ESEA Committee of Practitioners (CoP) August 18, 2016

19th Floor Conference Room – 1560 Broadway, Denver, CO, 80202

Committee Members:

Jesús Escárcega, Laura Gorman, Clint Allison, Tory Richey, Tracy Thatcher, Lori Cooper, Amy Beruan, Lynn Mather, Lynn Kintz, Bridgette Muse, Mitzi Swiatkowski, Dawn Roedel, Roy Holloway, Arlene Salyards, Holly Goodwin (phone), Jessica Martinez (phone), Amy Spruce (phone), Lucinda Long-Webb (phone), Myra Westfall (phone)

Guests:

Richard Garcia

CDE Representatives:

Brad Bylsma, Pat Chapman, Jeff Klein, Lynn Bamberry, Robert Hawkins, Stacy Goodman, Shelby Schaefer

The meeting was called to order by chairman, Jesús Escárcega at 10:00 a.m.

Chair Escárcega announced that Andrea Foust had informed the committee that she would be resigning her position as a member of the ESEA Committee of Practitioners.

* The committee discussed how to fill the opening and agreed to reconsider the three candidates with charter school experience identified through the application process recently conducted – Scott Graham, Clare Vickland, and Peter Vigil.
* The members present further agreed to vote on the candidates through an online election so all members could participate.
* Jeff Klein agreed to send applications for the three candidates to all members via email and allow a reasonable period for members to respond. The newly elected candidate will be invited to the next CoP meeting on Thursday, September 8.

Pat Chapman reviewed the Hub and Spoke Committee structure that CDE and the Colorado State Board of Education are using to facilitate the development of the ESSA State Plan.

* Role of CoP: (Act) in an advisory capacity to the Department, provide oversight of Colorado’s process of ESSA state plan development with a particular emphasis on the implementation of Title programs and supports for students.

Brad Bylsma introduced norms and expectations for the committee in support of CoP’s role in the development of the state plan.

Chair Escárcega facilitated a discussion about the decision-making process the committee would use to arrive at recommendations for the Hub Committee and State Board.

* Dawn Roedel made a motion to vote that the committee would vote on recommendations and that minority opinions would also be forwarded to the Hub Committee and State Board.
  + Holly Goodwin seconded the motion.
* ***The motion passed by a unanimous vote.***

Brad Bylsma provided some context regarding the timeline for state plan:

* ESSA was signed into law in December 2015
  + Replaces NCLB
  + Replaces Colorado’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver
* Proposed rules regarding accountability, reporting and state plans released in late spring
  + Colorado submitted comments before August 1 deadline
  + Brad Bylsma reviewed highlights of letter sent from Commissioner Anthes to USDE
  + Rules likely to be finalized and released in November
* USDE collecting feedback on proposed rules regarding assessment and assessment pilot
  + Comments due September 9
* State Board of Education has directed CDE to submit ESSA State Plan by March deadline (states may also submit by July deadline)
* Both sets of rules will impact plan submitted by Colorado. Changes in state legislation may also impact development and implementation of state plan
  + CoP and other groups will have ongoing opportunities to provide input on plan
    - Plan may be amended, even after submission to USDE
    - CDE will move forward with development of 2017 Consolidated Application
      * Goal is to limit requirements to what is unlikely to change and what is required to release funds
      * Alternate due date (besides June 30) may be considered

Brad Bylsma and Pat Chapman provided an overview of state plan requirements and decision points, as well as feedback on these items from the Colorado ESSA Listening Tour.

* On the issue of allocating school improvement funds on a formula or competitive basis, the most common responses during the listening tour were:
  + Formula was by far the most common recommendation
  + A hybrid of formula and competitive was the second most common recommendation
* Colorado will have to identify at least 5% of schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement based on academic performance (for Title I schools) and graduation rates (for all high schools)
* Colorado will also have to identify schools for Targeted Support and Improvement. Based on current reading of statute, it appears all schools (not just Title I) may be identified. USDE has said they will look further into this issue and provide clarification.
* Colorado will need to identify “consistently underperforming” in an effort to prioritize schools for Targeted Support and Improvement
* Title IV will be granted to LEAs by formula, but appropriations have been reduced from level of authorization ($1.6 billion) to $300 million nationwide
* Direct services will likely include support from CDE as well as support in selecting vendors – CDE is unlikely to approve vendors as it has in the past
* CDE is currently working on guidance for the field regarding impact of ESSA language regarding state licensure requirements on charter schools.
* Feedback from all listening tour stops with accompanying reports that summarize trends are available on CDE website.

Target for draft of state plan is end of calendar year

* CoP will likely be asked to go before HUB Committee in October and November to present recommendations

Comments made by participants regarding Colorado’s ESSA State Plan:

* Equity needs to be represented across plan. It’s currently not clear how Hub and Spoke framework prioritizes equity as an area of focus.
* Native American tribes, families, and students need to have a larger voice in process than they have previously had in statewide discussion of educational policy.
* Competitive allocation of school improvement funds excludes smaller and rural districts.
* Smaller and rural districts need more support in accessing school improvement funds and supports.
* If SES-like system of direct support from approved providers is implemented, there need to be rules that make funding and services for students equitable across state, regardless of district size, allocation, or metro/rural status.
* Plan requirements do not seem to address issue of hiring teachers of color.
* State law requires LEAs to notify parents they don’t have to have their kids take state assessments – this works against local efforts to increase participation and meet 95% federal requirement.
* State assessments are not released early enough to be useful.
* Higher Ed must have larger role in producing viable teacher candidates.
* All teachers (general education) need more special education training.
* Emphasis on middle school math would help rural districts that struggle to fill vacancies.
* Current law traps some students in English Learner programs.
* Native American students are underidentified because Native American status is deprioritized when more than one option is selected.
* Consultation with Native American tribes, parents, and students of color is vital in implementing ESSA State Plan.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00