CDE Meeting Agenda - TAP

Tuesday, 09/15/26

—

Attendees

- Scott Weldon, TAP Chair - Harrison School District 2
- Carol Eaton - Jefferson County Public Schools
- Ben Shear - University of Colorado Boulder School of Education
- Josh Quick - Colorado Education Association
- Julie Shue - Stratton School District
- Laurie Rossback - Durango School District
- Norm Alerta - Cherry Creek School District
- Pam Wong - Denver Public Schools
- Ryan Marks - Colorado Charter School Institute
- Stefan Richarz - Attainment Network
- Susan Thomas - Poudre School District
- Victoria Crownover - Colorado Community College System Career and Technical Education

CDE Staff Attendees

- John Lyons - Accountability Reporting Analyst
- Anne Laesecke - Director of Accountability Analytics
- Marie Huchton - Supervisor of Accountability Analytics
- Anna Perkins - Accountability Data Analyst
- B Sanders - Accountability Analytics
- Joel Ignizio - Accountability Analytics
- Michelle Romero - Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Office
- Reagan Ward - Data Services Unit

Meeting Logistics and Desired Outcomes

Meeting: Technical Advisory Panel on Longitudinal Growth (TAP)

Date and Time: 9/15/26, 1:00-4:00

Facilitator: John Lyons, CDE, Accountability Reporting Analyst

Meeting Objectives:

- Establish guiding principles with PWR metric
- Determine PWR: CCRGB and PSP denominator methodologies

Agenda Items and Next Steps

• New Member Introductions

- Time: 1:00-1:20
  - Julie Shue - Stratton School District
  - Stefan Richarz - Attainment Network
  - Victoria Crownover - Colorado Community College System Career and Technical Education

• Agenda Item: Guiding Principles with PWR metric

- Time: 1:20-1:50
- Notes and next steps:

Breakout groups identified the following priorities for TAP's PWR recommendations:

- Equity and access across student groups, regions, districts, and schools.
- Valid, verifiable, accessible, and transparent data that districts can reconcile to student-level records.
- Clear numerator and denominator rules so ratings are understandable and reproducible.
- Data integrity and statewide consistency in collection and reporting.
- A clear theory of action, attention to unintended consequences, and incentives for quality experiences rather than compliance alone.
- Coherence over time while retaining enough flexibility to respond to new information and changing conditions.
- Recognition that students need a meaningful pathway, not completion of every available pathway.

• Break

- Time: 2:45-3:00

• Agenda Item: PWR: PSP & CCRBG denominator methodologies

- Time: 3:00-3:50
- Notes and Next Steps:

Postsecondary Progression Denominator

CDE proposed including all graduates, completers, and high school equivalency diploma recipients from the reporting year regardless of AYG. The unresolved issue is when to include students who complete graduation requirements but remain enrolled in ASCENT, P-TECH, TREP, or special education transition services.

Approach	Rationale	Concern
Option 1	Include the student when coded as a graduate; simplest and aligns with graduation records.	The qualifying postsecondary outcome may occur later or may never be completed.
Option 2	Wait until the student finishes the extended program and receives the diploma; better aligns timing with the opportunity to demonstrate a successful outcome.	Credit is delayed and the rule is harder to explain and administer.

Direction: Option 2 was described as the more inclusive and substantively fair basis for continued analysis, but no final methodology recommendation was adopted. TAP members were asked to submit feedback, and CDE may revisit whether different extended programs require different treatment.

CCRBG Denominator

Two denominator concepts were compared:

- Option 1 would use a one-year grades 9-12 enrollment base. It aligns more closely with annual PWR incentive funding and assigns responsibility to the current-year school, but most included students have not yet reached the point at which readiness should be judged. CDE estimated that this could produce a statewide readiness rate near 30 percent and could be misleading.
- Option 2 would use a cumulative model. It includes students when they graduate or complete, regardless of AYG, and adds students at the end of the seven-year AYG window if they never achieved a successful graduation or completion outcome. A qualifying CCRBG activity completed anywhere during high school would count, and the last responsible school or district would receive attribution.

Direction: Discussion and chat feedback strongly favored Option 2 because it better reflects whether a student became ready by the end of high school, aligns with the concept of readiness, and counts each student once. This was a strong working preference rather than a closed final vote.