importance of shared responsibility among administrators, teachers, counselors, and other staff. Suggestions included creating simple, universal tools (e.g., tiered “ways to engage” frameworks) and improving school website navigation to help families understand engagement options.

### **Next Steps and Considerations**

DAC members suggested elevating key FSCP questions to the District Advisory Board (DAB) and encouraging schools to reflect on inclusive engagement practices as part of existing accountability structures. The discussion highlighted strong interest in leveraging existing FSCP expertise more broadly across the district to support all families.

This agenda item concluded with agreement that FSCP is foundational to student success and warrants continued DAC focus.

### **DAC–District Advisory Board (DAB) Interface and Family Engagement**

DAC members discussed alignment between DAC and the District Advisory Board (DAB) regarding family engagement, with particular attention to early childhood transitions into PSD schools. It was noted that DAB has been actively exploring how to better engage families with preschool-aged children as school choice options expand and traditional neighborhood school pathways become less automatic.

Members emphasized that while websites, flyers, and printed materials are important, family engagement is most effective when it includes **direct human interaction**. Personal connections—such as conversations with school office staff or knowledgeable parents—were cited as especially valuable for families navigating PSD systems for the first time, particularly those enrolling their oldest or first child.

The committee explored the concept of **parent-to-parent navigation support**, envisioning trained parent volunteers who could serve as a first point of contact for families seeking help understanding registration, school routines, engagement opportunities, and decision-making processes. These volunteers could provide Tier 1 (universal) support and connect families to Tier 2 and Tier 3 resources, including family liaisons, when more specialized needs arise.

Members suggested this model could:

- Support early childhood outreach through Q&A sessions at preschools
- Provide two-way communication rather than one-directional information sharing
- Help identify recurring points of confusion that should inform district and school communications
- Strengthen trust and community connection across schools

The DAC discussed whether this work could be intentionally connected to existing DAB and School Accountability Committee (SAC) structures. One idea raised was asking DAB representatives to help facilitate or champion family engagement conversations at the school level, potentially using common guiding questions. Schools could then bring insights back to DAB and DAC for shared learning and potential districtwide improvements.

Members emphasized that family, school, and community partnership work should not be siloed to specific roles or populations but viewed as a **universal strategy** embedded in school improvement planning and accountability processes. There was agreement that PSD has strong expertise and emerging frameworks in this area and that further coordination, particularly with Academic Cabinet and DAB leadership, would be beneficial before advancing formal recommendations.

The discussion concluded with consensus that:

- Family engagement is increasingly critical to PSD's future success
- Current systems could be strengthened through intentional coordination and shared responsibility
- DAC and DAB alignment presents an opportunity to elevate this work systemwide

DAC leadership noted the value of the discussion and recommended continuing the conversation in coordination with DAB and district leadership before determining next steps or providing the DAB with a request to consider specific actions.

---

### **Agenda Item: Math Placement Update**

DAC received a verbal update on districtwide work related to **math placement and student transitions**, aligned to PSD's Unified Improvement Plan and Strategic Plan. Emphasis was placed on the critical nature of math placement decisions during **upper elementary and middle school**, which strongly influence high school course trajectories.

Key points included:

- PSD is revisiting a **data-informed math placement process** originally developed approximately 10 years ago.
- The work focuses on **appropriate placement** (not acceleration), grounded in the **zone of proximal development**, ensuring students are challenged without being overwhelmed.
- District staff have collaborated with middle school math Department Chair Teams and district math leadership.
- A multi-year dataset (approximately five years) has been analyzed, including achievement, grades, attendance, and course progression, to identify **guiding cut points** for placement recommendations.
- The process is intended as a **universal screening support**, not a prescriptive mandate, with professional judgment retained.
- PSD plans to **pilot placement recommendations** for the **2026–27 school year**, with continued refinement.

DAC was informed that progress is ongoing and that this work is intended to support consistency, equity, and improved transition outcomes.

---

### **Agenda Item: Monitoring Report (Preview – Time Limited)**

DAC was advised that the **Board of Education Monitoring Report** will be presented publicly in **February** across two Board meetings. While a full preview was not provided due to time constraints, members were informed that the report includes:

- Celebrations of district progress
- Ongoing areas of need, including efforts to **disrupt disproportionality**  
DAC members were invited to attend the Board meetings for full context.

---

## **Agenda Item: 1338 Committee Responsibilities: Educator Growth Rating System (Discussion and Input)**

DAC was reminded of its statutory role as the 1338 Committee, advising on matters related to **licensed educator evaluation growth ratings**.

Key discussion points:

- PSD has maintained a **stable, collaboratively developed growth rating system** for approximately 12 years, aligned with SB 191 and co-built with the Poudre Education Association (PEA).
- State requirements have shifted the growth component from **50% to 30%** of an educator's evaluation, reducing its overall weight.
- As part of leadership transition and system sustainability, PSD is proposing a **simplification of the statistical growth model** used to identify evidence of educator effectiveness.
  - The current **Hierarchical Linear Model (HLM)** would be replaced with a **Multiple Linear Regression (MLR)** model.
  - The simplified model produces **highly comparable results** (correlations approximately .98) while being easier to maintain, explain, and transfer.
- The purpose of the growth model remains unchanged: to **identify evidence of effectiveness**, not ineffectiveness.
- Growth ratings continue to be limited to **"2" or "3"**, with professional practice ratings remaining on a 1–4 scale.
- Approximately **two-thirds of educators** demonstrate evidence of effectiveness through the analytic model; the remaining educators engage in a **Student Learning Objective (SLO)** process.
- No educator receives a growth rating of "2" without **direct evaluator engagement** via the SLO process. PSD implements **two rounds of SLO opportunity/support**.
- Analyses continue to control for student characteristics (e.g., SES, IEP status) to ensure outcomes are not driven by assignment differences.
- The workload for growth analysis remains **centralized at the district level**, reducing burden on schools and principals.

DAC members asked clarifying questions about:

- Differences between the two models in edge cases
- Ensuring educators needing support continue to be identified
- Transparency and communication with PEA

The committee expressed understanding of the rationale and **general comfort with moving forward**, noting the benefits of sustainability, efficiency, and continued fairness.

**Consensus:**

DAC members supported district leadership proceeding with internal planning discussions and subsequent engagement with PEA regarding the proposed model shift.

---

**Closing Reflections and Transition**

Members expressed appreciation for the clarity, transparency, and long-term impact of the outgoing DAC Co-Chair Dwayne Schmitz. Recognition was given to leadership continuity as Dr. Traci Gile assumes the position of DAC Co-Chair moving forward. Dr. Gile attended DAC meetings throughout the 2025/26 school year in preparation for this seamless transition. The meeting concluded with appreciation for collaborative engagement and anticipation of continued work in February.