Meeting Logistics & Desired Outcomes

Meeting: ESSA Committee of Practitioners

Date & Time: February 21, 2019; 10:00 am– 3:00 pm

Location: 1560 Broadway, Suite 1900 February 21, 2019 Webinar Link

Meeting Leads: Clint Allison, Laura Gorman, Brad Bylsma

Objectives: To allow the Colorado Department of Education the opportunity to provide updates to and elicit recommendations from the Colorado Committee of Practitioners regarding relevant and timely issues related to CDE’s responsibilities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, including:

**Attendees:** Mitzi Swiatkowski, Mary Ellen Good, Lori Cooper, Heathre Palige, Moses Rigidor, Clinton Allison, Jesus Escarcega, Amy Beruan, Clare Vickland, Paul Freeman, Laura Gorman

**Virtual Attendees:** John McKay, Chaile Hymes, Myra Westfall

Agenda Items and Next Steps

| **Headline****Time****Presenters** | **Topic** | **Presentation and Process** | **Expected Outcome** | **Summary/Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Committee Business****10:00-10:15***Clint, Laura, Brad* | Approval of Nov. 8, 2018 Notes | CoP Prep: Read Nov. 8 Meeting Minutes prior to Feb. 21, 2019 meeting. | CoP members will have an opportunity to review Nov. 8 meeting minutes, amend if needed, and approve. | The November 8, 2018 minutes were approved. (Amy approved and Mary Ellen Seconded). **Application from Carrie Maffoni:** Decision: Re-evaluate this application at the end of membership terms.  |
| **Equitable Distribution of Teachers****10:15 – 11:15**Jeremy Meredith, Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson | **Topic**Towards EDT Gap Sizes | **CoP Prep:**Review EDT gap size proposal in advance.  | **CoP will…**Review justification for using gap size analyses. Discuss two models to define gap size. Discuss possible LEA actions and CDE supports according to gap size.  | 1. CDE wants feedback from CoP members on if this gap should be address in the UIP, Cons App, or another place. **CoP Feedback**: -The use of percentile might not provide authentic data because district variability makes it difficult to determine cut points. -CoP appreciates that ‘experience’ is a factor because it is quantifiable, -Charter schools should be taken into consideration with EDT as they may or may not have a waiver to do the evaluation. - Are there common components across districts that CDE could utilize? -Testing data is not available until after teacher evaluations are done.2. One solution is to run the analyses at the student level using your own local data. 3. CDE encourages the field to think about teacher recruitment strategies, human capital strategies and systems. 4. CDE will need to see that there is a plan in place to address these gaps, and that the plan has begun. 5. EDT requirements will not interfere with SB 191 expectations. There’s a 4.67% gap between the lowest minority schools and the highest minority schools in terms of effectiveness. 6. This EDT indicator is here just to ensure that students have equitable access to effective teachers. 7. CDE has developed an FAQ guide, guidance, and a slide deck that district leaders can utilize.8. CDE will only be asking the field to include their plan in their UIP if they have a large gap. There is funding available to help address the gaps that exist. 9. CoP would like CDE to develop more guidance on the ‘effective’ range within EDT. 10. Decision: .CoP members voted on using Model B. This model affords flexibility for districts with minimal gaps. Vote for Model B: Mary Ellen made a motion to vote for Model B, Jesus seconds, motion passed.  |
| **1% Alternative Assessment****11:15 – 11:30**Paul Foster, Gina Herrera | Update on 1% Alternative Assessment | CoP Prep: None |  Members will have an opportunity to respond to the Alternate Assessment Update.  | Paul was not present. This will be continued on April 25th.  |
| **Alternative Diploma****11:30 – 12:00**Paul Foster, Gina Herrera |  Update on Alternate Diploma  | CoP Prep: None |  Members will have an opportunity to respond and provide feedback related to Alternate Diploma. | Paul was not present. Pat Chapman gave a brief overview: 1. There has not been much interest in creating an alternate diploma for CO, but it has raised other questions/issues such as inconsistency in graduation rates. 2. The goal is to engage in dialogue with the field to deal with this specific issue in order to ensure that the students’ diplomas are meaningful and appropriate based on their high school work. 3. This will be determined at the local level. This will be continued on the April agenda.  |
| **Lunch:****12:00 – 12:30** |
| **ESSA “Other Indicator”** **12:30 – 1:00**Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson | Update on Other indicator. LEAs that have schools identified for Targeted Support and Improvement have to establish the criteria and timeline for exiting schools | CoP Prep:Review §1111(d)(2) | Recommendations on: 1. How to improve quality of absenteeism data. 2. How to collect input from LEAs regarding TS exit criteria and timeline. Recommended exit criteria and timeline to which LEAs could just refer (instead of establishing own | **Definition of Chronic Absenteeism**: Students who are chronically absent from school 10% or more of the time. 1. 16-17 was the first year that CDE had collected the chronic absenteeism data. 2. CDE will be using chronic absenteeism in 19-20. 3. There are low rates of chronic absenteeism in districts across the state. 4. Exit Criteria Timeline for TS Schools: -Schools identified under ESSA must create a plan of improvement. -SEAs are responsible for reviewing and approving improvement plans. -LEAs are responsible for developing CS and TS plans. **CoP Feedback/Input:** -Low participation on tests will always be identified because there is an opt-out option (parent choice is noted in the state plan). ---One idea is to use the same platform from the first page of EASI to be applicable to all districts and schools. 5. CDE selected a 3-year timeline for CS schools. 6. CDE wants CoP’s recommendations on the timeline for CS schools not meeting deadlines. CDE needs CoP’s recommendations on the frequency of information that LEAs should submit. CoP will capture their thoughts/feedback on the note-catcher.  |
| **Migrant Education****1:00 – 1:40**Tomas Mejia  | Migrant Education Program  | CoP Prep: **Statutory Requirement:** 1309 of Title I, Part C**Regulatory Requirements:** Title I: C-CFR 200.81 and 200.103 | 1. COP will have an understanding of current district notification processes of eligible migrant students.2. CoP will have an opportunity to provide input on how they receive notifications of eligible migrant students. | 1. Definition of Migrant: children who have moved, changed schools due to economic factors. 2. MEP has 5 regional programs to identify and prioritize these students. 3. CoP Feedback: -This survey has been most effective with schools who put it in their registration packets at the beginning of the school year. -What do we need, how can we get this information out, and who needs to know this information? -One piece that is missing is a notification when migrant students leave the state. 4. MEP is streamlining their data to provide the most accurate list of migrant students to districts. 5. LEAs can have updated data on migrant students every day. 6. Should there be a dedicated district personnel who can access the pipeline data? 7. Hemp is now a qualifying activity. 8. There are some fantastic opportunities for migrant students (refer to PowerPoint).  |
| **ESEA Fall Director’s Meeting****1:40 – 2:15**Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson, DeLilah Collins | ESEA Fall Director’s Meeting: Theme, Content, Timing, Location | CoP Prep: None | CoP will provide input regarding content and timing of an ESEA Fall Director’s meeting sponsored by the CDE ESEA Programs Team.  | 1. CDE would like to re-institute the ESEA Fall Director’s Meeting. 2. What topics would be most meaningful for us to cover at this conference? -Supplement not Supplant -Successful Practices in Rural School Districts (Mitzi) -Integration of funds: how to maximize the funds that are granted to you? -Legal updates from Bruce. -Overview of funds spending on different programs. -Ideas/strategies from districts that have been monitored. “How are they using their funds and what are their practices?”-Overview of monitoring (not heavy into detail). --Fiscal breakout session. -Title IV guidance-Year-at-a-glance calendar with Regional Network Meetings. -Discussion of the program evaluation trainings. -BOCES session (birds of a feather session). \*Make it clear to the field that this is specifically for ESEA directors.\*3. The location of this conference is TBD (CDE will consider other locations than the metro area).  |
| **Consolidated Application****2:15 – 3:00**DeLilah Collins,  | * Title II Question Clarification
* Phased in Approach to Submission
 | CoP Prep: Review the proposed Title II revised question. Provide edits and input on the type of response that will be provided based on the questions asked. Do the updates help clarify what response is needed? Are additional edits needed? | CDE staff will clarify expectations of the Title II Consap Question with CoP input.CDE staff will ask for CoP input regarding a phased-in approach to the completion of the Consolidated Application | 1. The Title II question asks: How are districts prioritizing Title II funds to meet the needs of the highest needs schools? (ESSA, Title II). 2. The district will first need to identify the ‘highest poverty school.’ There’s no number attached to this.3. CoP Feedback: -Is this a requirement? -Add a scenario to the Title II Question. -Break this out into two questions: \*\*How are Title II funds being used to ensure the inclusion of all schools? \*\*If there are not enough Title II funds available how are they being prioritized? 4. CDE will work to illustrate some of the flexibilities available under this statutory language. 5. It would be beneficial to CoP if there were parenthetical statement on the end of the question to clarify the expectations.6. CDE may not be able to bring back to CoP in April but we will route this via email for your feedback.   |