

DAC Meeting Minutes
PSD Boardroom
Wednesday, October 16, 2024
6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Present

Meghan Archuleta	Clare Barquero	Ashley Barrett	Stephanie Cotton-Maceta
Adam Cronk	Erica Daniell	Jess Ellis Hagman	Tena Green
Marcy Lewis	Jodi Quass	Ian Rutherford	Susan Sasson
Scott Schoenbauer	Mark Strasberg	Michael Werner	Becky Woodcox

Welcome and Introductions

Dwayne welcomed the committee members.

Approval of Minutes

The committee approved and seconded the September 18, 2024, minutes as amended.

DAC Membership (BOE Approval) – Dwayne Schmitz

The newly recommended DAC members, Alicia Romero, a parent of an English Language Learner, and Adam Cronk, a parent of a middle school student, will be presented for approval on the consent agenda at the Board of Education meeting on October 22.

Review CDE/DOE Accountability Frameworks/Processes Part 1 – Susan Thomas

Susan reviewed state and federal accountability systems, explaining how frameworks inform school improvement plans and how state and federal identifications are incorporated into a school's Unified Improvement Plan (UIP).

The state utilizes a four-level rating system, with most schools classified at the "Performance Plan" level. State plans for elementary and middle schools focus on achievement and growth, while high schools also incorporate post-workforce readiness (PWR) criteria. During the discussion, metrics such as Student Growth Percentile (SGP) and Median Growth Percentile were reviewed, noting that the latter resets annually to a score of 50. The "On Track to English Learner (EL) Proficiency" metric also pertains to the ACCESS for ELLs assessments.

District and school performance ratings revealed that the district received accreditation, with over 90% of its schools classified under the performance plan type, including all elementary schools. Differences between state and federal accountability systems were noted, as these can impact school ratings. The federal system, under ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act), focuses on specific student groups and includes Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) for the lowest-performing schools and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) for certain student groups. Schools identified as CSI or TSI are eligible for the EASI Grant to support improvement efforts. Additionally, biennial flexibility is available, and 22 schools submitted plans this fall.

The Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) process has shifted to a streamlined template, focusing on student performance priorities (e.g., literacy, mental health, and belonging, graduating with options). The UIP should align with frameworks and strategic plans and be

data-informed, focusing on what adults can address and how they can be held accountable. Final plans will be released at the state board meeting in December. Dwayne will ask Joe Zappa at Blevins and Steve Apodaca at Putnam if the DAC can support them with their improvement plan to better understand their approach.

Committee discussion:

- Concerns were raised about Black and African American students, as their smaller population makes it difficult to substitute for growth metrics.
- The group also examined how PSD compares to similarly sized districts, highlighting that it achieves strong results in state assessment outcomes.
- Webber was highlighted for being flagged under ESSA for its high opt-out rates, a recurring issue for many years. The discussion questioned why Webber ranks so low and explored whether some schools may not meet the minimum student threshold for certain metrics.

SAC Budget Priorities – Part 1 – Dwayne Schmitz

The DAC is responsible for gathering information to inform the annual budget. To ensure comprehensive input, PSD seeks feedback from SACs and principals in a survey that was distributed in the spring to help guide this process. The survey included professional development, staffing and facility needs, and other fiscal areas that should be addressed. Dwayne will send the survey results to the DAC, allowing them time to review them and look for themes before the next meeting. They will collaborate on their insights and finalize the report, which will be used to inform the Board of Education.

Licensed Educator Growth Ratings – Dwayne Schmitz

The DAC serves as the 1338 committee, providing input on the 30% of every licensed educator's evaluation in Colorado that comes from student growth data. About a year ago, the state changed this to a 70% professional practice and 30% growth model. The committee's role is to understand and provide feedback on the growth rating process, focusing on finding evidence of effectiveness, not ineffectiveness.

The state mandates a four-level rating system (4-1) for the final evaluation rating, which itself is made up of a professional practice rating and a growth rating. Poudre School District (PSD) accepts a rating of "3" as evidence of effectiveness, while a rating of "2" does not indicate evidence of effectiveness, though it does not imply ineffectiveness. A final growth rating of "2" can only be assigned after a second round of SLO/SOO, and teachers are only required to engage in an SLO if effectiveness is not indicated by a comprehensive review of the prior year's outcome data. PSD believes that strong instruction and effective professional practices are the driving forces behind positive outcomes.

Statistical modeling and Student Learning Objectives (SLO) represent two approaches to evaluating student performance. Statistical modeling is standardized, norm-referenced, and based on prior outcomes, with much of the workload managed by the district. In contrast, SLOs are more time-consuming for principals and teachers, as they are customizable and criterion referenced.

The district utilizes data from various assessments from the previous year and analyzes it through two types of growth models. The unconditional growth model does not make statistical adjustments to growth expectation based on student characteristics. In contrast, the conditional growth model does adjust growth expectation based on student demographics. An additional source of effectiveness evidence is available for certain categories of staff, such as secondary music, AP, IB teachers. This additional source is called an Expedited SLOs and is calculated by district staff each year.

Committee Discussion:

- Teachers' workloads and the accountability placed on them can create significant stress, and there was a call for compassion and support for educators.
- A principal can work with a teacher and contact HR under extenuating circumstances to utilize a “default” growth rating.
- The discussion underscored the importance of balancing accountability and support.
- This system and approach have been developed collaboratively with PEA and other PSD stakeholders.
- The data cleaning and control process requires that at least 10 students have pre- and post-assessment scores prior to calculating gain scores.
- Growth is tracked annually.
- A comprehensive data visualization tool allows principals and teachers to view data and calculation outcomes used to generate ratings.

Family Engagement Topics – Clare Barquero

This agenda item will be discussed at the next meeting.

Closing

The next DAC meeting will be November 20, 2024, JSSC Boardroom, 6:30-8:30 p.m.

Adjourned

Parking Lot Items: