



CCIP Update

Presenter/Facilitator: Fran Herbert and Toby King

Fran Herbert shared the most recent update on modifications made to the CCIP based on recent feedback received from the field. CDE is working to differentiate the monitoring process to take into account the characteristics of the individual AU, their local context, and demonstrated needs.

Concerns raised by the directors include:

- Inclusion of Personnel Status Report: could negatively impact the rural districts that have difficulties in hiring appropriately certified staff.
- Inclusion of state complaints (with findings) are considered as part of the matrix to be used in making decisions as to whether or not a district is selected for monitoring.
- ESSU staff indicated that there will be a workgroup convened to consider how the personnel status report and state complaints might be included in a way that is not reactive to the issues raised by the Directors, rather, based on trends and longer term non-compliance.

RDA Matrix Work Group/AU Determination

Presenter/Facilitator: Miki Imura

An update regarding the definition of IEP Exiters was provided. In general, the longer a student spends in the general education classroom without IEPs, the better their performance on state assessments. With recommendations from the RDA matrix work group, IEP exiters' state assessment results were included as "information only" in the 2018 AU determinations and will be part of the AU determinations' calculations in 2019. AU determinations for 2018 are currently available in the DMS for special education directors to review. AU determinations will be made publicly available on April 20, 2018. Directors are encouraged to review their AU's determination and to contact [Miki Imura](#) or [Toby King](#) if they have any questions or concerns regarding their AU's determination. There is also a recorded webinar available that reviews how to understand the determination. Other resources regarding AU determination are available at <https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/determperf>.

I-13 / Side-by-Side Reviews

Presenters/Facilitators: Gail Lott and Gloria Howell

Gail Lott and Gloria Howell attended the meeting to discuss the local experiences AU have had with the recent I-13 Side-by-Sides. A director indicated that in a recent side-by-side review there appeared to be inconsistency between CDE staff on what was compliant. There was also feedback from directors that from year-to-year compliance standards may not be consistent. Also, there was a concern related to emphasizing one compliance indicator one year and not emphasizing it the next year. ESSU staff expressed its understanding that the standard needs to be consistent from person to person and year to year.



SLD Guidelines / Information Related to the “Simple View” of Reading

Presenters/Facilitators: Jill Marshall

Jill Marshall presented information regarding the draft technical assistance document of the Simple View of Reading (SVR) framework. Directors had questions regarding the purpose of and the audience for the document and potential confusion the document could cause if this is seen as a reading model / framework endorsed or propagated by CDE. Other questions related to the ESSU’s role in addressing this issue and how it fits within the realm of special education. As a whole, most of the directors wondered if this information would best be delivered by CDE’s Office of Literacy. An option may be to develop a companion document that would provide interventions for special education students who do need interventions in particular areas. The directors also cautioned ESSU about giving the *appearance* of endorsing a particular reading model or framework. The directors thought wide dissemination to general education providers would be most impactful in making changes. The directors noted that the SVR contained good content, but needs to be user friendly in length. There will need to be additional conversation regarding the purpose and need for this document as part of the SLD guidelines. It was suggested that there be additional consideration about possible unintended consequences related to dissemination of this information. SDLT members will talk with directors and staff in their regions to determine what (if any) revisions are needed to the proposed outlined content of the SLD guidelines.

Procedural Safeguards – Multiple Languages Approved by CDE

Presenter/Facilitator: Paul Foster and Toby King

Currently, CDE provides the Procedural Safeguards in two languages: English and Spanish. CDE has partnered with Administrative Units to obtain a number of translated procedural safeguards. CDE will invest in getting them reviewed for accuracy and make them available on the CDE website. Additionally, CDE will identify the 10 most common languages in Colorado and have the safeguards translated and made available on the CDE website.

CESUG User Group

Presenters: Heidi Derr

Heidi was present to provide clarity on the role of the CESUG User Group. There was a question regarding whether CESUG was making changes to Enrich. It also appears there might be a possibility of a lack of alignment between the state model forms and what is in Enrich. Directors discussed the need for clarification regarding the process and content of reevaluations. Directors suggested that any workgroup related to reevaluations also has a school district attorney on it. When changes are being requested there are workgroups created to study the issue and make a decision. ESSU staff expressed concern that CESUG does not have broader representation of end users (directors, teachers, school psychologists, and SLPs). CDE can be more explicit with CESUG members that their special education director needs to be aware of any conversations or requests coming to CESUG. The notes will also need to reflect who is making the request or initiating the conversation.