CDE Meeting Agenda & Notes – TAP

Tuesday, October 20, 2026

Attendance

TAP Members

- Scott Weldon, TAP Chair - Harrison School District 2
- Carol Eaton - Jefferson County Public Schools
- Ben Shear - University of Colorado Boulder School of Education
- Debra Gustafson - Colorado Association of School Boards (new TAP member)
- Jessica Alzen – Boulder County School District
- Joshua Quick - Colorado Education Association
- Julie Shue - Stratton School District
- Norman 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 and Presenters

- John Lyons - Accountability Reporting Analyst and TAP facilitator
- Anne Laesecke - Director of Accountability Analytics
- Anna Perkins - Accountability Data Analyst
- Bee Sanders - Accountability Analytics
- Cassandra Córdova
- Christina Wirth-Hawkins
- Erin Gray
- Erin Loften
- Jasmine Carey
- Jennicca Mabe
- Joel Ignizio - Accountability Analytics

- Marie Huchton - Supervisor of Accountability Analytics
- Michelle Romero - Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Office
- Reagan Ward - Data Management Analyst

Other Attendees

- Andrew Bristol
- David Bahna
- Heather Waldron
- Jamie Ball
- Peter Wright
- Scott Burke
- Unidentified phone participant (displayed in Zoom as 13038774155)

Meeting Logistics and Desired Outcomes

Meeting: Technical Advisory Panel on Longitudinal Growth (TAP)

Date and Time: 10/20/26, 1:00–4:00 PM

Facilitator: John Lyons, CDE, Accountability Reporting Analyst

Meeting Objectives:

- Determine PWR: CCRBG Numerator Methodology for Postsecondary Credit
- Determine PSP Numerator Methodology

Agenda Items, Discussion Notes, and Next Steps

Welcome and CDE Updates

- TAP purpose was reaffirmed: provide non-binding technical recommendations to CDE on accountability and related topics.
- Deb Gustafson was welcomed as the newest TAP member, representing CASB.
- September denominator recommendations were reviewed. CDE noted support for the proposed CCRBG and PSP denominator approaches and summarized remaining implementation considerations.
- Accountability Working Group priorities included data quality/transparency/burden, stable resources to support PWR outcomes, and consideration of when funding and accountability rules should align.
- CDE shared updates related to part-time programming for homeschool students, READ Act/dyslexia screening assessments, and multi-district online school re-approval.
- PWR guiding principles were revisited. Additional principles emphasized quality over quantity, equity, and using flexibility to respond to implementation needs without creating unnecessary churn.
- Engagement norms were reviewed: engage in difficult topics, step up/step back, and communicate with respect.

PWR: CCRBG Numerator Methodology – Postsecondary Credit

The discussion focused on three technical questions: which college-credit experiences should count, whether developmental education should count, and the minimum credit-hour threshold.

- GT vs. non-GT: CDE presented a recommendation to count a passing AP/IB score or successfully completed concurrent-enrollment course regardless of Guaranteed Transfer (GT) pathway status.
- Discussion highlighted that GT status changes over time and does not capture all potentially valuable postsecondary experiences, including some CTE, arts, and world-language coursework.
- Members emphasized the importance of grounding the methodology in the statutory purpose of CCRBG and avoiding unintended incentives that could narrow student opportunities.
- Developmental education: CDE recommended excluding students whose only college-credit experience is developmental education. Discussion noted that developmental courses do not contribute toward college graduation credit hours and are identifiable in the postsecondary data.
- Credit-hour threshold: CDE recommended three or more college credits as the CCRBG threshold—roughly equivalent to one semester-long concurrent-enrollment course or one qualifying AP/IB exam.
- Members raised the need for comparability across CCRBG components so that the threshold for college credit is reasonably comparable to future standards for work-based learning and industry-recognized credentials.
- Feedback forms were left open through the following Tuesday; CDE indicated that a summary of responses would be shared after the response period.

PSP Numerator Methodology

The PSP discussion examined how much the new postsecondary progression measure should overlap with, or remain distinct from, CCRBG.

- CDE analysis used the previously discussed PSP denominator of graduates/completers and accumulated concurrent-enrollment credits across years and institutions.
- Twelve-credit threshold: TAP was asked whether PSP success should include students earning 12 or more college credit hours during high school, consistent with the legislative language.
- Concurrent-enrollment program eligibility: TAP was asked whether eligibility should be limited to Early Colleges and high schools hosting ASCENT, P-TECH, or TREP programs, as recommended by the PWR office, or whether students meeting the 12-credit threshold at other schools should also count.
- Discussion raised concerns that a narrow program definition could substantially limit which students/schools receive credit and could be difficult to sustain as specific programs change over time.
- CDE noted that apprenticeship and broader workforce outcome data are not yet available but that work is underway with Colorado's longitudinal data system partners to improve those data connections.
- Industry-recognized credentials (IRCs): TAP was asked whether PSP should be limited to the components explicitly named in statute, thereby excluding IRCs, or whether IRCs should continue to serve as a proxy for students moving directly into the workforce.
- Impact analysis showed that excluding IRCs would have a larger effect on Early Colleges than on many other school types, reinforcing the need to consider differential impacts.

- Members discussed the tension between avoiding duplication with CCRBG and preserving multiple legitimate pathways to postsecondary/workforce success.
- CDE clarified that accountability and sustained-funding definitions may differ when the purposes of the two systems differ.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

- Feedback forms and presentation materials will remain available after the meeting so members who need additional time can review the analyses and submit responses.
- CDE will use meeting discussion, chat feedback, and feedback-form responses to inform the next stages of methodology development.
- Homework for November: district-based TAP members should meet with Work-Based Learning coordinators/staff to understand local WBL structures and implementation.
- Members were specifically asked to learn about industry-sponsored projects, school-based enterprises, and on-the-job training, including how districts implement and track these experiences.
- The next TAP meeting is scheduled for November 17, 2026.
- No public comment was recorded before adjournment.